



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Alberta Hansard

Wednesday afternoon, December 13, 2017

Day 66

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 29th Legislature

Third Session

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

Aheer, Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Rocky View (UCP),
Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition
Anderson, Hon. Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (NDP)
Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (UCP)
Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Bilous, Hon. Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)
Carlier, Hon. Oneil, Whitecourt-St. Anne (NDP)
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (NDP)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, Calgary-Fort (NDP)
Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP)
Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawthood (NDP)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP)
Cortes-Vargas, Estefania, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (NDP),
Government Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (UCP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (NDP)
Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Eggen, Hon. David, Edmonton-Calder (NDP)
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP)
Feehan, Hon. Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (Ind)
Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP)
Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (Ind)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., Calgary-Buffalo (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (UCP),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (NDP)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (NDP)
Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (UCP)
Jansen, Hon. Sandra, Calgary-North West (NDP)
Jean, Brian Michael, QC, Fort McMurray-Conklin (UCP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Kleinstuber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)
Larivee, Hon. Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (NDP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (NDP)
Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)

Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (NDP)
MacIntyre, Donald, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)
Malkinson, Brian, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Government House Leader
McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret,
Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (NDP)
McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),
Official Opposition Whip
McKittrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)
McLean, Hon. Stephanie V., Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (AP)
Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (NDP)
Miranda, Hon. Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (NDP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (UCP),
Leader of the Official Opposition,
Official Opposition House Leader
Notley, Hon. Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Premier
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Payne, Hon. Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Phillips, Hon. Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (UCP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)
Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP)
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)
Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)
Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)
Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (NDP)
Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)
Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (UCP)
Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (UCP)
Westhead, Cameron, Banff-Cochrane (NDP),
Deputy Government Whip
Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (NDP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)
Vacant, Calgary-Lougheed

Party standings:

New Democratic: 54 United Conservative: 26 Alberta Party: 2 Alberta Liberal: 1 Progressive Conservative: 1 Independent: 2 Vacant: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Robert H. Reynolds, QC, Clerk
Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Director of
House Services
Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel
Stephanie LeBlanc, Parliamentary Counsel

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

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms
Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
Gareth Scott, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

Rachel Notley	Premier, President of Executive Council
Sarah Hoffman	Deputy Premier, Minister of Health
Shaye Anderson	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Deron Bilous	Minister of Economic Development and Trade
Oneil Carlier	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Joe Ceci	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
David Eggen	Minister of Education
Richard Feehan	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Kathleen T. Ganley	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Christina Gray	Minister of Labour, Minister Responsible for Democratic Renewal
Sandra Jansen	Minister of Infrastructure
Danielle Larivee	Minister of Children's Services
Brian Mason	Minister of Transportation
Margaret McCuaig-Boyd	Minister of Energy
Stephanie V. McLean	Minister of Service Alberta, Minister of Status of Women
Ricardo Miranda	Minister of Culture and Tourism
Brandy Payne	Associate Minister of Health
Shannon Phillips	Minister of Environment and Parks, Minister Responsible for the Climate Change Office
Irfan Sabir	Minister of Community and Social Services
Marlin Schmidt	Minister of Advanced Education
Lori Sigurdson	Minister of Seniors and Housing

Parliamentary Secretaries

Jessica Littlewood	Economic Development and Trade for Small Business
Annie McKittrick	Education

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Coolahan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Clark	Horne
Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Turner
Ellis	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

Carson	Littlewood
Clark	Piquette
Connolly	Schneider
Coolahan	Schreiner
Dach	Starke
Fitzpatrick	Taylor
Gotfried	

Select Special Auditor General Search Committee

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Cyr	Littlewood
Gill	van Dijken
Horne	Woollard
Kleinsteinuber	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Miller
Ellis	Orr
Hinkley	Renaud
Horne	Shepherd
Luff	Swann
McKitrick	Yao
McPherson	

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Aheer	Littlewood
Drever	Pitt
Gill	van Dijken
Horne	Woollard
Kleinsteinuber	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	Nixon
Dang	Piquette
Jabbour	Pitt
Luff	Schreiner
McIver	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms Kazim
Deputy Chair: Connolly

Anderson, W.	Orr
Babcock	Rosendahl
Drever	Stier
Drysdale	Strankman
Hinkley	Sucha
Kleinsteinuber	Taylor
McKitrick	

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

Carson	Loyola
Coolahan	Miller
Cooper	Nielsen
Goehring	Nixon
Gotfried	Pitt
Hanson	van Dijken
Kazim	

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Cyr
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach

Barnes	Malkinson
Carson	Miller
Fildebrandt	Nielsen
Gotfried	Panda
Hunter	Renaud
Littlewood	Turner
Luff	

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Drysdale

Babcock	MacIntyre
Dang	Malkinson
Fraser	McPherson
Hanson	Nielsen
Kazim	Rosendahl
Kleinsteinuber	Woollard
Loewen	

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, December 13, 2017

[The Speaker in the chair]

The Speaker: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

Members' Statements

The Speaker: This will be the one moment that something has moved quickly around here.

The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View and deputy Leader of the Official Opposition.

Hanukkah

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Tonight Jewish families across Alberta and Canada will gather at sundown to light the hanukiah, a powerful symbol of faith and freedom. It is a statement of the Jewish people's struggle for religious freedom and shines with courage, with conscience, with strength, in centuries-long struggle for religious tolerance. The eight-day holiday commemorates the rededication of the temple against oppression more than 2,000 years ago. This victory still resonates today as a great triumph of religious freedom over subjugation and, as signified by the lighting of the hanukiah, of light over darkness. This joyous time represents an opportunity to think about the importance of faith and tradition as well as reflect upon the exceptional contribution of the Jewish community to our great province. Tonight as we watch the lighting of the second candle of Hanukkah, we're reminded of the ancient story of Israel's courage and their courage to make the darkness bright. We see the heroic spirit of the Maccabees live on in Israel today, and we know that a better day is coming when this festival of freedom will be celebrated in a world free from terror, and we will always keep hope that that light of hope will keep burning. The UCP caucus wishes a happy Hanukkah [remarks in Hebrew] to all those celebrating in Alberta and all around the world.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Glenmore.

Hanukkah

Ms Kazim: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to recognize the Jewish tradition of Hanukkah. Yesterday at sundown families across Alberta celebrated the first day of Hanukkah through the lighting of the first candle of the menorah. The lighting of the candle represents the spread of light, wisdom, enlightenment, and faith throughout the world and is a demonstration of how every individual has the ability to change the world for the better.

Many cultures and religions brighten the darkest nights of the year with festivals of light, and the tradition of Hanukkah is one of the oldest. Hanukkah celebrates and commemorates the strength and perseverance of the Jewish people and their struggle for religious freedom. After the rededication of the temple in Jerusalem a one-day supply of oil lasted for eight days until new and ritually pure oil could be prepared for the temple menorah.

This year as we celebrate 150 years of Confederation, we have the special privilege of also celebrating the countless contributions of the Jewish people to Alberta and to Canada. We owe them a debt of gratitude for sharing their history, traditions, and culture with all of us and for their work as community builders and leaders.

As the MLA for Calgary-Glenmore I am proud to represent such a diverse and dedicated constituency that includes a very strong and proud Jewish community. I'm proud to join with them to mark the beginning of the festival of lights, and on behalf of my colleagues on both sides of this House I wish everyone celebrating a happy and peaceful Hanukkah. May the lights of the menorah shine upon all families of the Jewish faith this holiday season and brighten their prayers for peace.

Thank you.

Government Policies

Mr. Loewen: With apologies to Dr. Seuss' the Grinch.

Every Albertan down in Albertaville liked jobs and prosperity a lot,
But the Premier with her Leap Manifesto did not.
She talked of making life better, you see,
But she forgot overregulation is never the key.

She talked lots about having Albertans' backs,
But she never campaigned on her carbon tax,
Not to mention that large tax will increase by 50 per cent.
In January Albertans' pocketbooks will have a bigger dent.

Now, the NDP managed to increase surgery waits.
It was hard for hurting Albertans to wait for those dates.
Seven months or more wait for an MRI.
When the Health minister talked it was a pie in the sky.

Now, rural crime is going nowhere but up, up, up,
And Crown prosecutors are now looking at an empty cup.
Dippers talked about social license. Free pipelines for all,
But Kinder Morgan now has run into an NDP wall.

With the debt reaching over \$90 billion, we fear,
And expected interest racking up at \$3 billion a year,
Now the Dipper budgets credit agencies like this not,
So six credit downgrades is what we got.

They even reduced money to public schools
And called it an increase. No one was fooled.
Now rural crime is everywhere to and fro,
So the NDP responds by letting criminals go.

Now, when it comes to the NDP caribou plans,
MDs, counties, foresters, and oil are no fans.
All they've ever asked for is to be consulted,
But they continue to feel nothing but insulted.

Biologists just say the NDP have no species plans,
So how can they provide the feds with caribou range plans
When clearly we know that species interact?
Grizzlies and cougars eating caribou has an impact.

So before the feds get the caribou plans,
The people need to become very big fans.
That will take consultation, you know,
But with the NDP smoke they will blow.

Making life better is something they say,
But all indications point to higher costs each day.
Now, the Premier looked down from her lofty perch
Expecting to see Albertans left in a lurch.

Maybe prosperity, she thought, doesn't come in a bill.
Maybe prosperity in Alberta is hard to kill.
What happened then? Well the right did unite.
They chose a leader for Albertans they did . . .

The Speaker: Thank you.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre.

Political Discourse

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a BA in professional communications, and in my studies I took a particular interest in political communications. It's a fascinating field that delves into human psychology, the evolution of technology, and how information can be shaped, transmitted, received, and taken in.

It was that study that led to my own increasing political engagement and eventually my run for office because I saw that the public and many people I knew felt disengaged and cynical, convinced that all politicians lie and everyday people have no hope of making a difference.

I ran to change that, to try and bring back some integrity to politics by helping people understand how our system works, how and why decisions are made, and how they themselves could get engaged. Now that I have the honour of standing here, I work every day to use my platform to do just that. That is why I'm committed to adamantly opposing the toxic environment being created by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

I recognize that political communications will always involve a certain amount of spin. Members will use hyperbole and exaggeration to frame their arguments, but we only have to look south to see the chaos and disorder created when elected officials take that behaviour to extremes. Since Jason Kenney's return to Alberta we've seen an exponential increase in the number of utterly inaccurate, disingenuous, and false claims infecting our political discourse to the point that our local media has felt the need to begin to call him out. It has been with great disappointment that I have seen members opposite follow that lead, spreading dangerously massaged and misleading information about GSAs, our electoral system, and even the written record of this House.

Mr. Speaker, to quote Charles Sykes, "Conservatives once recognized that politics was a means, not an end . . . that moral communities are 'fragile things, hard to build and easy to destroy.'" Power is not an end that justifies any means. That kind of attitude only serves to increase cynicism and drive our communities apart. Albertans deserve better. I'm committed to preserving the integrity of our political discourse, and I will continue to use my platform to call out those who abuse it. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Clarissa Stoffelsen

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the distinct pleasure of telling you about Clarissa Stoffelsen, chief warrant officer of the 2850 Grande Prairie army cadet corps. Clarissa was recently awarded the General Walsh commemorative sword, the highest prize in army cadets in Canada. To give you an idea of the significance of this honour, she was invited to Ottawa for Remembrance Day where she joined the vice-regal party at the National War Memorial and was a luncheon guest at the Governor General's residence.

Clarissa was chosen as Canada's top army cadet from hundreds of nominees based on her experience, determination, fitness, outstanding service record, and the highest level of personal discipline. Mr. Speaker, our community could not be more proud, and I hope all Albertans now feel the same way.

1:40

Let me tell you a bit more about Clarissa. She joined the cadet program at the age of 12. Over the next five years she worked hard to reach the highest rank in the corps, regimental sergeant major. She also excels academically and has an excellent record of community involvement. Clarissa has received many awards during

her time as a cadet and has been rewarded with opportunities to travel to Chile, Europe, and the Yukon. She has one year left in cadets, and then she'll work towards a new objective, studying to become a doctor.

There's no doubt in my mind and I'm sure in all of yours now that I've told you about her that Clarissa will attain all of her life's goals as this cadet has already proven that she has the right stuff. She's the best of the best, Mr. Speaker.

Chilean Community in Alberta

Loyola: Mr. Speaker, today and every day my caucus colleagues and I stand with the Chilean community here in Alberta. Starting in 1975 Chilean refugees fled to Canada and other countries to escape the totalitarian and murderous military dictatorship in Chile. These families were torn apart by thousands of murders, tortures, and disappearances, but when they started new lives in safer places like here in Alberta, the process of healing began.

I spoke in this very House of the importance of upholding democracy and fighting for democratic principles while the members opposite belittled those very values. As I spoke of the Chilean dictatorship, a member opposite shouted at me and said that Pinochet's dictatorship was a success story. Mr. Speaker, Latin American Canadians from countries across this hemisphere know undemocratic governments and dictatorships far too well. For the opposition to ever think of joking about a dictatorship that resulted in the deaths of thousands is incredibly offensive. They undermine the Chilean community's ability to reconcile its past when they claim that a dictator was a success. They ought to know better, but belittling human rights appears to have become a pattern for them.

Canada is a wonderful place for people from all walks of life, and I'm grateful my family is here in Canada, living and respecting indigenous communities and their territory. I call on the opposition to apologize to the Chilean community here in Alberta. They need to withdraw their comments and educate themselves on the atrocities of the military dictatorship in Chile. They need to stand on the side of human rights, of peace, and, most importantly, of democracy.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Airdrie.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite number of copies of a letter from the reeve of Wheatland county, which I will read into the record this afternoon in debate of Bill 33.

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

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have the five copies of an OH and S alert issued by the United Nurses of Alberta entitled You Have the Right and Obligation to Refuse Unsafe Work! It also says, "What does this mean? . . . refusing to perform unsafe work is not only a right it is a legal requirement in Alberta." Unfortunately for this government, this was issued in 2009.

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

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Regarding rural crime letters still coming in, I have one from Gordon here talking about the police response time of 45 minutes.

I have another one here from David talking about all the stolen vehicles just in his one community. It's just terrible.

I have another letter from Shauna pleading with the government to please do something to keep repeat offenders in prison.

Another one was anonymously sent. "Rural Crime is getting out of control." Eight residences were broken into in a two-kilometre circle around her farm just in the last year. These people are not feeling safe.

Another one, Marilyn, from my riding. This is regarding a home invasion. Again, criminals right back out on the street again. Of course, it's not an emergency.

This one was written to the Premier regarding the \$55,000 in security systems that this business installed which was stolen from their business.

It's not an emergency, Mr. Speaker?

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of Her Majesty's Official Opposition.

Ministerial Panel on Child Intervention

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, over a year ago we had an emergency debate in this House about the tragic death of little Serenity in 2014. Albertans were horror stricken and heartbroken when they learned the details of Serenity's short life. They demanded action from this government to find out what happened and to ensure it never happens again. The government set up the Ministerial Panel on Child Intervention that was to submit a final report within six months. The child intervention panel has been meeting for about a year now, and Albertans are getting anxious. To the Premier: when will Albertans receive the child intervention panel's final report?

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Premier.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I will take the House leader's questions today or, rather, perhaps the Minister of Children's Services will, but first I need to say how surprised and frankly disappointed I am that the member didn't reconsider his decision to stay in this position. Instead of defending a woman who came forward to him about sexual harassment, he fired her, and instead of holding the House leader accountable, the UCP leader rushed to his defence. We'll certainly be answering the questions asked by this member, but I think that Albertans deserve some clarity from the leader of this party and the House leader as well.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have addressed that issue both in and outside this House. This caucus takes harassment very seriously. I took the harassment that was happening to my employee at the time very seriously as well. I was deeply concerned about that. My firm and I made some mistakes as we worked through the processes, as our client removed Ms Harrison from our site. We would have made some decisions differently with the benefit of hindsight and experience. We regret that and have apologized for that.

But this question was about the report from the child intervention panel, Mr. Speaker. I will ask it again. When can Albertans expect to see that report?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Children's Services.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very thankful to all the members of the panel, who've spent many months deliberating the very complex situation around child intervention in this province. Of course, we were moved to do so after hearing the story of Serenity and many other stories over the years. Certainly, I'm very thankful for that work, and I know that they have done some great work, even just this morning, in terms of coming forward with some

ideas on where they want to go with that. As they work to bring recommendations forward, I'll be happy to keep the House updated on what's happening.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, members from all parties have been attending meetings of the child intervention panel for almost a year. We all care deeply about the safety and well-being of children in our intervention system. This is not the first time in recent years we have had a panel or a round-table examining our child intervention system. Premier, what can you tell Albertans is different this time with this child intervention panel?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Without doubt, we want every child in Alberta to have a safe, healthy, and loving home because, truly, here in Alberta we take that seriously. We need to work together to take care of our families and our neighbours. That was the spirit with which we brought forward the panel, and certainly that was the spirit by which we responded to phase 1 of the panel's work, by bringing forward legislation as soon as possible after phase 1 was completed and the recommendations were submitted. We make that commitment as well, that as soon as the recommendations are received from the panel, we will be taking action and moving forward.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

The hon. Member for Calgary-West.

1:50 Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Children's Services continues to state that she will do everything she needs to do to prevent child abuse to ensure a tragedy such as the one that occurred to little Serenity does not happen again. Premier, your government had a chance to do that with Bill 216, which has been before this House since December 5. You failed with this bill. Will you work with me and other members of this opposition to make it work as soon as possible for Serenity and her mom?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Children's Services.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like the member, I am very deeply committed to doing everything we possibly can to reduce child abuse in this province and to do everything we can to prevent a tragedy like what happened to Serenity. I certainly committed to Serenity's mother when she was here that I would work with the member in terms of achieving those goals and objectives. Again, I think that there were some challenges with Bill 216, but that does not mean that the commitment behind it to address these issues is not real. We had a meeting just last week, and I'm thankful for the...

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

First supplemental.

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Children's Services said in the House last week, "Our whole Legislature is committed to honouring the memory of Serenity by taking action to prevent child abuse." Premier, this is a good statement. I support it. The whole House supports it. You have said that you support it, but can you please tell us today what concrete changes you have implemented in the past 12 months that meet that goal?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, again, when tragedies happen, families deserve answers and families deserve action. That was why we established the Ministerial Panel on Child Intervention. We all want to do better for children and families. We unanimously passed Bill 18 so that Albertans know that when something happens to children in care, our government is taking action. We're exploring ways to address the disparity in on-reserve services. We increased funding to hire 60 new staff to support vulnerable kids, and we will keep taking action on that. I can't wait to get the recommendations from the panel and start working with my department to take action to make life better for children who are in care and families who continue to be challenged.

Mr. Ellis: I am also waiting for the recommendations.

This government has vowed that it is committed to preventing child abuse. Well, Premier, all of Alberta is watching because Serenity's sad case has touched the hearts of everyone. Her family has come here twice to quietly and respectfully urge this government to take action. Premier, when will Albertans see action from your government that truly, truly does honour Serenity's memory?

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Reporting suspected abuse and neglect is both a moral responsibility and a legal requirement that we all have. I would continue to urge Albertans that if they suspect that a child is being abused or neglected, they must call the child abuse hotline at 1.800.387.KIDS. Each situation and family is different, so while some of the signs might point to abuse, they might also mean that the family is facing other challenges. Regardless, Children's Services can help children and their families be supported and make a difference in whatever that family may face. Again, any suspicion of abuse or neglect: please, please report it so that we can provide the support needed to those families.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

The hon. Member for Chestermere-Rocky View.

Federal and Provincial Finance Ministers' Meeting

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the Finance minister chose to avoid answering whether he stood up for Alberta's small business in the recent meeting of finance ministers. Alberta small-business owners are concerned about the federal tax, and they want a provincial finance minister that will actually stand up for their concerns. They are concerned that they may have to make major changes to their existing business structures at the end of the year. They're concerned because it is already the busiest time of the year for the retail service industry. Again, did the government raise these concerns at the finance ministers' meetings or, for that matter, have they ever raised them at the federal government level?

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Premier.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we have. Yes, we will continue to make sure that we prioritize the concerns that are brought forward from Alberta businesses. We're proud of our track record, and we're proud of the work we're doing to support them, including the fact that we have reduced small-business taxes by a third in this province. We'll keep working to make sure that Alberta continues to be the best place to work, start a business, and live.

Mrs. Aheer: We're hearing from small businesses, Mr. Speaker. They're very concerned. Yesterday the Finance minister claimed that he stood up on behalf of Albertans for important issues of equalization at the recent finance ministers' meetings. It's a welcome change from his past position where he was, quote, agnostic about equalization issues. It's important that this government seize the opportunity to correct existing imbalances in the government. To the Premier: did her Finance minister put forward a proposal for a new formula at these negotiations? Yes or no?

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can say unequivocally that our Finance minister went to that meeting and he stood up and fought for Alberta. That is quite unlike Jason Kenney when he was a member of the Harper government, who had multiple opportunities to fix the equalization formula for this country to benefit Alberta. Instead, the one change that he did make made it worse. It's hurt Alberta because it has cost us money.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, it's no secret that Albertans give more than they get when it comes to equalization. That's why it's important that there's a provincial government standing up for Albertans when it comes to federal-provincial discussion on this matter. That's why it was troubling when the Finance minister said last year that equalization was not something that the minister was focused on, but yesterday the minister claimed that he was taking steps to stand up for Albertans. Can the Premier or the Finance minister now update the Assembly on the next steps and how they plan to follow through with these promises?

Mr. Mason: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member and members of this House that the Finance minister has put the financial position of this province relative to federal issues first and foremost, and I'll just give another example. The federal government began by saying that the proceeds from taxation on marijuana would be split 50-50 with all the costs coming to municipalities and to the provinces. Our Premier and our Finance minister stood up and fought for a much better formula. It's now 75-25 with a cap on federal . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Education Budget

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We recently learned that the Education minister ordered all Alberta school districts and education organizations to reduce costs. This goes directly against the government's repeated commitment to not reduce funding for programs that Albertans value most. This is the second time this week that we're learning about big cuts to critical programs from the media rather than from the government. To the Premier: how many other critical programs and services have been targeted for cuts?

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Premier.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to revisit what's happened over the last number of years, we've been very focused on making sure that we stop the deep cuts that were coming forward from the now Official Opposition. We made sure that we funded enrolment growth, and we made sure that those funds went towards school districts. We also worked to make sure that we

reduced school fees in this province, and all of those things certainly wouldn't have happened under the opposition's watch. Now, in terms of local decision-making we respect the fact that we get the funds as close to the communities as possible, and we trust local decision-makers to do the best with those funds to meet the community's needs.

Ms McPherson: Mr. Speaker, school districts have been told to cut several items that help our education professionals become better at serving Alberta students. Conferences, travel, and professional membership fees are on the block. These opportunities allow our teachers and administrators to share and learn best practices with education professionals around the world. To the Premier: what is the dollar amount that the government expects to save by cutting Alberta's education professionals off at the knees in their ability to become better educators in the future?

Ms Hoffman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know the member opposite is working at hyperbole, but that's exactly what that is. We've worked hard to make sure that we're getting funds into the classrooms. We're getting funds through the agreement that we had with the Alberta Teachers' Association classroom improvements funds. When I've gone to schools and asked "How are you investing some of those funds?", they've talked about very specific conferences that they've taken around literacy or numeracy or other items that are of particular interest to the students in their class. When I, of course, have met with school boards, some of them talk about the focus that they've really done around making sure that they have reasonable class sizes. These are all things that are only possible because this government brought in a budget that supports Alberta families and makes their lives better.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Ms McPherson: Mr. Speaker, it's unfair and lacking in compassion to present our educators with a lump of coal by demanding these cuts right before Christmas. There are definitely savings to be found by collaborating with educators rather than issuing a grinchy edict. To the Premier: how does the government hope to achieve compassionate cuts by surprising our educators with this last-minute rush to address costs?

Ms Hoffman: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone knows that this government is deeply committed to ensuring that we have a very strong education system in this province, and we've shown that through all of our budgets. We've also shown all Albertans that we expect, now that we're out of the economic downturn and we're on a path of moving up, up, up, we want to do so while, of course, ensuring that we have thoughtful ways of addressing what might be some excess. That's why those letters were sent to school boards rather than dictates that said what they had to do. We want to work with them to make sure that we find efficiencies and make Alberta's classrooms even better.

2:00 Conversion Therapy Use in Alberta

Ms Goehring: Mr. Speaker, attempting to change or repair a person's sexual identity is a very dangerous practice. LGBTQ-plus youth that are subjected to this unscientific and unproven treatment often face lifelong consequences, including substance abuse issues, self-harming behaviours, and potential suicide. I have personally heard from numerous Albertans about the dangers of conversion therapy. To the Minister of Health: what steps is the government taking to ensure that no Albertan is subjected to this archaic and dangerous practice?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for her strong advocacy on this issue as well as many others. Our government unequivocally stands against conversion therapy. This harmful practice is incredibly detrimental to LGBTQ youth, and we refuse to support anything that could harm our most vulnerable Albertans. I'm deeply proud of the work we've done to support LGBTQ rights, including expanding human rights legislation. We know that there is more work to be done, and this continues to be a priority for our government.

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I'm concerned that our LGBTQ-plus youth may be subjected to a practice that is not supported by health practitioners. To the same minister: what is your ministry hearing from stakeholders and health professionals about this practice?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We work very closely with a number of health professionals who engage in therapy, including psychiatrists, psychologists, and many others, social workers included. In every case these professional colleges were appalled at the practice of conversion therapy and have mechanisms to discipline any member who may be engaging in it. There is no billable service related to conversion therapy. We do not fund it in any way, and under this government we never will.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that Ontario already has legislation in place banning conversion therapy, to the same minister: does this government plan to introduce legislation that would outlaw conversion therapy?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. The Ontario bill has made it illegal for any practitioner to bill Ontario Health for conversion therapy. I'm glad to say that Alberta Health in no way covers this practice. However, we are continuing to examine options to ensure that conversion therapy is not forced upon LGBTQ youth outside of the health care system. I appreciate the member's concern with this issue, and I look forward to working with her to protect all vulnerable Albertans.

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

Saskatchewan's Construction Site Ban on Alberta Licence Plates

Connolly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today marks a week since the province of Saskatchewan banned Alberta licence plates from bidding on highway construction projects. Given that our government gave the Saskatchewan government a week or we would take them to court, to the Minister of Transportation: what progress has been made in resolving this issue?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, I can tell the House that after six days ministers from the Saskatchewan government finally returned our phone calls yesterday, and the minister of economic development and I asked them about this issue. They were not able to provide any concrete evidence to

support their claims that Saskatchewan firms are being discriminated against in our province. They have retroactively changed open tenders to restrict Alberta-plated vehicles, and we think this is unacceptable. As a result, we've demanded that they kill that ban and do so . . .

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

Connolly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that Alberta has a strong commitment to the New West trade partnership and to its other interprovincial and international trade agreements and given that, as the Premier has demonstrated on the pipeline file, we know that ultimately we see best results when we work through the systems available, to the same minister: how is this government working to resolve this issue through the courts or through other means?

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

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've spoken with our legal teams and have a trade challenge prepared through the New West Partnership agreement. We're ready to file first thing tomorrow morning. I want to be very clear that we would rather resolve this issue through conversations as opposed to through the courts, but we are left with no choice given the government of Saskatchewan's stubborn position. Once this issue is resolved – and we will win – I hope that the western provinces can work together to further enhance trade to compete internationally.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Connolly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that ultimately this is about standing up for Alberta's workers and that involves talking to all our partners in the industry, to the same minister: what is the government hearing from Alberta construction and road builders about this protectionist restriction?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. From the building trades to construction associations, industry partners are dumbfounded and confused by Saskatchewan's unsubstantiated claims. They worry about their members and the impacts this restriction is going to have on construction. That's why we're standing up for Alberta companies and Alberta workers. We know that the government of Saskatchewan is not trade compliant. We will fight this in court, and we will win. Our government has the backs of Albertans.

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

Veterinary Profession Act Amendments

Dr. Starke: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A little over two hours ago Bill 31 passed third reading in this Assembly despite vocal opposition from veterinarians, veterinary technologists, and pet owners from across the province. This bill includes several amendments to the Veterinary Profession Act, which is under the purview of the Minister of Labour. The veterinary profession reports to the Minister of Labour, who was silent throughout the debate on Bill 31. To that minister. Please clarify: do you support the changes that Bill 31 makes to the Veterinary Profession Act?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Service Alberta and Status of Women.

Ms McLean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were very proud to pass Bill 31 today. We know that veterinarians are trusted professionals, and Albertans look to them to provide quality care for their pets. Our government supports this legislation because after the past several months of listening to thousands of Albertans who told us that they want better protections for consumers and a level playing field for business, we were happy to be able to consult with the industry and other veterinary stakeholders. We heard their concerns, and we were happy to pass legislation and are very much, after hearing all sides, of the view that it strikes a balance.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, we know how that minister feels. We're really wanting to hear the Minister of Labour.

Given that the issue of veterinary billing was identified as number 13 out of 15 of the issues in the government's consumer protection survey and given that this paragraph was deleted from the report on the survey that was shared with the ABVMA and given that the withholding of this vital information is a disturbing practice by the Minister of Service Alberta, to the minister: how do you explain the two different versions of the document reporting on veterinary billing survey results, and why did you withhold selected information from the ABVMA?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McLean: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, we heard from many ordinary Albertans who told us that they want to be better informed when looking for veterinary services for their pets. That's why we proposed reasonable new rules requiring fee disclosures that are in line with other provinces. Certainly, when we reviewed the results of the survey, we took not only into account quantity but also the quality of responses. After hearing some very heartbreaking stories from individual Albertans and, again, after consulting with industry, we determined this was a balanced approach.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Dr. Starke: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the members of the veterinary profession are justifiably outraged by the callous and disrespectful treatment given them by the Minister of Service Alberta and given that this damage the ham-handed handling of Bill 31 has done to the relationship with our profession and given that the successful implementation of changes to the Veterinary Profession Act will require a co-operative effort between this government and the ABVMA, to the minister: now that you've taken over the Veterinary Profession Act, will you work to repair the damage you've caused by speaking at the AGM of the ABVMA, as the Minister of Labour did last March?

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

Ms McLean: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take the opportunity to clarify something mentioned by the member. The legislation has not been moved under the jurisdiction of Service Alberta. We consulted with Albertans and with industry with respect to some specific changes around the issue of transparency, which we heard from Albertans was a concern and an improvement that they would like to see in this area. We will continue along with Labour, as we have throughout our consultations, in conjunction, to consult with the ABVMA and other stakeholders to ensure the regulations . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister. [interjection] Hon. member.

Photoradar Review

Mrs. Pitt: Mr. Speaker, last spring the Official Opposition called on the Transportation minister to conduct a review into the use of photoradar. Even the minister said last May that, quote: my concern is that there is a strong public view that photoradar has gone beyond just enforcing safe traffic and has become in some cases a bit of a cash cow for municipalities. End quote. Can the minister advise the House: what is the status of the review of photoradar, and when will the report be tabled?

2:10

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to do that. I think there's been a great deal of public concern about the utilization of photoradar, and it's important that any kind of electronic monitoring of traffic or enforcement needs to be done on the basis of improving safety. That's our main objective. It's always focused on making sure that people are safe on our roads, and the degree that it can be a useful tool for that is the degree to which this government will support it. Otherwise, it should not be used in place of taxes.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that when the minister committed to the review, which has not been tabled, nor did he mention anything about it, Alberta was one of only four provinces with a photoradar program and given that Alberta is the only province that allows so-called mobile speed cameras on roadways that are neither school zones nor construction zones, can you update this Assembly on why your government is delaying this much-needed review, or is this another broken NDP promise?

Mr. Mason: I can assure the hon. member that that is simply untrue. This government is committed to seeing through this review and to making sure that our roads are as safe as possible but that these devices are not misused. That's the subject of the review, Mr. Speaker, and we're very much focused on that. Safety is our top priority, and we also want to make sure that drivers are not unfairly taken advantage of for taxation reasons.

Mrs. Pitt: Mr. Speaker, Albertans have a long-standing concern about how photoradar is used in this province. Earlier this year the government scrambled to book a press room to get out ahead of the opposition last minute on this issue. Since the minister hastily announced this year that there would be a review, there has been no update or sign that the review is even close to completion or even started. Minister, how many people are working on this review, and is it anywhere near completion?

Mr. Mason: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that a review is under way. We have issued an RFP in order to provide an opportunity to look at consultants who can help us with this review, and the House will be informed of the results of the review in due course.

Energy Policies and Industry Competitiveness

Mr. Panda: Mr. Speaker, the CAPP president, Tim McMillan, said, quote: Alberta's climate plan with its new regulations does not support working Albertans. End quote. He said that the \$440 million oil sands innovation fund pits companies and communities against each other and that the NDP government's plan does not

protect jobs or the competitiveness of the energy sector. Husky, Imperial, and CNRL all agree. To the Deputy Premier: why is your government making it more difficult to do business in Alberta while making life miserable for Albertans?

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

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll thank the member for the question. You know, we've been working with industry, including CAPP and all of their members, for the past two years, ensuring that we were going to move forward with our climate leadership plan to ensure that companies are moving forward on developing innovative technologies that will reduce their greenhouse gases, reduce their footprint but also make them more competitive. Last week we announced \$1.4 billion that will be invested with industry into finding innovative solutions and continuing to drive the innovation agenda forward.

Mr. Panda: When the Official Opposition is trying to do its job holding the government to account and offering constructive feedback, the NDP says that we are cheering for the failure of Albertans. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth, and we will not be bullied by this NDP government. Instead of auditioning for the role of Official Opposition, why won't this NDP government face the facts about high unemployment, the brain drain, rural crime, credit downgrades, and vanishing investments and stop pulling from their record?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know what I find disingenuous? That the opposition is continuing to hope that the pipeline approvals that we've secured will fail and that these pipelines won't be built. It's getting quite tiresome of an opposition that is running down our industry. We know that they are the best in the world. We are working collaboratively with them to increase opportunities, to expand the innovative technologies that they are developing. We are partnering with industry. We stand with our oil and gas sector. We stand with our energy sector. When will the opposition do the same?

Mr. Panda: Given, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP shamelessly takes credit for any success of hard-working entrepreneurs and businesses like JACOS, who only recently started production after years of construction, and since the NDP is taking credit for the increased production of Suncor, Cenovus, and CNRL but it was all due to the mergers and acquisitions when the multinationals left, will the NDP admit that they're just following Tommy Douglas's energy policy of the 1970s to kick the big multinationals out of the oil sands while misleading Albertans?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know what? The opposition would have us sit on our hands and do nothing. Well, you know what? There is a role for government to play, and we're very proud of the role that we play in working with industry to encourage investments, to make it as easy as possible to invest in this province. The credit always goes to the companies and to the small-business owners. But there is a role for government to play, whether it's through our Alberta jobs plan, bringing forward tax credits that make us more competitive, or, again, investing \$1.4 billion from the carbon levy into innovation that's going to benefit our oil and gas sector, our energy sector, our food processors.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.
The Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake.

Renewable Energy Development

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rural Albertans are being pressured to sign away the right to their land, all in the name of this government's rapid and irresponsible drive to 30 per cent renewables by 2030. I have asked repeatedly about what protections are in place for landowners and what reclamation requirements exist. The answer: none. It turns out that even minimum setback requirements are, quote, negotiable. When will this government protect rural Alberta farmers from the predatory practices of Ontario speculators furiously buying land options so they can develop subsidized wind projects in Alberta?

Ms Hoffman: Mr. Speaker, we're really proud of the fact that we're working to ensure that we address climate change. We do it in a way where we work with local Albertans, taking all of the money invested through that price on carbon, investing it back in Alberta's local economy. We also know that that means there are opportunities for more income, more employment. I've met with many rural landowners who are excited about the opportunities that they see now for diversifying some of their income as well. We respect them. We want to ensure that they have the opportunities to work collaboratively, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. MacIntyre: I look forward to the minister tabling that list.

Minimum wage increases, costly Bill 6 regulations, a carbon tax that unequally penalizes rural Albertans forced to travel further for their goods and services: it's, frankly, impossible to figure out what this government hasn't done to make life harder in rural Alberta. Given that we've heard repeatedly about efforts to buy development options along the poorly wind-resourced eastern slopes, do these developers even need to prove viability, or are skyrocketing electric bills one more thing rural Albertans can look forward to?

Ms Hoffman: Sorry. My rural roots just couldn't keep me seated on this one, Mr. Speaker, because just earlier this week I had the opportunity to visit a number of different health care facilities in northwestern Alberta, and I have to say that the number one question they ask is: we're really scared that our hospital is going to get closed. You know what? We've worked with those rural communities to ensure that we're providing stable, supportive care environments for those Albertans. We're working with rural landowners to make sure they have opportunities to get fair compensation if they choose to expand and diversify some of their opportunities for investment, and we're working to make sure that local municipalities have a voice and have strong opportunities to engage with this government. I'm proud of that.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. MacIntyre: Wow. That was exciting.

The government is announcing today the results of Alberta's renewables auction. Pricing per kilowatt is reported to be below 4 cents. But that is not the full cost to Albertans, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister tell Albertans what the full cost of renewable electricity will be, including the cost of rapid-response backup generation and the infrastructure for it when the wind doesn't blow and the sun doesn't shine?

The Speaker: The Minister of Economic Development and Trade.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think there's quite a bit of wind blowing from the other side of the House.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta isn't just a leader in oil and gas; we're a leader in renewable energy as well. The announcement today is about great jobs, big private-sector investments, and making sure that we get the best possible price for Albertans. Alberta is setting a record for the lowest cost of renewables in Canada, less than half of the price in Ontario and amongst the lowest in the world. This shows that our made-in-Alberta plan is working. It highlights a highly competitive process, strong potential for renewable power in Alberta, and positive.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

2:20

Dementia Care

Mr. Clark: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The number of people with dementia in our province will triple in the next 30 years, and that's why I've been asking this government repeatedly about their dementia strategy, or should I say their lack of a dementia strategy. Frustrating as it is, I will ask today for the third time. In June the Minister of Health promised that a strategy would be completed in a couple of weeks. In September she said that it's coming soon, but Albertans are still waiting. To the Minister of Health one more time: where is the dementia strategy? When will we see it? Why is it taking so long?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. This absolutely has been a priority. Every time we feel like it's almost done – it kind of reminds me of when I was working on my master's thesis – we always think there's one more thing that we can just improve a little bit to make it that much better. We're doing this in partnership with a number of stakeholders, but it will be done very soon. I'll dare to give an exact date. I'm hoping to have it out before Christmas.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, given that this government has started sending signals that cuts are coming to education and PSE, we can only assume that health care is next and given that there are many community programs that are cost-effective and that deliver badly needed services to people with dementia, their families, and caregivers and given that these programs save money by keeping people in the community rather than hospital, again to the Minister of Health: will you commit to not cutting any existing dementia support programs in the next budget?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the important question. I think that our past budget practices have shown that on this side of the House we stand with Albertans. We're working hard to protect and improve health and education. The calls for cuts continue to come from the members opposite. We're working to make sure that we can move forward in a way that's respectful of all Albertans, including those who are living with dementia in their families.

Mr. Clark: That's not a no, Mr. Speaker, and you're not hearing calls for cuts from me.

Mr. Speaker, dementia care in this province doesn't just need sustainable funding for existing programs; new investments are badly needed. Given that Ontario has a fully funded provincial dementia strategy and given that this strategy allocates \$100 million over three years plus an additional \$20 million for respite care, one more time to the Minister of Health: if we do eventually see a provincial dementia strategy – and I sincerely hope that we do – will it come with significant new funding to support Albertans living with dementia, their families, and caregivers?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you again to the member for the question and for the opportunity to respond, Mr. Speaker. We continue to work with the dementia strategy itself, which will hopefully be released in the coming days. The budget process, the budget cycle begins, of course, in the spring. We look forward to bringing a budget to this House. We know that the Official Opposition has talked about cuts of 20 per cent. We know that wouldn't help Albertans. We're fighting hard to make sure that we improve opportunities for Albertans to get care in the communities that they choose to live in, and that, of course, includes dementia supports.

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

Agricultural Exports and NAFTA

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year 40 per cent of our agriculture products were exported to the United States, bringing in \$4 billion to the Alberta economy. The North American free trade agreement, or NAFTA, has played a critical role in giving Alberta producers access to the American market. To the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry. Farmers in my riding are curious to know: what is the government doing to protect Alberta's agricultural interests under NAFTA?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. We understand how important it is for Alberta producers to get their products to market. It makes life better for farm families, makes life better for small communities, small rural communities. It's important for diversifying our economy and creating jobs that support families. We're working closely with the government of Canada and with other provinces to defend Alberta's interests during the review of our trade agreements with the United States and Mexico.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: how is the government ensuring that the supply management of agricultural products is protected in any proposed changes to NAFTA?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. Our government strongly supports supply management. Together, SM5 commodities accounted for 6.9 per cent, or \$891.6 million, of the total value of agricultural production in 2015. The latest demands to scrap the supply management system in the United States are unacceptable to us and industries like dairy. They've made unsupportable suggestions like this on other issues before. We'll continue to advocate for a system that ensures stable access to safe, healthy food.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the same minister: what is being done to diversify Alberta's agricultural exports to make us less dependent on exports to a single market such as the United States?

Mr. Carlier: Mr. Speaker, the world knows our reputation for good, safe, and quality products. Our government will work to open those opportunities for producers. That's why I'm pleased to participate in trade missions that showcase our amazing products, places like China, Japan, Korea, and Europe. We will continue to monitor developments in the U.S. very closely, and we will take a pragmatic, long view of any proposed changes to ensure that we're protecting Alberta's interests. The United States is Canada's biggest trading partner, and we value that relationship. We also know that we need to diversify our markets so that more people around the world have the opportunity to enjoy amazing agricultural products: beef, pork, grain, and oilseeds.

Justice Ministry Intervention in University of Lethbridge Labour Grievance

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Speaker, as disgusting as it may be to all of us, pockets of anti-Semitism still exist in Alberta. Anthony Hall, a disgraced, Holocaust-denying professor from the University of Lethbridge, may as well be the poster child for such hate-mongering beliefs. In October 2016 the U of L took a strong stand and suspended Dr. Hall based on his abhorrent conduct. Sadly, Dr. Hall's union pushed hard for his reinstatement. During court proceedings the government intervened in support of the position taken by Dr. Hall's union, an exceedingly rare action within Canada. Respectfully, to the Minister of Education: why did the government choose to intervene in this case?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity that the member has given me to address this issue. The Ministry of Justice did intervene in this case. It had absolutely nothing to do with supporting Dr. Hall's abhorrent views. It had everything to do with making sure that we followed the proper process, that was a result of the legislation that we brought forward to enhance postsecondary bargaining in this province. The Justice department was keen to make sure that all the parties involved in this dispute were following the proper procedures that were new to this case and to make sure that we didn't set a dangerous precedent.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Speaker, given that B'nai Brith, a respected Jewish human rights organization, reached out to the government during this dispute and warned them that intervening in this case could have the effect of placing a Holocaust denier back in the classroom and given that the government chose to brush off such concerns and intervene, arguing that they needed to do so in order to uphold the academic labour relations structure implemented via Bill 7, introduced this spring, again to the minister: why did the government ignore the concerns of B'nai Brith prior to intervening in this case?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we took B'nai Brith's concerns very seriously. We find as a government that

Dr. Hall's views on the world are abhorrent and really have no place, poisoning the young minds of the province of Alberta. It was important, though, that we follow the proper procedure in this case so that we don't set a precedent for dismissing people from our universities improperly. Dr. Hall is under investigation by the University of Lethbridge, and I look forward to seeing the outcomes of that investigation in the very near future.

Mr. Gotfried: Mr. Speaker, given that the judge overseeing court proceedings specifically said that the passing and content of Bill 7 are the reasons he was ruling in favour of Dr. Hall's union and given that the passing of Bill 7 retroactively strengthened Dr. Hall's and his union's position, leading to his reinstatement, thankfully not to a teaching position, again to the minister: were you aware that a situation like this, where a professor is reinstated to an institution that has valid concerns regarding adherence to human rights legislation, could arise as a direct result of the passing of Bill 7?

Mr. Schmidt: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for all members to remember that the proper process has been in place. We certainly don't want people to be dismissed unfairly from any of our postsecondary institutions. We want to make sure that everybody has access to the proper procedures and the proper administration of the law, regardless of how abhorrent their views are. Dr. Hall is under investigation. The proper procedure is being followed in this case. I look forward to the outcome of following the proper procedure.

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

Rural Crime

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Less than three weeks ago we had over 100 rural residents show up, demanding actions on rural crime. We asked the government for an emergency debate to discuss solutions that could be used to solve the rural crime problem, but the government argued against the need for debate. One of those solutions would be to ban the Waze app and other apps that track police vehicles. To the Acting Minister of Justice: has the government given any consideration to banning such software applications to get them out of the hands of criminals?

2:30

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, rural crime has many faces. Certainly, trespassing and poaching are significant issues in rural areas of Alberta, and we remain very concerned about those in addition to all of the other rural crime issues that have been raised in the past. Our government has made significant advances in reducing rural crime, including investing in ALERT, a program that, of course, Jason Kenney cut when he was in the federal government. We continue to invest in more prosecutors. We're investing in more courthouses. The hon. member . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Mr. Hanson: Wow, Mr. Speaker. That's all I can say.

There are other things the government can do to combat rural crime, and since this government saw fit to build a new courthouse in Red Deer and demands for a new courthouse also exist in Strathcona county – meanwhile, courthouses in other parts of the province have been closed down – to the Acting Minister of Justice:

would your department be prepared to reopen the courthouse or resume court services in the provincial building in the town of Smoky Lake to help reduce the backlog?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, we continue to examine ways that we can reduce rural crime, and it's important to remind all members that we have invested significantly in the justice resources that are available to the people of Alberta in spite of the calls from the members opposite to cut the budget by 20 per cent. It's interesting that the member opposite wants us to invest more resources while cutting the budget and cutting taxes for wealthy people. Those two things don't add up. We can't do both. We're investing in crime reduction.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Hanson: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to offer some practical solutions here. Given that adjustments to the courts could get more criminals and troubled people off our streets, cracking down on crime, and given that in other jurisdictions specialized courts like mental health courts can be used to get people the help that they need and in other places special night courts are held to deal with traffic offences, minor infractions, misdemeanours, and to enter pleas, to the acting Justice minister: are you prepared to sit night courts in the major cities in order to help us clear off the backlog?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, as I've said in my previous answers, we continue to look at additional ways that we can reduce rural crime. We're very concerned about the backlog. We continue to press the federal government to appoint additional judges to the Court of Queen's Bench, but you know the member opposite has to recognize that the resources he's demanding cost money. We can't cut taxes for rich people, we can't cut a budget by 20 per cent and do the things that he's asking us to do. We need to invest in resources to cut crime. That is what our government is doing.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Stoney Trail 14th Street Interchange in Calgary

Mr. Kleinstaub: Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that long ago when Stoney Trail defined the northern edge of the city of Calgary. However, over the last few years, as neighbourhoods in Panorama and Coventry were completed, growth in Calgary has expanded to the north side of Stoney Trail into the neighbourhoods of Evanston and Carrington. My question to the Minister of Transportation: when will the 14th Street overpass commence construction, linking the communities of Panorama and Evanston?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, our government is very committed to ensuring the safe and efficient transportation of individuals and goods on our provincial highways. We've had conversations with the city of Calgary going back to 2015 around this particular interchange. We have, in fact, retained a consultant with respect to this potential project, and we're waiting for the city of Calgary to put it on their construction program, which they have not yet done.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Residents of both Evanston and Panorama tell me that navigating around the Stoney Trail-14th Street interchange can be confusing and that they often have to drive through other communities, adding to neighbourhood traffic. My question, again to the Minister of Transportation: can residents expect to see this important project appear on the funded or unfunded capital projects list in the upcoming budget?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much for that question, Mr. Speaker. We know that this project is important to those living in and developing these communities. We need to listen to the concerns of these residents and the businesses as well as being aware of the ongoing development plans of the city of Calgary. We have signed an agreement in principle for the city of Calgary to fund this interchange, and the member needs to stay tuned.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that this could be the last supplemental of the session and, again, given how important the Stoney Trail and 14th Street overpass is to the connectivity of the neighbours, neighbourhoods, and commerce and given that this is the best time to move forward with infrastructure investments, when can we expect to see improvement on this issue for the betterment of north-central Calgary?

Mr. Mason: Well, thank you very much for that question. Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. member and the House that we're continuing to have conversations with the city of Calgary, and we will have more information to share on the tendering of this project and the eventual start date. It's another example of this government working with the people of Calgary to improve the lives of the people of that city.

Orders of the Day

Statement by the Speaker

Remarks at the End of the Fall Sitting

The Speaker: The time is already consumed, hon. members. [interjections] I'm surprised by the reaction. I heard rumours around this place – and of course there are very few rumours in this place – that many of you wanted to go home. I don't know if that's true.

In that light, hon. members, if you would allow me, as we leave, I'd just like to make a few remarks to all of you. I would say that I think that I speak for all of you that the privilege to be in here is beyond the expectation that any of us had prior to this experience. It's my hope that each of us will remind ourselves of that fact frequently. Whenever we speak to and with each other, let us remember that the goal is to reach an agreement, not whether one side lost or won.

I learn at least one thing every day that I am here. There is, however, so much more that I need to learn.

On behalf of the LAO staff, the deputy speakers, myself, I hope that each of you have a peaceful time with your loved ones. It has been my honour and privilege to serve you.

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 33 Electoral Divisions Act

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very pleased to stand and move third reading of Bill 33.

Bill 33 enacts the report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission as well as incorporating limited name changes approved in this Chamber on November 28. As I've said in the past, I think it's safe to say that electoral boundary redistributions rarely satisfy everyone. It's important, Mr. Speaker, to remember that this was an independent panel that studied the issue at some length. We believe that the alternative of politicians deciding their own boundaries is not appropriate, so it's for that reason that I urge members of the House to support this bill at third reading.

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

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's unfortunate that we are here today with this bill. I will tell you that it's very disappointing for myself to see the constituency of Bonnyville-Cold Lake be changed the way it is. A lot of my rural colleagues across the province – I would say that even some of the government colleagues – are not overly enthused with this.

2:40

Now, I would like to note a few things from my colleague from Battle River-Wainwright, some of the concerns that he brought forward for the House. I'd like to put that on the record, that he's put a lot of effort into some of this. The first thing that he mentioned here is that according to the interim report it's actually written that "Alberta is no longer rural." I would agree that after the commission is done, we're no longer rural. What happened was that they took that statement, and after realizing that this was probably a poor statement to put into an interim report and finalize into a final report, they changed the statement to, "Alberta is no longer entirely or primarily rural in nature." You've got to recognize here that I believe the commission is completely letting rural down. I am sad to see that some of our colleagues from across the aisle can't see the fact that this is causing long-standing damage to Alberta and to the representation to rural Alberta.

But I want to take this a step further, and I want to explain. I talked about section 14, I believe, in a referral motion to committee, but the specific things that my colleague from Battle River-Wainwright was very, very focused on were the legal aspects. Some of this can be a little dry, but I need to get it onto the record. Now, he goes on, saying that the legal part is something that needs to be considered. Is what we're doing legal? That is the question. It's clear to myself that the commission was given a mandate and they broke that mandate. It's a shame, but here we are today with this broken piece of legislation.

Now, what we need to say is: is rural Alberta getting effective representation? It's worth bearing in mind this explanation of the goal of redistribution as contained on an Elections Canada website. We've got a quote here. "The right to vote under section 3 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guaranteed the right to effective representation. The goal of redistribution is a constitutional right to 'effective representation.'" So this goes beyond Alberta's laws. This is an actual constitutional right. This is what, I believe, our boundaries commission has deliberately broken, our right as rural representatives.

What we've got here is an example for assistance, this summary by the 2009-2010 commission on what effective representation is.

In summary, the principles of effective representation seem to the Commission to be as follows:

- (1) Relative parity of voting power.

- (2) Tradition in Canada is “effective representation,” not absolute parity as in the [United States].
- (3) The process of achieving effective representation may involve diluting the political force of some votes but not unduly and not without reason.
- (4) The balancing of these interests is a delicate one, which involves an examination in depth of the social history, geography and demography of the communities in every sense of the word.

Those are the four.

Now, I'd like to point out that what's key here in my view are comments 2 and 4. The 2009-2010 commission themselves gave clear indication that the exercise is not one purely of mathematics. This is important that this is a starting point, if you will, to ensure that we have numbers in constituencies. But what happens is that we need to be making sure that our MLAs are able to get the voice of our constituents out effectively, effective representation. That's effective representation, which I believe our commission has missed.

Moving on to voter parity now. In response to the commission's comment regarding the absolute voter parity reference I would offer this observation made by Justice McLachlin in the Electoral Boundaries Saskatchewan 1991, 2 SCR 158 decision.

First, absolute parity is impossible. It is impossible to draw boundary lines which guarantee exactly the same number of voters in each district. Voters die, voters move. Even with the aid of frequent censuses, voter parity is impossible.

So while absolute voter parity has a very intuitive appeal, one person to one vote is just not possible. It's just not possible.

Incidentally, moreover, in the redistribution rules is the concept of voter parity even mentioned? Further, population and voter parity numbers are two entirely different measures. Comments were made by the commission that with the advent of motor vehicles distance capacity would increase significantly. Unhappily, they failed to notice that the length of workdays has not increased. What we need to say is that by adding a lot more to an MLA, we are expecting a lot more from within that constituency, especially when you have something called windshield time, not to mention time spent actually carrying out the real work. It certainly gives very clear credibility to a quote by Robert Louis Stevenson that it is better to travel happily than to arrive.

Furthermore, regarding providing better allowances, more staff, satellite offices, and video conferencing, none of which the commission was mandated to actually move forward, what we have seen here is that they have completely failed. What they did was say: “Well, you know what? To make up for that failure, let's allow the government just to give those MLAs who are impacted more money.” That seems strange. This is literally robbing Peter to pay Paul, proposals that are at best unfair and at worst possibly a breach in the redistribution rules.

Regarding the commission I have made a case that a failure to properly apply section 14 is enough rationale that we are robbing some rural ridings of their current status. In turn, this is diluting, perhaps in some cases removing, effective representation, which is the goal of the redistribution rules that were in place. Put candidly, I believe that the commission is opening the door to a reverse Saskatchewan 1991 legal challenge.

As I have mentioned in my previous speeches, Bonnyville-Cold Lake is the prime example of a commission that went out of control. They chose to create facts that were refuted in the interim process. I don't understand how they could say that my constituency was going to decline versus Alberta's average even though I brought forward proof that the Alberta government themselves believed that my constituency is going to grow.

To put perspective to this, I am asking each and every member here to look at what it is that you're trying to do. I will tell you that rural Alberta needs your voice now. We need to vote this terrible piece of legislation down. We need to throw this review out, and we need to give that commission a better mandate.

Thank you.

2:50

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

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to go into too much detail because I think we've already covered most of the issues, but I'd just like to go on the record, you know, as saying: what a way to wind up the 2017 fall session, with a good hard slap to the face of rural Alberta.

You know, I don't believe that northern Alberta got a fair shake in this deal. I don't think that we were given the respect that we deserve as being the economic driver of the province. I think that all constituencies in this province benefit from what comes out of the northeast and northwest parts of our province, and I think that it should have been recognized as such.

The message all over the province, at least in the sessions that I attended, was very, very clear. Everybody sent the same message, to leave the boundaries the way they are. There aren't any constituencies that couldn't have been tweaked a little bit here or there. You know, it's very unfair that a lot of our rural ridings ended up plus 10 to plus 15 over the provincial average while some areas of Calgary and Edmonton are at par or negative, with really no potential to grow. Why wasn't that taken into consideration? We could have maxed out some of those, spread those lines a little bit. I mean, they're never going to increase in population by 10,000 people. It's impossible.

The legislation mandates a review of the boundaries on a regular basis I believe it's every eight years or every second election, whichever comes first but it does not mandate a wholesale change. It just mandates a review. So I think that the boundaries commission went way above and beyond what was requested or expected of them, and we're going to suffer the consequences in rural Alberta.

Now, I know that there are members across the aisle, both rural and urban, that don't like what's in this boundaries commission report, and I would urge those members to vote against this bill. I know that their constituents don't want it. And I would urge those members that are sitting on the fence to support your rural MLA that's going to have to go out and face his constituents over the next year and especially in the election in 2019 that will be coming up.

I'm just going to end with: again, support and stand up for yourself and your constituents; stand up for your MLAs that are going to suffer the consequences of this bill. It doesn't need to be done. I think we should all vote to reject it in third reading.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow. Under 29(2)(a), sir?

Mr. Clark: No.

The Acting Speaker: Seeing and hearing none, the hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Clark: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak very briefly in third reading to Bill 33. I've heard the comments from our legislative colleagues representing rural constituencies, and I have a tremendous amount of empathy for the

challenges they face as rural MLAs. It is different than the challenges faced by urban MLAs.

I think that one of the things that we should consider and had I had the opportunity to be on the Members' Services Committee, perhaps Members' Services could have tackled this particular issue is looking at providing more financial resources to rural constituencies to allow those larger rural constituencies the opportunity to have more than one constituency office fully staffed on a full-time basis, or perhaps even more than two for some of the larger constituency areas, so that the residents of those large rural constituencies have adequate access to their representatives.

I acknowledge that it will not always be possible for MLAs in large rural constituencies to meet in person with every constituent that wants to. It is different, very different, to have to travel many hundreds of kilometres over many, many hours to get from one end of your constituency to the other. That is a different challenge than faced by urban MLAs, and I want my rural colleagues to know that I understand how difficult that is.

I think that in a time where we have access to information technology, to ways of connecting with your MLA that go beyond face to face it's not a replacement; it is somewhat helpful. It can never replace that face to face. I know constituents do want to come in and meet in person with their MLA. If they can't meet in person directly with the MLA, if there's an opportunity for us to find ways of providing more resources to those rural MLAs so that they can have more constituency offices staffed for more hours, perhaps that's a way of bridging some of this.

It will never be perfect. This will never be perfect. We'll never be able to have as many MLAs in as many places as, I'm sure, all of us might like. That said, I would never advocate for more politicians in Alberta. I don't think, as much as I would like to get re-elected, that that would be a strong platform to run on. I think that while the role that we play is an important one, we're never going to find a perfect world.

The process was a very open process. There were two rounds of the panel travelling the province, allowing Albertans the opportunity to provide their input rural and urban, north, central, south, east, and west provide that input in person, provide that input online, comment on a draft report, provide further comment. There was an opportunity for members to tweak some of the names of constituencies to make them more appropriate.

We're never going to get to a place where everyone is happy. I acknowledge the challenges this creates for rural MLAs, and I acknowledge and hear the concerns of rural Albertans. But I do in the end stand in favour of Bill 33 at third reading. The process was appropriate, and I think we need to move forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Seeing and hearing none, the chair will recognize the Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, we know that many government members are not happy with this, too. We know that a lot of the ones from the rural constituencies are not happy. We know that even urban MLAs are not happy. In good conscience, I would encourage those members to vote with their conscience on this and not be whipped into a vote or whatever they're doing there to make them vote along the lines of the government's choice, which is to pass this bill.

Now, when we look at this report, I think everybody seems to agree that there were a lot of mistakes in this. A lot of people agree on that. When I look at it, you know, the constituency that I represent now was actually misspelled, which might not seem like

a big thing. I mean, I'm sure that if somebody from southern Alberta misspelled the name of my constituency, that's not a big deal, but when the people in charge of creating a report like this can't get the name right, then I think that shows a little bit of how much care and concern they actually put into this.

During debate on this there was one thing that kind of struck me, and that was, of course, when the Member for Lethbridge-East got up and said that voting against this bill is gerrymandering. Now, that's an absolutely bizarre comment. Voting against this bill means that we'll have the status quo, what we have now. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how voting against something to remain status quo could be gerrymandering.

Now, what was also interesting is that the Member for Lethbridge-East made a presentation to the boundaries commission with a member of her NDP constituency executive. Mr. Speaker, as far as gerrymandering and trying to influence the commission to do something for political purposes goes, I would say that if an MLA shows up with a NDP constituency executive at a commission to do a presentation I'll just leave it at that.

What was also interesting is that the constituency of Lethbridge-East didn't change. It stayed the same through the interim report to the final report, as it is right now. Obviously, then, if it's gerrymandering to vote against this to remain status quo, then with the Member for Lethbridge-East voting to have the status quo, for her it must also be gerrymandering, I guess, following that same logic.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I tried to make one amendment to change the name of the constituency, to take it from three words to two words, to more accurately describe the constituency. Even that was voted down by the government. I mean, a simple thing like that, that changed nothing other than to more accurately reflect the constituency, was turned down by this government. Obviously, there is nothing we can do on this side of the House to change the government's mind on this. They're going to make all their members vote for this so that we have to take this report that, of course, they admit is not good.

3:00

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to leave it at that. Like I say, there have been some very odd things said in this House in regard to this. I think that we should be able to vote our conscience on this. We should be voting against this and turning this down. Under legislation the report had to be made. The report is flawed. Accepting something that's flawed I don't believe does any justice to what our job is here.

Thank you.

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

Seeing and hearing none, are there any other members wishing to speak to the bill? The hon. Member for Airdrie.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak to Bill 33 in third reading. First, earlier today I tabled copies of a letter from Mr. Glenn Koester, the reeve of Wheatland county. Now, currently, as the final boundary report sits, it puts a little chunk of Wheatland county into the new constituency of Airdrie-East. I'll read the letter and then I'll speak to it.

While we thank The Electoral Boundaries Commission for asking in July for our input regarding the proposed changes to electoral boundaries, we are concerned and disappointed that The Commission moved forward with drastically different boundaries than what were first proposed.

In our preliminary feedback, we indicated that we were satisfied with the new boundaries as suggested – as that proposal ensured that all of Wheatland County would remain in one

electoral division. In the Final Report of the 2016/17 Electoral Boundaries Commission however, Wheatland County is divided amongst four different electoral divisions. We are concerned that the needs of Wheatland County residents will not be sufficiently represented under this structure. The County areas included in each of the four electoral divisions will be insignificant in comparison to the whole of each division and, as such, they will have very little voice.

In conclusion, Wheatland County Council is greatly concerned that there was no opportunity to provide feedback on this proposed final version. We maintain that being inclusive is necessary at this stage of the process as well, and request that input be sought once again regarding these updated changes to electoral boundaries prior to adoption.

Mr. Speaker, as is very clearly articulated in this letter from Wheatland county, just Wheatland county, many of my hon. colleagues have expressed concerns as well as colleagues from the government side have expressed concerns, many different concerns, this one certainly being that a county, the county of Wheatland in particular, here in this case now resides in four different ridings.

The riding, the current riding of Airdrie, does in fact contain Airdrie city, a major population, and of course a good chunk of Rocky View county, which I know I share with a few other MLAs here in this Chamber. I do my best to make sure I represent the rural constituents in Airdrie and the Madden area, Nier, and Dogpound as well as the needs of the Airdrie citizens as a whole, whose population currently sits at about 65,000 people. Now, there's no doubt that given the population numbers in Airdrie the constituency would have to be split up in some way, shape, or form. I understand that. It's the fastest growing city in Canada, Mr. Speaker. Sorry; it was about a year ago, but I'm not quite sure where we sit right now, to be honest.

To be fair, the rural constituents in the Airdrie riding for many years have actually always felt a little bit on the outside. It doesn't matter who the MLA is or what efforts are taken; it's very common to think that as the largest part of the population of the constituency is within Airdrie. Now, any constituent that contacts my office certainly gets all of the respect and attention that they need for their concerns, and I will absolutely bring it forward. I have a great relationship with the reeve of Rocky View. I'm very, very grateful for that, and I will continue to nurture that relationship moving forward as Rocky View county also now sits in the new constituency of Airdrie-East. That would make it part of Airdrie, the city of Airdrie, part of Rocky View county, and a little bit of Wheatland county.

Now, Wheatland county in particular is the one that brings up the most significant amount of concern, and I absolutely share this concern. To be honest, Mr. Speaker, I've never been to Wheatland county. I will, and I'm sure it's a wonderful, wonderful place. I will seek a nomination in the Airdrie-East riding, and I will get to know the people and the councillors in the county of Wheatland and the area. I've heard it's beautiful. I've heard it's wonderful. Something about duck hunting. I don't know. Could be interesting.

There are some significant concerns on proper representation when a county that's split amongst four different electoral districts in very small chunks, to be honest, according to this letter that the reeve from Wheatland county sent – Mr. Speaker, they're going to feel the same way that many rural constituents do when they are put into a municipality with such a larger population. I mean, I don't think Wheatland county has a parade. I don't know.

Just speaking from experience in the riding that I currently represent, there's a pancake breakfast every year once a year in the area of Bottrel. If you've never been to Bottrel, it is a beautiful, wonderful area. There's a campground there. There's a neat creek

that goes through, and some really awesome people come out to this pancake breakfast every year. It's a great opportunity for me to be able to connect with a lot of the rural residents in the area; otherwise, there are not a lot of spaces or events or things where we all gather together in one place. I also, in the area of Bottrel, get to meet a lot of my colleagues' constituents from around the constituency of Airdrie as well and lots of farmers that are busy throughout the year, and you know this is one of the big main gathering events for the area of Bottrel.

Of course, Madden has a golf course and a community hall out there and an RV park. There is a golf course in that area as well. I think I just mentioned that. There are some things that happen there, but there are not a lot of times where the people of Madden and the people of Bottrel and the people of Airdrie interact with each other or do life together or have similar interests or concerns, that type of thing.

It was interesting: during Bill 6 I got a lot of e-mails from the rural constituents in the area, and a lot of people in the city didn't quite understand Bill 6 if they had not been those people that actually grew up in rural Alberta or in rural Canada, wherever they might be, having that understanding or that background of the things and the effects that Bill 6 has on that way of life. It was really interesting that that, in itself, shows quite a divide just on one piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I always will continue to balance the needs and the wants and the concerns of my constituents. I always have. I always will, and I have no doubt that everyone in this Assembly absolutely will, but the boundaries in this report, quite honestly, in many ways don't make sense, as expressed by many of my colleagues here in this Assembly both in the opposition and the government side. There are a lot of dangers in these ridings, I think, in proper representation.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate of the Electoral Boundaries Commission was to update the electoral districts while respecting the following considerations:

- (a) the requirement for effective representation as guaranteed by the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms,
- (b) sparsity and density of population.

That certainly speaks to the density of population in the city of Airdrie and the sparsity of population in Wheatland county and Rocky View county. They don't do life together. I can bet many people in Airdrie have not been to Wheatland county and vice versa. Maybe we'll have to create a pancake breakfast should this report actually go forward just to bring all of these constituents together.

3:10

I think there could be the potential for many opportunities where the constituency is imbalanced on major issues, and that would not present a fair and equal opportunity for the constituents in the riding as a whole. I think Wheatland county would have the concern that perhaps they would be less on the totem pole, which is a valid concern to have. I'm not saying that that's what would happen, but their fears about not being properly represented are very clearly spelled out in this letter, and I can empathize with these.

I think that we don't actually have to pass this. We had to study the electoral districts and make recommendations, but there is actually no provision that says that we have to pass this or actually make those changes. We don't have to do that, so, Mr. Speaker, I would urge this Assembly to think long and hard about what we're doing here today when it comes to changing these districts because we don't want to make anyone feel like they are not part of what we do here in this Assembly.

When they go to vote in, say, a constituency like mine, Mr. Speaker, sometimes in the rural areas – and this is certainly true for

my riding, for many years – the rural constituents aren't actually quite sure which riding they're in. I have a few friends, actually, that showed up to vote for me in a riding and found out that my name wasn't there on the ballot. They were in fact, you know, right on that line and voted for my hon. colleague in Chestermere-Rocky View, so it worked out really well.

Mr. Speaker, I would just urge this Assembly – I won't take more time – to not vote this thing forward. Sit back, take a breath, and figure this out. I know that we've got some MLAs pitted against other MLAs when it comes to nomination on the government side and the opposition side. There are lots of problems with this, so listen to your conscience on this as you've listened to your constituents through your consultation on the electoral boundaries. The second draft was not at all like the first draft, and we have no way to provide input on this except by not moving the new electoral divisions forward.

With that, I will be voting against this, absolutely, and I urge all members in this Assembly to vote with your conscience, vote against this piece of legislation, and do the right thing for your constituents.

Thank you.

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

Seeing and hearing none, anyone wishing to speak to Bill 33? The hon. Member for Calgary-Northern Hills.

Mr. Kleinstuber: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad I had a chance today to speak to Bill 33, Electoral Divisions Act. I had quite a bit to say here, but I'll keep my remarks brief. In May 2017 the Proposed Electoral Division Areas, Boundaries, and Names for Alberta interim report was released. At that time the report recommended that the boundaries for Calgary-Northern Hills be divided into three ridings: Calgary-North, Calgary-Bedlington, and Calgary-North East. There were a few concerns that I had with the report, and as a result, I joined many members of the community in Calgary-Northern Hills at the hearing in Calgary that was scheduled on the evening of July 20, 2017.

At that hearing I proposed three main suggestions. When referring to the link between the new proposed riding of Calgary-North East and the neighbourhoods of Coventry Hills, Harvest Hills, partnering with the communities in the northeast, I had the following concerns: one, recreation. Vivo for Healthier Generations is a community hub for Calgary-Northern Hills, and it would be part of the proposed Calgary-North East riding. It has very little connection with Redstone and Skyview Ranch, and I think there is too much distance between Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, Harvest Hills, and the other communities across Deerfoot and past the airport in the north commercial district, the Métis Trail to the northeast communities of the proposed riding. Vivo should be closely connected to the communities it serves. Redstone, Skyview Ranch communities are more oriented to go with the Genesis Centre in the Saddle Ridge, Martindale, and Taradale neighbourhoods rather than Vivo and the Coventry Hills neighbourhoods.

Community associations were also an issue. The Northern Hills Community Association serves Panorama Hills, Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, Country Hills, and Harvest Hills, and it has no connection directly with the communities east of Deerfoot. The proposed boundary changes would split these community associations and their political advocacy into three electoral districts.

Finally, the third issue was school infrastructure. The Notre Dame high school, CCSD; and the future north Calgary high school, which would be the CBE, are both provincially funded school systems, and their source communities are and will be Panorama Hills, Coventry Hills, Country Hills Village, Harvest

Hills, and Country Hills. The students in the Redstone and Skyview Ranch communities are more oriented to go with the new Nelson Mandela high school in Taradale.

Mr. Speaker, these were some of the concerns that I raised last summer, and I highlighted that these communities have little in common. But imagine the surprise when the final report was released, in October 2017, to see that the boundaries had not shifted, that they were nearly exactly the same as in the interim report.

Mr. Speaker, I know that myself and many members of the community put a lot of time and consideration into this report. One member actually drafted and submitted an alternative boundary map for consideration, and I would like to thank her for that thoughtful submission. In addition, another member of the community, the first vice-president and advocacy director of the NHCA, recently wrote a three-page letter voicing his concerns about the final report.

Mr. Speaker, despite all these negative impacts that I see from splitting Calgary-Northern Hills into three ridings, I had to reflect back to my initial observations when I started researching the 2016-17 Electoral Boundaries Commission. From the beginning I recognized that the city of Calgary had some wild differences in population between the ridings. According to the Calgary civic census count estimates for 2016 the population of Calgary-South East stands at 79,000 while the population of Calgary-Fish Creek, for example, is at about 40,000. One riding is nearly double the population of another riding.

The target identified in the interim report was 46,118, as noted on page 24. Again, the first thing I recognized in this report was that the populations of the city of Calgary had to be equalized to create more fair representation and access to MLAs. Calgary-Northern Hills' 2016 estimate was 61,377, which means that the population of Calgary-Northern Hills is over by 15,000 people. It was clear that the boundaries had to change. I and other members of the community made our case and presented our vision of how these boundaries should have looked. At this point I want to express my disappointment in the final conclusion. I felt that the commission could have reflected some of the requests that we had presented a little bit more clearly. However, I will be supporting Bill 33 at third reading because I think it's important that the populations in Calgary are balanced evenly between the electoral divisions.

I think it's also important to consider that the Electoral Boundaries Commission panel worked independently of politics and interference from the parties in this Legislature. In the end, if we cannot support the work of an independent panel and we start to delve into the electoral boundaries in the political sphere, it will open debate about the self-interest of individual MLAs, who should not decide these things.

Mr. Speaker, I'll continue to work hard for the constituents of Calgary-Northern Hills within the current boundaries. I want to again thank the president and volunteers of the Northern Hills Community Association, some of whom took some late-night phone calls from me. I'd also like to thank many of the other community volunteers who took the time out of their schedules and their lives to submit their suggestions and try to design the electoral divisions that reflect our community.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Are there any questions under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills under 29(2)(a).

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm really confused here. The hon. member says that he doesn't agree with the report, and then on the other hand he says that he's going to support it.

Just to put it in context, actually, I ran in that riding of Calgary-Northern Hills twice. I probably door-knocked at every house, in those six years that I campaigned in that riding, five or six times, so I have a history in that riding. The persons that he is referencing actually called me, too, and they were very disappointed.

When it comes to my case, it doesn't matter to me. I can run anywhere in that part of the city although my riding is also split into three. Calgary-Foothills will become Calgary-Foothills, Calgary-Edgemont, and Calgary-Bedlington.

3:20

That apart, my initial dilemma was, you know, that if I go and represent myself and give my submissions, then I thought that maybe I'll be blamed because I'm looking after myself, my self-interest.

I thought that we would have an opportunity here to fix those shortcomings. The Government House Leader asked us to support this, but he's the person who actually rejected even simple fixes like the name changes. There was an opportunity to fix some of those problems and attach the historic names in our area. I'm sure that the members from Calgary-Hawkwood, Calgary-Northern Hills, and Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill, all my neighbouring ridings, all agree with me. There is some sentiment attached there, so we asked for those name changes, but they were all rejected.

If I knew that this was how this government was going to handle this, unilaterally rejecting, showing an authoritative, dictatorial approach, I probably would have had better luck arguing my case, actually, with the boundary commission. So I should have done that. I deeply regret.

Mr. Hanson: Support your rural MLAs.

Mr. Panda: Yeah.

Now, my hon. colleague from Northern Hills was saying that he represented the problem correctly, but in the end he's caving in. That's not democracy. I'm not going to support this bill, and I ask my hon. colleagues on the other side to actually vote as per the wishes of their constituents and to also support some of these rural MLAs. They're going to face real hardship with these changes. It's an obligation on their part to show some sympathy and empathy and solidarity with their rural colleagues, too.

That's why I urge all members of this House, both sides, to unanimously reject this report. I'm not going to support this, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Northern Hills.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Yeah. I think that was under 29(2)(a)?

The Acting Speaker: Correct.

Mr. Kleinsteuber: Yeah. I just want to comment as well. No, I don't think that we caved in. I don't think I caved in at all. I went and I presented on the mid-term report. I went with members of the community, and we presented our case, actually, to the boundary commission, as we should.

I just have a question as well for the member. I didn't see him at the boundary commission that night. I'm just wondering if he also had the opportunity to present his case then, if he did or if he didn't.

The issue here is that I think I made it clear that I and many members from the community did our very best. We made submissions, as we should, as we were asked to, when we saw the interim report and then took it to the final report.

The bigger issue, overall, was, in my opinion, with the populations in general for all the ridings in Calgary. I thought that, ultimately, as I mentioned in my statement here, the most important part was to balance that differential out evenly between the cities.

I appreciate as well some of the concerns that the member raised about the rural areas of the province. I, too, have a lot of sympathy for some of the changes there as well. Ultimately, as someone who represents a riding in the city, I thought it was important to represent my riding and respect as well.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

The chair will recognize the hon. Member for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief. I have to respond to some of the assertions made by the Member for Calgary-Northern Hills, recognizing that the final report may not have had many changes from the interim report for his riding, but in my opinion the final report had very significant changes throughout many parts of Alberta. In that respect, I find it very concerning. With the final report, I would have expected to have very minimal changes from the interim report.

Therefore, I cannot support this bill. I did not support the motion to accept the report, and I do believe that we are moving down a path that is not leading towards effective representation of Albertans but that the commission decided to move more on a path of equitableness. In my opinion and in the opinion of many decisions that have been made in the past, effective representation is the goal, and effective representation is in the best interests of all of its citizens within a democracy.

You know, we saw also in some of the submissions how we have Edmonton and Calgary being outside of the population base by 5 to 6 per cent and the rest of Alberta being below by 5 or 6 per cent and that a few minor adjustments within the urban ridings could have made the difference with regard to the concerns where certain ridings had significant population increases without disrupting the entire province.

I will speak against this bill. I do encourage all members in this House to recognize the damage that we are doing to the democratic principles of effective representation in Alberta.

Thank you.

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

Seeing and hearing none, I recognize the hon. Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster.

Dr. Starke: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's indeed an honour to speak on Bill 33 regarding the electoral divisions as they've been put forward by the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

I guess I would say that the one thing I knew for sure about the riding that I'm privileged to represent is that if it was going to change, it wasn't going to go east. It was going to either go north or south or west, but it was not going to go east. That was the only thing we knew for certain. It was interesting, in the interim report, where there was a significant expansion of the constituency in a westerly direction, where the current boundary is approximately where highway 36 intersects with highway 16, that that boundary was proposed to be extended all the way to Elk Island park, which would have been a considerable extension along highway 16. At the same time, there would have been what I call a compression of the riding into a very long, thin ribbon along highway 16 and also highway 14.

I will give the boundaries commission, certainly, credit. There were a number of constituents in Vermilion-Lloydminster who lived north of township road 532 that were proposed to be moved

into the Fort Saskatchewan-St. Paul riding, which was also being proposed. They expressed their concerns very, very clearly. They organized a letter-writing campaign, and about one quarter of the total number of written submissions to the Electoral Boundaries Commission came from the communities of Dewberry, Clandonald, Tulliby Lake, and Lea Park. I'm not sure that there are even 150 people that live in Dewberry, Clandonald, Tulliby Lake, and Lea Park, but certainly they got very organized. To the incredible credit of the boundaries commission, they looked at that and said: no, it makes sense to leave the boundary where it is, contiguous with the county boundary of the county of Vermilion River.

What was somewhat surprising in the transition from the interim report to the final report was that the electoral division was completely turned at a 90-degree angle, so instead of going east-west, it was flipped and now goes more or less north-south with the combination of the county of Vermilion River and the municipal district of Wainwright.

You know, overall, I'm actually very much in favour of using county boundaries as a way to set boundaries, especially in rural areas. They make sense. County boundaries are well established, they don't change, and the county boundaries are understood by everybody in the rural areas. If you say, "This constituency consists of this county, this county, and this MD," everybody knows exactly what you're talking about. That was one of the recommendations I made after the interim report was released.

3:30

I've listened to the debate, and I certainly listened very carefully to the comments by the Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills and also his discussion of the minority report that was written by Commissioner Day. I would say that I completely concur with Commissioner Day's comments, especially vis-à-vis her comments with regard to rural representation. Commissioner Day, I think, absolutely nailed it when she discussed the need for rural representation to be reflective and also to consider the challenges of representing a large riding.

You know, I don't represent a geographically huge riding. I'm fortunate in that way, but I will tell you that despite that fact, on this past weekend, attending events in and around the Vermilion-Lloydminster constituency, I didn't leave the constituency, but from the time that I left Edmonton on Thursday night to the time I returned to Edmonton Sunday night, I'd driven over 1,300 kilometres attending events in my constituency. With all due respect to the Member for Calgary-Elbow, the reason why some of the electronic communication tools – yes; they're great. But the reason you do that is a lesson I learned from my former colleague MLA the long-time Member for Whitecourt-St. Anne, whose lesson to us as young legislators was: being there is 50 per cent of it. Fifty per cent of it is being there.

He was right. When you're there, you don't have to speak. Most people would actually prefer that you don't speak. When you're there and you're interacting with the constituents, people absolutely appreciate that. I'm sure everybody in this Legislature would concur with that. People want to see the whites of your eyes because when you're there, you're telling them you care. You're telling them that you care about their community. You're telling them that you care about their cause or, you know, whatever it is that they're promoting when you're there at a graduation or at a 50th anniversary, as I was this past Saturday, or at a sporting event or at a rodeo or at a parade. When you're there, you're saying that you support them.

As the rural ridings become larger and larger and larger, that's going to become more and more difficult, and there's no amount of teleconferencing or additional offices that is going to mitigate the

fact that you cannot be in two places at once. I think the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills said that. So did the Member for Livingstone-Macleod, you know, that really the only way that having extra offices was going to help was if you could be cloned. I have two offices now. I have an office in Vermilion. I have an office in Lloydminster. They're staffed by outstanding, outstanding assistants. I have wonderful staff. Could you open another office, say, in Wainwright, after the next boundaries? Yes. You could. In fact, I would definitely recommend that that be done, but basically what that means is that now not only do you have to staff the offices, but your presence is expected in those offices. If you have offices but you never show up at them, people start asking: "Well, why do you have this office? I want to be able to make an appointment to see you, and I want to be able to see you in the office that is closest to me. I don't want to have to drive an hour and a half one way to get to see my MLA."

So, Mr. Speaker, that's my concern. I think that Commissioner Day's comments were very, very well taken. I think Commissioner Day carefully considered the path this is going down and that if indeed we are to stay at 87 members – you know, I would even question whether that is this magic number of 87, but that was the parameter that was given, and that's fine – and if we're going to continue to do what this boundary commission did, and that was to put a heavy emphasis on voter parity and an equal number of voters per constituency, then rural Alberta's voice will become quieter and quieter and quieter. Pretty soon you'll have a scenario where the only rural representation will be in combination with an urban centre.

I have a riding that's a little bit like that. I mean, the city of Lloydminster on the Alberta side has got over 20,000 people, and that's nearly half of the total population of our constituency. Then Vermilion's got, you know, close to 4,500 people. But there are ridings like Drumheller-Stettler, for example, like Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre, like Peace River, like the two Fort McMurray ridings. These are sprawling, huge tracts of land. You know, to have them represented by a single person, whether there are one, two, or three offices, is a daunting task. I worry sometimes about the fatigue of members. I worry about travel safety. I worry about the number of hours we spend driving. I know our families worry about that, too.

Like I say, I think that a balance has to be struck. I acknowledge that the Electoral Boundaries Commission has got a tremendously difficult job. The Government House Leader is right. No matter what gets proposed, somebody is going to be unhappy. He is right about that. But I think the overriding message in this Electoral Boundaries Commission report was the shift from rural to urban, those three seats. It doesn't sound like a lot, but it is, especially the precedent it sets that we are going to stick with absolute voter parity. Numerical voter parity does not equate to effective representation, and it's effective representation that we're trying to aim for.

I will be opposed to this bill. I will vote against it but not because I don't appreciate the efforts of the boundaries commission. I do. I recognize that they had a very difficult job. But I have to state unequivocally that it's so important that we have rural representation be able to bring forward the concerns and to have the rural representatives, the MLAs who represent these challenging ridings, be able to do their job, not just for them to have access to their constituents but for their constituents to have access to them. You know, while electronic means of communication are helpful – and they should be used; they're tools – ultimately it's your presence that people want. If the ridings become so very large that that becomes very difficult, it's going to become increasingly challenging, and I don't think that's good for democracy in Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Seeing and hearing none, the hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to rise very briefly today to speak against this bill, really around some concerns I have as an urban MLA. My constituency is rather concentrated. My ability to attend community associations and meetings throughout the constituency is very positive. My ability to attend events within the constituency is relatively easy in terms of access. I have an opportunity to see my constituents on a regular basis, and I make that opportunity to do so. So for me, although I'll be sad to lose the community of Canyon Meadows and will take over some territory from the hon. Speaker in terms of Midnapore and Sundance, those areas are not a far distance away from me. They are probably relatively similar in terms of the makeup of the community, in terms of the mix of rental accommodations and homeowners and multifamily and single-family and seniors' facilities and whatnot. Of course, then I'll have both sides of Fish Creek, so we won't have that boundary in the middle of us to converse over.

Ms Hoffman: Should you be elected.

Mr. Gotfried: Should I be elected. Should I be nominated, even.

The concern I have. You know, I always even talk to my children and I talk to people about the fact that the wealth of this province is not created – certainly, it's managed; the investment is there – in the glass towers of downtown Calgary. It's actually in the field, whether that field be the farmer's field or the forests that we enjoy or the oil and gas industries' operations, whether that be in the oil sands or whether that be drilling activity or natural gas drilling in the province. That is where our wealth is created.

The representation we talk about in this province is not always about raw population numbers; hence, obviously, when we get into the rural areas, where we have a lack of population density. But we do have rich resources in those areas. With appreciation for the hard work done by the Electoral Boundaries Commission, which we all appreciate, I think it's a bit of a slippery slope, and I'm concerned about that going forward. If we get continued urbanization of this province, what will happen is that eventually we will have fewer and fewer rural constituencies. We will have less and less representation of the land from which we derive our wealth in this province.

3:40

I'm concerned also with the huge distances and the chances and opportunities for representation, for attendance at community events, for those random opportunities. In my constituency I can see constituents at the grocery store and at the coffee shop and various other things, but that's because I am frequenting those areas. I'm often in those and have a chance to see them. When you might have 500 or 1,000 kilometres, or it could be longer distances, I think, in some of the constituencies, your chances to have those less frequent and more random opportunities to see your constituents, which I think we all embrace and enjoy, will become less. That concerns me deeply.

I just wanted to say as an urban MLA that when we are looking at this, I think that we should have the opportunity, possibly, for greater latitude within the urban environments, where we have an opportunity for strong representation, that we have sometimes more of an opportunity for density of individuals in those areas, that we do need to take into account more than just the population. We need to think about the wealth and the resources and the richness we have, whether that, again, be agriculture, forestry, tourism, or the

energy sector as well. I don't believe that those are being taken into account on this bill and the report that we're embracing and taking a look at today. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will not be supporting this bill, because of the concerns today, tomorrow, and into future for future generations.

Thank you.

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

Seeing and hearing none, is there anyone else wishing to speak to Bill 33? The hon. Member for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater.

Mr. Piquette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah. I just wanted to briefly get on the record a couple of points. Of course, I mean, I haven't made secret my own concerns over the Electoral Boundaries Commission. I just want to respond to some of the things from the people on the other side. As a rural member I don't feel like my colleagues are throwing me under the bus. I have to say that, I mean, they're looking at this from a different perspective. I respect that. I understand where they're coming from when they look at their own ridings and when they look at that we appointed this commission.

That all being said, I'm going to be voting against this on third reading. I feel like I can't do otherwise. I mean, I did very extensive consultation with members in my riding. I spoke to every individual municipality, and I had unanimous consent. I had unanimous consent not from the municipalities merely but from every single councillor that was a member of every municipality. They all said the same thing, that they were really concerned about the changes. They were concerned about the dilution of representation that the expansion of the boundaries of our riding represented, and they urged me that what they wanted to see was the status quo. Because of this overwhelming voice from the riding, I can't support the report's recommendations. I have to give credit, too, you know, that I do have the ability to vote against this, and I intend to exercise it.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Any questions or comments under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Calgary-Greenway.

Mr. Gill: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a comment to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater, I want to thank you for your commitment to your constituents and for listening to them and representing them in this Chamber while we're here. Thank you for voting against this bill. Thanks a lot, sir.

The Acting Speaker: Any other questions or comments under 29(2)(a)?

Seeing and hearing none, any members wishing to speak to Bill 33? The hon. Member for Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill.

Ms McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't planning to speak to this bill, but last week I was in Westlock for the Digital Futures conference. It brings together people from rural Alberta. I grew up in Sexsmith, Alberta. I'm very proud of having come from a rural location, and my riding as it stands right now has a number of farms in it still. On the north end of Calgary there is land that hasn't been developed yet, and there are a number of farms. From the conversations that I have had and my own experience growing up in a rural location, I do have concerns about the proportion of representation for rural Alberta. I'm a big fan of eating, and I really appreciate the experience of having grown up in a rural area. I really value that lifestyle, and I think it's a big part of our history in Alberta. I don't know that the Electoral Boundaries Commission's report really addresses those concerns. I think it's an opportunity

for us to really think about what we value as Albertans, what's important to us. I would like to see more consideration of balancing those two.

For those reasons I will not be voting in favour of the bill.

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

Seeing and hearing none, any other members wishing to speak to Bill 33? The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. Mason: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'm pleased to stand in support of Bill 33. I think we've had a good debate. I think that members have legitimate concerns, but we've laid out the reasons why the government is proceeding with a bill that mirrors exactly the boundaries recommended by the commission because the appearance of objectivity and nonbias, I think, is critical to the confidence of Alberta citizens.

I urge all members to support this bill.

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation, to clarify, was closing debate?

Mr. Mason: What?

The Acting Speaker: You're closing debate?

Mr. Mason: I just did.

The Acting Speaker: Okay.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 3:47 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Mr. Sucha in the chair]

For the motion:

Anderson, S.	Feehan	Mason
Babcock	Fitzpatrick	McKittrick
Bilous	Goehring	McLean
Carlier	Gray	Miller
Carson	Hoffman	Miranda
Ceci	Horne	Nielsen
Clark	Jansen	Payne

Connolly	Kazim	Sabir
Coolahan	Kleinstauber	Schmidt
Cortes-Vargas	Larivee	Schreiner
Dach	Littlewood	Shepherd
Dang	Loyola	Westhead
Drever	Luff	Woollard
Eggen	Malkinson	

Against the motion:

Aheer	Hunter	Pitt
Anderson, W.	Loewen	Rosendahl
Barnes	MacIntyre	Smith
Cyr	McIver	Starke
Drysdale	McPherson	Stier
Ellis	Nixon	Strankman
Gill	Panda	van Dijken
Gotfried	Piquette	Yao
Hanson		

Totals:	For – 41	Against – 25
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion carried; Bill 33 read a third time]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, I would like to begin by thanking all members for their contributions in this session. I think it has been a productive session, and we've passed a significant number of bills in this House.

I would like also to wish everyone the merriest of Christmases or whatever way people celebrate the season. I wish them the very same thing and wish everyone safe travels home and a wonderful break. I think I certainly have need of it, and I'm sure some members do as well.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Government Motion 35 I am rising to advise the Assembly that the business of the sitting has been concluded and that the House stands adjourned.

The Acting Speaker: Happy holidays, everyone.

Hon. members, pursuant to Government Motion 35, agreed to on December 5, 2017, the House stands adjourned until February 2018.

[The Assembly adjourned at 4:06 p.m. pursuant to Government Motion 35]

Bill Status Report for the 29th Legislature - 3rd Session (2017)

Activity to Wednesday, December 13, 2017

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

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

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

Bill 1 — An Act to Reduce School Fees (Eggen)

First Reading — 6 (*Mar. 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 105-10 (*Mar. 8, 2017 morn.*), 192-96 (*Mar. 9, 2017 aft.*), 235-42 (*Mar. 14, 2017 morn.*), 269-71 (*Mar. 14, 2017 aft.*), 273-74 (*Mar. 15, 2017 morn., adjourned*), 282-91 (*Mar. 15, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 424-31 (*Mar. 21, 2017 aft.*), 556-58 (*Apr. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 674-78 (*Apr. 19, 2017 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — 879 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2017 c6]

Bill 2* — An Act to Remove Barriers for Survivors of Sexual and Domestic Violence (Ganley)

First Reading — 67-68 (*Mar. 7, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 110-11 (*Mar. 8, 2017 morn.*), 192 (*Mar. 9, 2017 aft.*), 314-22 (*Mar. 15, 2017 aft.*), 336-39 (*Mar. 16, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 455-59 (*Mar. 22, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 678-79 (*Apr. 19, 2017 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — 879 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force May 4, 2017; SA 2017 c7]

Bill 3* — Voluntary Blood Donations Act (Hoffman)

First Reading — 208 (*Mar. 13, 2017 aft., passed.*)

Second Reading — 323-36 (*Mar. 16, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 394-400 (*Mar. 21, 2017 morn.*), 421-24 (*Mar. 21, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 472-80 (*Mar. 23, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 30, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force Mar. 30, 2017; SA 2017 cV-5]

Bill 4 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2017 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 191 (*Mar. 9, 2017 aft, passed*)

Second Reading — 306-07 (*Mar. 15, 2017 aft., adjourned*), 322 (*Mar. 15, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 389-93 (*Mar. 21, 2017 morn.*)

Third Reading — 449-52 (*Mar. 22, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 30, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force Mar. 30, 2017; SA 2017 c2]

Bill 5 — Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 2017 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 266 (*Mar. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 310-14 (*Mar. 15, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 393-94 (*Mar. 21, 2017 morn.*)

Third Reading — 452-55 (*Mar. 22, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 30, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force Mar. 30, 2017; SA 2017 c1]

Bill 6 — Northland School Division Act (Eggen)

First Reading — 524 (*Apr. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 558-61 (*Apr. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 671-74 (*Apr. 19, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 755-59 (*May 2, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — 879 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force May 4, 2017; SA 2017 cN-5.1]

Bill 7 — An Act to Enhance Post-secondary Academic Bargaining (Schmidt)

First Reading — 552 (*Apr. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 679-81 (*Apr. 19, 2017 aft.*)

Committee of the Whole — 810-15 (*May 3, 2017 morn.*), 828-38 (*May 3, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 865-66 (*May 4, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — 879 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force May 4, 2017, with exception; SA 2017 c4]

Bill 8* — An Act to Strengthen Municipal Government (S. Anderson)

First Reading — 577 (*Apr. 10, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 691-700 (*Apr. 20, 2017 morn.*), 716-22 (*Apr. 20, 2017 aft.*), 780-84 (*May 2, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 784-95 (*May 2, 2017 aft.*), 838-45 (*May 3, 2017 aft.*), 855-65 (*May 4, 2017 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 991-1004 (*May 11, 2017 morn.*), 1101-06 (*May 16, 2017 aft.*), 1107-10 (*May 17, 2017 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2017 c13]

Bill 9 — Marketing of Agricultural Products Amendment Act, 2017 (Carlier)

First Reading — 606 (*Apr. 11, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 683-87 (*Apr. 20, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 687-90 (*Apr. 20, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 759-62 (*May 2, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — 880 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2017 c5]

Bill 10 — Appropriation Act, 2017 (\$) (Ceci)

First Reading — 670-71 (*Apr. 19, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Second Reading — 690-91 (*Apr. 20, 2017 morn.*), 700-02 (*Apr. 20, 2017 morn.*), 722-23 (*Apr. 20, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 762-67 (*May 2, 2017 morn.*), 795-97 (*May 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 799-810 (*May 3, 2017 morn.*), 845-47 (*May 3, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — 880 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force May 4, 2017; SA 2017 c3]

Bill 11* — Public Interest Disclosure (Whistleblower Protection) Amendment Act, 2017 (Gray)

First Reading — 771 (*May 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 849-55 (*May 4, 2017 morn.*), 924-39 (*May 9, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1072-77 (*May 16, 2017 morn.*), 1092-1101 (*May 16, 2017 aft.*), 1168-69 (*May 18, 2017 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1199-1202 (*May 23, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2017 c11]

Bill 12* — New Home Buyer Protection Amendment Act, 2017 (S. Anderson)

First Reading — 877 (*May 4, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 939-44 (*May 9, 2017 aft.*), 945-56 (*May 10, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 956-62 (*May 10, 2017 morn.*), 1004-1008 (*May 11, 2017 morn.*), 1008-10 (*May 11, 2017 morn.*), 1111-20 (*May 17, 2017 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1169-71 (*May 18, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2017 c10]

Bill 13 — Securities Amendment Act, 2017 (Ceci)

First Reading — 893 (*May 8, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 977-90 (*May 10, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1027-31 (*May 11, 2017 aft.*), 1065-72 (*May 16, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1137-44 (*May 17, 2017 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 7, 2017; SA 2017 c12]

Bill 14 — An Act to Support Orphan Well Rehabilitation (McCuaig-Boyd)

First Reading — 1090 (*May 16, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1144-52 (*May 17, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1225-30 (*May 23, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1244-46 (*May 24, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 7, 2017; SA 2017 c14]

Bill 15 — Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2017 (Ceci)

First Reading — 1137 (*May 17, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1184-89 (*May 18, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1215-25 (*May 23, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1246-48 (*May 24, 2017 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2017 c15]

Bill 16 — An Act to Cap Regulated Electricity Rates (\$) (McCuaig-Boyd)

First Reading — 1214 (*May 23, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1262-78 (*May 24, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1279-91 (*May 25, 2017 morn.*), 1291-97 (*May 25, 2017 morn.*), 1351-58 (*May 29, 2017 eve.*), 1389-1406 (*May 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1514-17 (*Jun. 1, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 7, 2017, with exceptions; SA 2017 cC-2.3]

Bill 17* — Fair and Family-friendly Workplaces Act (Gray)

First Reading — 1260 (*May 24, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Second Reading — 1311-22 (*May 25, 2017 aft.*), 1359-61 (*May 29, 2017 eve.*), 1363-76 (*May 30, 2017 morn.*), 1407-20 (*May 30, 2017 eve.*), 1421-32 (*May 31, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1432-36 (*May 31, 2017 morn.*), 1449-66 (*May 31, 2017 aft.*), 1467-79 (*May 31, 2017 eve.*), 1490-99 (*Jun. 1, 2017 morn.*), 1517-20 (*Jun. 1, 2017 aft.*), 1534-51 (*Jun. 5, 2017 aft.*), 1553-67 (*Jun. 5, 2017 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1589-93 (*Jun. 5, 2017 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2017 c9]

Bill 18* — Child Protection and Accountability Act (Larivee)

First Reading — 1388 (*May 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1481-90 (*Jun. 1, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1567-79 (*Jun. 5, 2017 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1587-89 (*Jun. 5, 2017 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2017; c8]

Bill 19 — An Act to Protect Gas and Convenience Store Workers (Gray)

First Reading — 1610 (*Oct. 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1648-53 (*Oct. 31, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1695-98 (*Nov. 1, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1729-31 (*Nov. 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 20 — Beaver River Basin Water Authorization Act (Phillips)

First Reading — 1610 (*Oct. 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1627-35 (*Oct. 31, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1655-64 (*Nov. 1, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1728-29 (*Nov. 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 21 — Agencies, Boards and Commissions Review Statutes Amendment Act, 2017 (Ceci)

First Reading — 1648 (*Oct. 31, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1664-72 (*Nov. 1, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1699-1706 (*Nov. 2, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1789-90 (*Nov. 7, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 22 — Resident and Family Councils Act (Hoffman)

First Reading — 1648 (*Oct. 31, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1687-94 (*Nov. 1, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1706-14 (*Nov. 2, 2017 morn., adjourned*), 1731-32 (*Nov. 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1790-94 (*Nov. 7, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 23 — Alberta Human Rights Amendment Act, 2017 (Ganley)

First Reading — 1685-86 (*Nov. 1, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1761-69 (*Nov. 7, 2017 morn.*), 1796 (*Nov. 7, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1805-15 (*Nov. 8, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1910-17 (*Nov. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 24 — An Act to Support Gay-Straight Alliances (Eggen)

First Reading — 1726-27 (*Nov. 2, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1769-74 (*Nov. 7, 2017 morn.*), 1796-1803 (*Nov. 7, 2017 aft.*), 1833-46 (*Nov. 8, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1847-55 (*Nov. 9, 2017 morn.*), 1870-75 (*Nov. 9, 2017 aft.*), 1917-19 (*Nov. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1921-35 (*Nov. 15, 2017 morn., passed on division*)

Bill 25 — Regulated Forestry Profession Amendment Act, 2017 (Gray)

First Reading — 1745 (*Nov. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1794-96 (*Nov. 7, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1815-19 (*Nov. 8, 2017 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 1935-36 (*Nov. 15, 2017 morn., passed*)

Bill 26 — An Act to Control and Regulate Cannabis (Ganley)

First Reading — 1978 (*Nov. 16, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2021-26 (*Nov. 27, 2017 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2087-2104 (*Nov. 29, 2017 morn.*), 2121-26 (*Nov. 29, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2166-69 (*Nov. 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 27* — Conflicts of Interest Amendment Act, 2017 (Ceci)

First Reading — 1831 (*Nov. 8, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1876-78 (*Nov. 9, 2017 aft.*), 1904-10 (*Nov. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1936-39 (*Nov. 15, 2017 morn.*), 1955-59 (*Nov. 15, 2017 aft.*), 2066-68 (*Nov. 28, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2119-21 (*Nov. 29, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 28 — School Amendment Act, 2017 (Eggen)

First Reading — 1953 (*Nov. 15, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1980-81 (*Nov. 16, 2017 aft.*), 2027-31 (*Nov. 28, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2126-29 (*Dec. 29, 2017 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2169-75 (*Nov. 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 29* — An Act to Reduce Cannabis and Alcohol Impaired Driving (Mason)

First Reading — 1903 (*Nov. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1959-66 (*Nov. 15, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1982-85 (*Nov. 16, 2017 aft.*), 2031-39 (*Nov. 28, 2017 morn.*), 2053-66 (*Nov. 28, 2017 aft., passed with amendment*)

Third Reading — 2117-19 (*Nov. 29, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 30* — An Act to Protect the Health and Well-being of Working Albertans (Gray)

First Reading — 2000 (*Nov. 27, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2131-51 (*Nov. 30, 2017 morn.*), 2230-34 (*Dec. 4, 2017 eve.*), 2209-25 (*Dec. 4, 2017 eve.*), 2235-43 (*Dec. 5, 2017 morn.*), 2274-78 (*Dec. 5, 2017 aft.*), 2332-51 (*Dec. 6, 2017 aft.*), 2443-54 (*Dec. 11, 2017 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2489-2506 (*Dec. 12, 2017 aft.*), 2508-10 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed with amendment*)

Third Reading — 2525-28 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 31* — A Better Deal for Consumers and Businesses Act (McLean)

First Reading — 2115-16 (*Nov. 29, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2225-30 (*Dec. 4, 2017 eve.*), 2243-46 (*Dec. 5, 2017 morn.*), 2263-74 (*Dec. 5, 2017 aft.*), 2402-10 (*Dec. 7, 2017 aft.*), 2454-63 (*Dec. 11, 2017 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2533-50 (*Dec. 13, 2017 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2550-53 (*Dec. 13, 2017 morn., passed on division*)

Bill 32* — An Act to Strengthen and Protect Democracy in Alberta (Gray)

First Reading — 2190 (*Dec. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2297-2316 (*Dec. 6, 2017 morn.*), 2369-88 (*Dec. 7, 2017 morn.*), 2465-76 (*Dec. 12, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2510-25 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2528-30 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 33 — Electoral Divisions Act (Mason)

First Reading — 2190 (*Dec. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2279-95 (*Dec. 5, 2017 eve.*), 2353-68 (*Dec. 6, 2017 eve.*), 2507-08 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2525 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2565-73 (*Dec. 13, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 34 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2017 (Mason)

First Reading — 2329 (*Dec. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2507 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed.*)

Committee of the Whole — 2525 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2530 (*Dec. 12, 2017 eve., passed*)

Bill 201 — Justice System Accountability Act (Jean)

First Reading — 127 (*Mar. 8, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 208-20 (*Mar. 13, 2017 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 202* — Protecting Victims of Non-Consensual Distribution of Intimate Images Act (Cyr)

First Reading — 245 (*Mar. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 375-86 (*Mar. 20, 2017 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 578-86 (*Apr. 10, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 738-40 (*May 1, 2017 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — 880 (*May 4, 2017 aft.*) [Comes into force 3 months after date of Royal Assent; SA 2017 cP-26.9]

Bill 203 — Alberta Standard Time Act (Dang)

First Reading — 253 (*Mar. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 496-503 (*Apr. 3, 2017 aft.*), 1614-20 (*Oct. 30, 2017 aft., reported to Assembly, not proceeded with*)

Bill 204 — Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017 (Stier)

First Reading — 444 (*Mar. 22, 2017 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 503-07 (*Apr. 3, 2017 aft.*), 899-905 (*May 8, 2017 aft.*), 1046-50 (*May 15, 2017 aft., reasoned amendment agreed to on division (not proceeded with)*)

Bill 205* — Advocate for Persons with Disabilities Act (Jansen)

First Reading — 552 (*Apr. 6, 2017 aft.*)

Second Reading — 1050-57 (*May 15, 2017 aft.*), 1120-25 (*May 17, 2017 morn., moved to Government Bills and Orders*), 1153-63 (*May 18, 2017 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1163-68 (*May 18, 2017 morn.*), 1191-99 (*May 23, 2017 morn., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1231-43 (*May 24, 2017 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2017 cA-5.5]

Bill 206* — Child, Youth and Family Enhancement (Adoption Advertising) Amendment Act, 2017 (Aheer)

First Reading — 1024 (*May 11, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1334-45 (*May 29, 2017 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 1747-56 (*Nov. 6, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 1879-82 (*Nov. 14, 2017 morn., passed*)

Bill 207 — Regulatory Burden Reduction Act (Hunter)

First Reading — 1310 (*May 25, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1756-58 (*Nov. 6, 2017 aft.*), 1882-90 (*Nov. 14, 2017 morn.*), 2008-11 (*Nov. 27, 2017 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 208 — Government Organization (Utilities Consumer Advocate) Amendment Act, 2017 (Hinkley)

First Reading — 1512 (*Jun. 1, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2012 (*Nov. 27, 2017 aft.*), 2191-95 (*Dec. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 209* — Radon Awareness and Testing Act (Luff)

First Reading — 1903 (*Nov. 14, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2195-2203 (*Dec. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2426-28 (*Dec. 11, 2017 aft., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 2430-31 (*Dec. 11, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 210* — Missing Persons (Silver Alert) Amendment Act, 2017 (Smith)

First Reading — 1869 (*Nov. 9, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2423-25 (*Dec. 11, 2017 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2428-30 (*Dec. 11, 2017 aft., passed with amendment*)
Third Reading — 2431-36 (*Dec. 11, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 211 — Assured Income for the Severely Handicapped (Discretionary Trust) Amendment Act, 2017 (Malkinson)

First Reading — 2259 (*Dec. 5, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 212 — Tobacco and Smoking Reduction (Protecting Children's Health) Amendment Act, 2017 (Sweet)

First Reading — 2329 (*Dec. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 214 — An Act to Regulate Political Action Committees (Swann)

First Reading — 2165 (*Nov. 30, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 215 — Tow Truck Safety Act (Drysdale)

First Reading — 2329 (*Dec. 6, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill 216 — Child, Youth and Family Enhancement (Protecting Alberta's Children) Amendment Act, 2017 (Ellis)

First Reading — 2259 (*Dec. 5, 2017 aft., passed*)

Bill Pr1 — Calgary Jewish Centre Amendment Act, 2017 (Kazim)

First Reading — 524 (*Apr. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1110 (*May 17, 2017 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1110-11 (*May 17, 2017 morn., passed*)
Third Reading — 1261-62 (*May 24, 2017 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 7, 2017]

Bill Pr2 — Paula Jean Anderson Adoption Termination Act (MacIntyre)

First Reading — 524 (*Apr. 4, 2017 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1027 (*May 11, 2017 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1027 (*May 11, 2017 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 1110 (*May 17, 2017 morn., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Jun. 7, 2017 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 7, 2017]

Table of Contents

Members' Statements	
Hanukkah	2555
Hanukkah	2555
Government Policies	2555
Political Discourse.....	2556
Clarissa Stoffelsen.....	2556
Chilean Community in Alberta.....	2556
Tabling Returns and Reports	2556
Oral Question Period	
Ministerial Panel on Child Intervention.....	2557
Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect.....	2557
Federal and Provincial Finance Ministers' Meeting	2558
Education Budget	2558
Conversion Therapy Use in Alberta	2559
Saskatchewan's Construction Site Ban on Alberta Licence Plates.....	2559
Veterinary Profession Act Amendments	2560
Photoradar Review	2561
Energy Policies and Industry Competitiveness.....	2561
Renewable Energy Development.....	2562
Dementia Care.....	2562
Agricultural Exports and NAFTA	2563
Justice Ministry Intervention in University of Lethbridge Labour Grievance	2563
Rural Crime	2564
Stoney Trail 14th Street Interchange in Calgary.....	2564
Orders of the Day	2565
Statement by the Speaker	
Remarks at the End of the Fall Sitting.....	2565
Government Bills and Orders	
Third Reading	
Bill 33 Electoral Divisions Act.....	2565
Division	2573

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

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875