



Province of Alberta

The 31st Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday morning and afternoon, March 19, 2026

Day 35

The Honourable Ric McIver, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 31st Legislature

Second Session

McIver, Hon. Ric, ECA, Calgary-Hays (UC), Speaker
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie-East (UC), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
van Dijken, Glenn, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock (UC), Deputy Chair of Committees

Al-Guneid, Nagwan, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Amery, Hon. Mickey K., ECA, KC, Calgary-Cross (UC),
Deputy Government House Leader
Arcand-Paul, Brooks, Edmonton-West Henday (NDP)
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Hon. Jackie, ECA,
Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UC)
Batten, Diana M.B., Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Boitchenko, Hon. Andrew, ECA, Drayton Valley-Devon (UC)
Boparai, Parmeet Singh, Calgary-Falconridge (NDP)
Bouchard, Eric, Calgary-Lougheed (UC)
Brar, Gurinder, Calgary-North East (NDP)
Brar, Gurtej Singh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Calahoo Stonehouse, Jodi, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, ECA, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Chapman, Amanda, Calgary-Beddington (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Assistant Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UC)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
de Jonge, Chantelle, Chestermere-Strathmore (UC)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, ECA, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UC)
Dyck, Nolan B., Grande Prairie (UC)
Eggen, Hon. David, ECA, Edmonton-North West (NDP)
Ellingson, Court, Calgary-Foothills (NDP)
Ellis, Hon. Mike, ECA, Calgary-West (UC),
Deputy Premier
Elmeligi, Sarah, Banff-Kananaskis (NDP)
Eremenko, Janet, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, ECA, Calgary-Peigan (UC)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., ECA, Calgary-Mountain View (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UC)
Glubish, Hon. Nate, ECA, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UC)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gray, Hon. Christina, ECA, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Guthrie, Hon. Peter F., ECA, Airdrie-Cochrane (PTP)
Haji, Sharif, Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Hayter, Julia K.U., Calgary-Edgemont (NDP)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, ECA, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Hon. Nate S., ECA, Drumheller-Stettler (UC)
Hoyle, Rhiannon, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., ECA, Taber-Warner (UC)
Ip, Nathan, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Assistant Whip
Jean, Hon. Brian Michael, ECA, KC, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche
(UC)
Johnson, Jennifer, Lacombe-Ponoka (UC)
Jones, Hon. Matt, ECA, Calgary-South East (UC)
Kasawski, Kyle, Sherwood Park (NDP)
Kayande, Samir, Calgary-Elbow (NDP)
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, ECA, Red Deer-North (UC)
Loewen, Hon. Todd, ECA, Central Peace-Notley (UC)
Long, Hon. Martin M., ECA, West Yellowhead (UC)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UC)
Lunty, Brandon G., Leduc-Beaumont (UC)
McDougall, Hon. Myles, ECA, Calgary-Fish Creek (UC)
Metz, Luanne, Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
Miyashiro, Rob, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Nally, Hon. Dale, ECA, Morinville-St. Albert (UC)
Nenshi, Naheed K., Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Neudorf, Hon. Nathan T., ECA, Lethbridge-East (UC)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, ECA, Calgary-Bow (UC)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, ECA, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UC)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Petrovic, Chelsae, Livingstone-Macleod (UC)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, ECA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, ECA, Calgary-North West (UC)
Sawyer, Tara, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, ECA, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Hon. Joseph R., ECA, Cardston-Siksika (UC),
Government House Leader
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, ECA, Calgary-Shaw (UC)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, ECA, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, Hon. R.J., ECA, Highwood (UC)
Sinclair, Scott, Lesser Slave Lake (Ind)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UC)
Smith, Hon. Danielle, ECA, Brooks-Medicine Hat (UC),
Premier
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UC)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP)
Tejada, Lizette, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Turton, Hon. Searle, ECA, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UC)
Wiebe, Ron, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UC)
Williams, Hon. Dan D.A., ECA, Peace River (UC),
Deputy Government House Leader
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., ECA, Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UC)
Wright, Justin, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UC),
Government Whip
Wright, Peggy K., Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UC),
Deputy Government Whip
Yaseen, Hon. Muhammad, ECA, Calgary-North (UC)

Party standings:

United Conservative: 47

New Democrat: 38

Progressive Tory: 1

Independent: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, KC, Clerk
Trafton Koenig, Law Clerk

Vani Govindarajan, Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and
Executive Director of Parliamentary
Services

Nancy Robert, Clerk of *Journals* and
Committees
Aaron Roth, Committee Clerk
Amanda LeBlanc, Managing Editor of
Alberta Hansard

Terry Langley, Sergeant-at-Arms
Paul Link, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Gareth Scott, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Lang Bawn, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

Danielle Smith	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental and International Relations
Mike Ellis	Deputy Premier, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services
Mickey Amery	Minister of Justice
Andrew Boitchenko	Minister of Tourism and Sport
Devin Dreesen	Minister of Transportation and Economic Corridors
Tanya Fir	Minister of Arts, Culture and Status of Women
Nate Glubish	Minister of Technology and Innovation
Nate Horner	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Grant Hunter	Minister of Environment and Protected Areas
Brian Jean	Minister of Energy and Minerals
Matt Jones	Minister of Hospital and Surgical Health Services
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Primary and Preventative Health Services
Todd Loewen	Minister of Forestry and Parks
Martin Long	Minister of Infrastructure
Myles McDougall	Minister of Advanced Education
Dale Nally	Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction
Nathan Neudorf	Minister of Affordability and Utilities
Demetrios Nicolaides	Minister of Education and Childcare
Jason Nixon	Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Joseph Schow	Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration
R.J. Sigurdson	Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation
Searle Turton	Minister of Children and Family Services
Dan Williams	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Rick Wilson	Minister of Mental Health and Addiction
Muhammad Yaseen	Associate Minister of Multiculturalism

Parliamentary Secretaries

Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk	Parliamentary Secretary for Settlement Services and Ukrainian Evacuees
Chantelle de Jonge	Parliamentary Secretary for Affordability and Utilities
Nolan Dyck	Parliamentary Secretary for Indigenous and Rural Policing
Shane Getson	Parliamentary Secretary for Economic Corridor Development
Chelsae Petrovic	Parliamentary Secretary for Health Workforce Engagement
Jason Stephan	Parliamentary Secretary for Constitutional Affairs
Ron Wiebe	Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health (North)
Justin Wright	Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health (South)
Tany Yao	Parliamentary Secretary for Small Business and Northern Development

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Yao
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Johnson
Ellingson
Kasawski
Kayande
Rowswell
Stephan
Wiebe
Wright, J.

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Wiebe
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach
Boparai
Bouchard
de Jonge
Elmeligi
Hoyle
Stephan
van Dijken
Wright, J.

Select Special Citizen Initiative Proposal Review Committee

Chair: Mr. Lundy
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Sawhney
Ellingson
Nixon
Pancholi
Sawyer

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Lovely
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring
Batten
Getson
Haji
Johnson
Lundy
Sawyer
Singh
Tejada

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Lundy
Deputy Chair: Mr. Wright
Chapman
Cyr
Dyck
Miyashiro
Petrovic
Sawyer
Shepherd
Wright, P.

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. McIver
Deputy Chair: Mr. Yao
Eggen
Getson
Gray
Metz
Petrovic
Rowswell
Sabir
Singh

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Mrs. Johnson
Deputy Chair: Mr. Cyr
Armstrong-Homeniuk
Bouchard
Ceci
Deol
Dyck
Hayter
Lovely
Sigurdson, L.
Vacant

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Armstrong-Homeniuk
Deputy Chair: Mr. Wiebe
Arcand-Paul
Bouchard
Brar, Gurinder
Brar, Gurtej
Getson
Gray
Sinclair
Singh
Stephan

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Sabir
Deputy Chair: Mr. Lundy
Cyr
de Jonge
Eremenko
Lovely
Renaud
Sawyer
Schmidt
van Dijken

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Dyck
Deputy Chair: Ms Sweet
Al-Guneid
Armstrong-Homeniuk
Calahoo Stonehouse
Cyr
Ip
Petrovic
Rowswell
Yao

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

10 a.m.

Thursday, March 19, 2026

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Hon. members, let us pray. Lord, the God of righteousness and truth, grant to our King and his government, to Members of the Legislative Assembly, and to all in positions of responsibility the guidance of Your spirit. May they never lead the province wrongly through love of power, desire to please, or unworthy ideals but, laying aside all private interests and prejudices, keep in mind their responsibility to seek to improve the condition of all. Amen.

Hon. members, we will now be led in the singing of *God Save the King* by Kalyna Brytan. I would invite all to participate.

Hon. Members:

God save our gracious King,
Long live our noble King,
God save the King!
Send him victorious,
Happy and glorious,
Long to reign over us,
God save the King!

The Speaker: Please be seated.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: Starting with Sherwood Park.

Mr. Kasawski: Perhaps starting and ending with Sherwood Park, Mr. Speaker. We'll have to see how much runway I have today. I want to introduce you to a wonderful group of students, their parents, and staff who are here from Sherwood Park. We have a beautiful wooden bridge in Sherwood Park in a place that used to be a farm. The school is called Woodbridge Farms. Will the students and staff and parents of Woodbridge Farms please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly?

The Speaker: The Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration.

Mr. Schow: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce to you the Magrath Zeniths high school senior boys basketball team. They're here for the 5A provincial tournament after defeating Medicine Hat in the south zone final in convincing fashion. No big deal, Premier. They had a spectacular season with an 11-1 regular season record, winning multiple tournaments in convincing fashion. But the job is not done yet. There are more wins to have, and I wish them all the best of luck this weekend in their pursuit of a provincial championship. I ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: The Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to introduce five outstanding conservative youth, including the Deputy Premier's daughter, whose dedication and hard work is truly inspiring: Simone Ellis, Chui Yang, Sara-Lyn Quist, Pamela Duggan, and Adrian Zinck. Please rise and accept the warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Mental Health and Addiction.

Mr. Wilson: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm so pleased to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly my amazing constituency association board of directors for the great constituency of Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin. I'm so proud of all the work and advocacy they do for my riding. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Vegreville.

Ms Armstrong-Homeniuk: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly my amazing office manager Jess Arsenaault, who happens to be here with Minister Wilson's group. Jess, if you could rise and please receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Sorry; that was Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

Members' Statements

Premier's Travel to Saudi Arabia

Member Irwin: Disabled folks, seniors on low incomes, and Albertans struggling to make ends meet heard loudly and clearly when the Premier called Alberta's social programs, quote, overly generous. It's incredibly out of touch to say that people just scraping by don't deserve the very basic supports they need to buy groceries or pay their rent. We're a resource-rich province. We should be able to take care of those who need a little support to live in dignity.

That's why it's incredibly disheartening and shockingly entitled to learn that while teachers were without pay, on strike in front of this Legislature while their government stripped away their Charter-protected rights, that Premier was enjoying the hospitality of her friend the Prince of Saudi Arabia, who offered her, and she accepted, free rides on a private jet.

But it gets worse. Not only did she and seven of her staff take these private flights around Saudi Arabia; they also stayed in very fancy hotels in the capital city. Wow. And the only reason she was able to accept these lavish gifts is because – wait for it – she changed the ethics rules herself. You can't make any of this up. What absolute audacity and entitlement to accept these gifts, which some have said are valued in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

You know what else? She kept this all secret from Albertans until we asked hard questions. It's appalling that when so many people are struggling with the high cost of living, this government feels entitled to a life of luxury. They should be ashamed. I'm old enough to remember an Alison Redford government brought down by far, far less.

So if any of those UCP members want to distance themselves before more of the scandal is uncovered and denounce this Premier, they should do so now before it's too late.

Mr. Schow: Point of order.

The Speaker: A point of order was noted at 10:06 a.m. [interjections]
Order. Next up is Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Bill 18

Mr. Wiebe: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. When medical assistance in dying, or MAID, was legalized in Canada in 2016, it was intended to be an option of last resort for those nearing the end of life. Since 2021 MAID has rapidly expanded, and too many people have been allowed to end their life through doctor-assisted death. In Alberta MAID deaths have increased over 100 per cent since 2021.

Mr. Speaker, we have a responsibility to act with compassion, caution, and clarity when it comes to MAID. Bill 18 brings Alberta back to the original purpose of MAID. It is to listen to feedback of

countless mental health and disability advocates and health care professionals. That's why Bill 18 prohibits MAID for minors and those with mental illness.

If Bill 18 is passed, physicians will no longer be able to refer patients to receive MAID outside of Alberta, just like the tragic case of a 26-year-old man who sought his end-of-life options from outside of his own province. Bill 18 will fully protect patients who do not want information about MAID or from being coerced into choosing MAID. It ensures that MAID is never presented as an alternative to care, treatment, or support. Finally, Bill 18 will fully protect the conscience rights of physicians and health care facilities who do not want to assist or provide MAID.

Mr. Speaker, we need to support people facing severe mental challenges with treatment rather than providing a path to end their life when they are struggling the most. There is no turning back from end-of-life decisions. Hope should always be easier to access than death.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Next up, St. Albert.

100e anniversaire de la Francophonie albertaine

Ms Renaud: Merci, M. le Président. Aujourd'hui à l'occasion de la Journée internationale de la Francophonie, I am honoured to rise and celebrate Alberta's vibrant and resilient francophone community, une communauté qui marque cette année un moment historique: le 100e anniversaire de la Francophonie albertaine.

For a century Alberta's francophones have strengthened our province through culture, education, entrepreneurship, and community leadership. Depuis l'établissement des premières communautés francophones, les contributions des Franco-Albertains et les Franco-Albertaines ont façonné notre identité collective. They helped build schools, co-operatives, and cultural institutions that remain central to Alberta's social and economic fabric. Today French-language education thrives from preschool to postsecondary. Nos artistes francophones enrichissent nos scènes. Nos organismes communautaires, comme l'ACFA, qui célèbre également 100 ans d'histoire, continuent de défendre les droits linguistiques et de promouvoir la dualité culturelle qui fait la richesse de notre province.

International Francophonie Day reminds us that French is not only a language of heritage but a language of opportunity, connecting Alberta to a global network of more than 320 million francophones. It reminds us, aussi, de l'importance de protéger et de promouvoir la vitalité de la langue française ici même chez nous. Alors, aujourd'hui je remercie toutes celles et ceux qui depuis cent ans ont porté la flamme de la francophonie albertaine.

Vive la Francophonie, vive l'Alberta et vive le Canada.

The Speaker: Calgary-East.

10:10 Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr

Mr. Singh: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Eid marks the end of the holy month of Ramadan. It's a time of deep reflection, prayer, generosity, and community for Muslims across Alberta and around the world. For an entire month families and individuals fast from dawn to sunset, not only refraining from food and drink but also focusing on patience, charity, and spiritual renewal. Ramadan is a reminder of gratitude, discipline, compassion: values that uplift us all. Throughout the month most community centres and families in Calgary-East and across our province opened their doors to neighbours, shared evening meals, and supported those in need. It is a time when our communities come together in a spirit of giving, understanding, and unity.

Mr. Speaker, Eid al-Fitr is a joyous celebration marking the completion of the sacred journey. It is a day filled with prayer, family gatherings, community festivals, and acts of kindness. It is also a moment to honour the incredible contributions of Alberta's Muslim community. Those contributions strengthen our social fabric, enrich our cultural landscape, and reflect the best of who we are as a province while reminding us of the importance of compassion and shared humanity.

I have heard from many families during Ramadan that speak about the significance of fasting, the importance of faith, and the comfort of community during challenging times. They also speak with pride in calling Alberta home, a place where diverse cultures and traditions are welcome and celebrated.

Mr. Speaker, as we mark this special occasion, we recognize the resilience, generosity, and dedication of Muslim Albertans. To all who observe the holy month and to all celebrating tomorrow: Eid Mubarak. May this Eid bring peace, joy, and blessings to families across Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Government Record

Mr. Ip: Mr. Speaker, if you ask the average Albertan whether life is better today than when this UCP government came to office, most would say no. Why? Because everyday life costs more and this government keeps giving Albertans less to show for it. Groceries are up, auto insurance is up, fees are up. It costs more to buy a home, it costs more to register a business, and now the UCP is hiking education property taxes again by 16 per cent in a single year.

While Albertans are paying more, what do they see from this government? They see waste. They see scandal. They see entitlement. They see the Turkish Tylenol fiasco, \$70 million of public money down the drain. They see the corrupt care scandal still hanging over this government. They see luxury suite tickets handed out to cabinet ministers and staff, and now Albertans see a Premier flying on a private jet and staying in luxury hotels, all provided by the Premier's friend, a crown prince of the Saudi government.

All of it happened while more than 50,000 teachers had their rights taken away and were sent back to overcrowded classrooms without the supports they had been asking for, all of it while nearly a million Albertans do not have a family doctor, all of it from a government running a deficit of nearly \$10 billion with no path to balance in sight.

They waste your money. They blame Ottawa. They blame immigrants. They divide Albertans because they do not want to answer for their own record. After seven years the UCP record is clear: higher costs for you, perks for them, and a lot of your money wasted along the way. Albertans will not forget.

Government Spending and Accountability

Member Tejada: Seven years into a UCP government boasting surpluses while underfunding public services and with record resource revenues, this Premier has tabled a budget that features a \$9.4 billion deficit and no path to balance. Fiscal conservatives, we barely knew you.

Albertans are well justified in asking where the money went. The Premier has said she's concerned that Alberta has been overly generous when it comes to supports for the most vulnerable, but what we've seen is that this government's supposed generosity has never extended to the people they've sworn to serve.

The fact of the matter is that this government has been overly generous to their friends through bloated contracts, shady land deals that continue to pop up, and failed privatization schemes like

DynaLife; overly generous when making it rain for their friends to buy Turkish Tylenol and then spend millions to have it sit in a warehouse for years; overly generous to themselves, increasing pay and perks for UCP MLAs and jetting off to Florida to give generously of their time on the public dime to fund raise for the extreme right. And now, despite record resource revenues, they blew the boom like a weekend in Vegas.

While Albertan families struggle to pay the bills, while folks with disabilities scramble to figure out how they will survive this government, while seniors who built this province are told to live on less, while members of this government and their friends live large, don't worry. The Premier flew all the way to Saudi to ponder global poverty with her friend, the prince. She casually forgot to mention that the flights and luxurious hotels in Saudi Arabia were a generous gift from that prince that she never proactively disclosed to Albertans or her caucus, so she'll use a deceptively sweet tone as she tells Albertans about delivering hope.

Albertans do have hope, Premier, but they demand ethical and responsible government. That's what they deserve and that's what they will get from Alberta's NDP.

Introduction of Bills

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

Bill 205

Non-Disclosure Agreements Act

Mrs. Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce Bill 205, the Non-Disclosure Agreements Act.

For too long survivors have been pressured, cowed, cornered, bought, and bound by agreements designed to protect the strong, not the survivor. This bill tears down that wall of secrecy. It says that your voice cannot be bought and your truth will not be buried.

I proudly move first reading of the nondisclosure act.

[Motion carried; Bill 205 read a first time]

Tabling Returns and Reports

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

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have the requisite number of copies of a piece from the *Journal* yesterday by Stacey Litvinchuk, who is the former senior program officer for surgery with Alberta health, and she talks about the \$34.4 billion budget not adding up for patients.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the requisite number of copies of an e-mail from Tavis, a teacher who is urging the UCP and the Premier to stop scapegoating immigrants, and he's made a video as well.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Whitemud.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have five copies of the itinerary for the Premier from the fall and her trip to Saudi Arabia, which does not mention any private flights on that itinerary.

Ms Hayter: I have a news article from CityNews saying Investing in Domestic Violence Prevention in Calgary Would Save Millions of Taxpayer Dollars: UCalgary Report.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am tabling five copies of a letter I wrote on February 6, 2025, while I was Leader of the Official Opposition, asking the RCMP to investigate the concerning situation at Alberta Health Services and this government.

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The first question belongs to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Investigation of Health Services Procurement

Mr. Nenshi: Well, thanks, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. The Premier really, really wants the corrupt care scandal to go away. It's not going away. It is the biggest government scandal in Alberta history, well, until this week. It's not going anywhere, and it's clear that this government is either in cahoots with or got taken by a player who just happens to be the best friend, bro, travel partner, and relative of the Justice minister. A dozen RCMP officers are now on their third day of a raid on Sam Mraiche's headquarters. Does the Premier still think corrupt care is a conspiracy theory?

10:20

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite well knows that we cannot and will not comment on policing matters. With regard to this matter in particular we received a report from Judge Raymond Wyant which clearly found that no politician, no political staff, and no government of Alberta official had any wrongdoing in this matter. This is an AHS matter, looking at AHS personnel, and we would ask for everyone to be patient while the RCMP does its work and while the Auditor General finishes its work.

Mr. Nenshi: Of course, the government has commented on this continuously, sending up Mraiche's cousin to defend him and the Premier herself calling this a conspiracy theory. Mr. Speaker, chemtrails are a conspiracy theory, although the Premier believes in them, and corrupt care certainly is not . . .

Mr. Schow: Point of order.

Mr. Nenshi: . . . despite the Premier calling it that. The government fired the AHS CEO and board for daring to ask questions about Sam Mraiche. That was not AHS; that was the government. The Premier has undertaken a systemic campaign of character assassination against that CEO. Given that she was right about everything, will the Premier apologize?

The Speaker: A point of order was noted at or about 10:21.
The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the member opposite to once again read the Judge Wyant report because it is very clear that there were irregularities within Alberta Health Services in how they were managing procurement contracts, how they were dealing with conflicts of interest, how they were dealing with oversight, how they were dealing with having a second set of eyes and legal review. It's part of the reason why we have moved that procurement function into an oversight by the Deputy Minister of Executive Council so that we can have standardized contracts and make sure that this never happens again in any department.

Mr. Nenshi: I've read the Wyant report. The Premier clearly didn't get to the first line of the Wyant report, which says that he was limited in investigating this government and could call no conclusions. The

Premier has called this whole thing a conspiracy theory despite volumes of evidence that something shady is happening, and today the web and the police team get tighter and tighter around Mr. Mraiche and around this government. The government has cancelled the contracts the former CEO has called corrupt, but they've never once denounced Mr. Mraiche. They send the Justice minister up to defend him. Will the Premier finally admit a public inquiry is needed?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I've said before, Judge Wyant found that there were several officials at AHS that declined his interview. However, the Auditor General does have the power to compel testimony, and I'm assuming that those individuals will also be interviewed at some point. The Auditor General has mentioned he anticipates that his work in interviewing is going to be done before the end of his term, and we look forward to see if he has any additional recommendations for us. But yes, very clearly there was something that was going wrong in AHS procurement. We took matters into our hands so that we could fix it.

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: She sure did take matters into her own hands, making it even more likely for political interference in this matter, Mr. Speaker.

Premier's Acceptance of Gifts and Benefits

Mr. Nenshi: The Premier yesterday admitted that she and seven staff took an undisclosed number of private jet flights within Saudi Arabia as well as a flight from Saudi Arabia to the U.A.E., where there are 50-plus commercial flights a day between those destinations. She said that Saudi Arabia offered her those flights with no expectation of return. Why didn't the Premier just say no?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason why we are travelling internationally and expanding our contacts with different countries is because we're trying to double our exports to countries other than the United States. The Prime Minister is doing exactly the same. In fact, the Prime Minister went to the region after I did and inked a historic deal for us to open up free trade. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that we have more trade with the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia and Oman combined than we do with India. We have \$414 million in exports to U.A.E., \$96 million to Saudi, and we'd like to see that number . . .

The Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: No one is asking the Premier today about all her international trips. We're asking about accepting gifts from a foreign government. They are not the same thing. Yesterday the Premier claimed she was super transparent, but of course nobody knew until I asked her – her caucus didn't know – that she had accepted the most lavish gifts in any Canadian politician's history from a foreign government. Surely one of her caucus members, if they knew, would have balked at it because it's wrong. How many flights did the Premier take on those private jets in Saudi Arabia?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite has it exactly backwards. What we're trying to do is open the markets in the region so that our oil field service companies can increase the amount

of sales that they do, and it's working. You can see in the United Arab Emirates they have one of the largest external investments of all of their investment portfolio, \$18 billion in the purchase of the NOVA Chemicals plant in Joffre. They've established flights, direct flights, between Abu Dhabi and Calgary as a result of our advocacy. These are the kind of results that our business community . . .

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Nenshi: That NOVA Chemicals plant deal was 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker. It had nothing to do with her private jets and seven-star hotels right now. Yesterday the Premier consistently equated taking a group up to see the oil sands with her luxury private jets. Listen, the Pomeroy Hotel in Fort McMurray is awesome. The Delta in Grande Prairie has a terrific waterslide. This is not what the Premier did. These are not luxury suites. I'm sorry that the member opposite doesn't like Grande Prairie. Will the Premier tell us where she stayed? Was it in a palace? Was it in a hotel? Were the suites nice? [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.
The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's important to underscore that no taxpayer money was spent on that trip. I think that that is the important thing to remember. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. We heard the question just fine.
Go ahead.

Ms Smith: And part of the issue that we had in Saudi Arabia, very similar to when we're trying to host people here to see sites that are not accessible by regular commercial aircraft like our oil sands and other installations: you cannot go to a refinery in Saudi Arabia that is at a military air base without going on a noncommercial flight. You cannot see the largest oil field in Saudi Arabia without not going on a commercial flight. We do the same thing when we host people, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: For the third set of questions, the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: Alberta taxpayers spent \$65,000 so that the Premier could accept hundreds of thousands of dollars, more than a house, from a foreign government. This was not hockey tickets. It wasn't even luxury watches as gifts. It would be, if true, the largest kickback any politician in Canadian history has ever received, worth more than a house in Alberta, and of course this doesn't include other undisclosed gifts from foreign governments, including a giant golden cat. Will the Premier disclose all gifts she has received from foreign governments?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. Whenever we have any kind of protocol exchange, I always report that to the Ethics Commissioner, and then the Ethics Commissioner indicates whether or not we have to receive it on behalf of the government of Alberta, whether we have to disclose this. We have very clear rules about that. I've had my meeting this year with the Ethics Commissioner. This particular trip we had a number of exchanges with him in advance so that he understood that we were doing the kind of trip that we often do in Alberta in hosting people to see our oil sands, and he signed off on the trip. That's the reason why it was disclosed. It was disclosed in the appropriate way to the appropriate entity.

Mr. Nenshi: But, of course, this government has removed the need for public disclosure or, it seems, disclosure to her own caucus. Yesterday the Government House Leader stood up and read off a list of things that I did over 11 years as mayor. He knew about them because we disclosed them. We disclose every pen. This government discloses nothing. The Government House Leader has never disclosed his own gifts. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. This time I have to say that we heard the answer; we need to hear the question.

Carry on.

Mr. Nenshi: Can I have five more seconds, Mr. Speaker? Thank you. Thank you.

The Government House Leader has never disclosed his own gifts, so the simple question is: would this Premier have told Albertans, would she have told her own caucus about these gifts if I hadn't asked her?

10:30

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, we have a process with the Ethics Commissioner that is very detailed about how you disclose to the Ethics Commissioner, and he makes a judgment on what needs to be disclosed to the public. I leave that in the hands of the Ethics Commissioner because that is the process that we have all agreed to. We passed legislation here. We have regulations that guide that, and yes, my office is in compliance with the codes that have been written.

Mr. Nenshi: She softens the law to not require disclosure, but she claims the Ethics Commissioner said everything is A-okay. If he did that, if he allowed this Premier to do something that no Canadian politician in history has been allowed to do, which is accept hundreds of thousands of dollars in gifts from a foreign government, there must have been a big written opinion on this. There must have been case studies. There must have been a rationale on this. I've now asked the Premier four times, and she's ignored the question. I'm going for a fifth time. Will she table the Ethics Commissioner's analysis and recommendation?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The argument is very clear; it's that when we host international delegations to our oil sands, we . . .

Mr. Nenshi: We give them seven-star suites.

Ms Smith: . . . have a chartered plane and . . .

The Speaker: Order. Order. Order.

Let's hear the answer.

Ms Smith: . . . in order to be able to have them go and see our oil sand sites . . .

Mr. Nenshi: We bribed them with private jets.

The Speaker: Order. Order. Or we'll have her start over again.

Premier, just carry on.

Mr. Schow: Point of order.

The Speaker: A point of order.

Ms Smith: This has been a practice of government for decades. The NDP did it four times that we can count and maybe more. We continue to have delegations internationally come and see our oil sands site. I think it's a shame that there aren't more politicians who would go abroad and see what other countries are doing to learn the things that we have learned. This is important for us to be able to continue to expand our trade ties, and we're going to continue to do this kind of work. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. I've got quite a bit of advice on both sides about giving people extra time, and I thank you for it, but I've got this.

Ms Pancholi: The Premier travelled by private jet and stayed at luxury hotels, all paid for by the Saudi princes of a foreign government. Bizarrely, her defence to this entitlement is that when the Alberta NDP was government, we worked tirelessly to sell Alberta's energy sector to the U.S., our number one customer, by inviting them to our oil sands. Guilty as charged, Mr. Speaker, but of course that's very different from the Premier taking the most lavish gifts from a foreign country that's our competitor on the world energy stage. If the Premier really believed there was nothing wrong with the fancy gifts she accepted on this trip, why did she change MLA gift rules two days after she left?

The Speaker: A point of order was noted at about 10:31.

The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Worked tirelessly to sell Alberta's energy sector? The members opposite are entitled to their own opinions, but they're not entitled to their own facts. I can tell you that while that government was in power, they did nothing to defend Alberta's energy sector, and they made sure they stayed quiet when Bill C-69, the no-more-pipelines bill, was introduced. In fact, Rachel Notley sat on her hands for nine months. It took her that long to get on a plane to go anywhere, let alone Ottawa, to defend Alberta's best interests. On this side of the House we're standing up for the oil and gas sector. They: not even close. [interjections]

The Speaker: A point of order is noted at 10:33.

Okay. Let's try hearing the question and the answer this time just for fun. Go ahead.

Ms Pancholi: Mr. Speaker, the Alberta NDP got a pipeline built, which is one more than the UCP has ever done.

Most Albertans will never in their lifetime experience the luxury the Premier experienced on that trip. The kind of hotel she stayed at had a 24/7 private butler, gold leaf interiors, private yoga instructors, chauffeured Rolls-Royces. It's the kind of out-of-touch entitlement true conservatives would normally howl about. In fact, it's the kind of out-of-touch entitlement that the Premier used to howl about when she was leader of the Wildrose. She brought down Alison Redford over less extravagance than this, but as Premier, she thinks she's entitled to it. She's entitled to change the rules while she's on a trip. Will the Premier admit there's no principled position . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, your time was up quite a bit before you finished talking.

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite throw insults like their personality depends upon it. On this I can tell you: the members opposite did not build a pipeline. The members opposite nationalized a pipeline.

I can tell you that on this side of the House we have a memorandum of understanding with the leadership of the Premier of Alberta with the federal government to get more of Alberta's world-class product

to international markets because that's what governments do. They lead by example.

The Speaker: I've had people ask for coffee this morning, but I think you've got enough energy out there. [interjections]
Order.

Ms Pancholi: Alberta NDP: one pipeline. UCP: zero.

Less than 10 years ago Justin Trudeau faced scathing criticism from Conservatives for taking a private helicopter for a luxurious trip. I'm certain many members of the UCP remember it well. I'm sure they were outraged by Trudeau's entitlement, and it was just one more reason why they thought he wasn't fit to govern, but it's interesting how quiet the so-called Conservatives in the UCP are when it's their supreme leader who is living the high life and getting lavish gifts from a foreign government.

There's a saying, Mr. Speaker: when you stand for nothing, you fall for everything. How far are the UCP MLAs willing to fall?

The Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The NDP know a whole lot about falling, particularly falling out of government into opposition after one term in government. Their mandate was repudiated by Albertans because they disagreed so much with what they were doing, including the single largest tax increase in the history of Alberta, the carbon tax, one that they did at the behest of their best friend and ally Justin Trudeau. On this side of the House we understand that attracting investment, creating jobs, helping build wealth in this province is our job as a government. Members opposite will ... [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. You know what's not allowed? Talking when the Speaker is standing, and I'll just take this opportunity to remind the Government House Leader that when your time's up, you got to stop, too.

The hon. member, go ahead.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I remember when this Premier, then Leader of the Opposition, repeatedly condemned Alison Redford's expensive flights and wasteful spending, and rightly so, but now this Premier said staying in seven-star luxury hotels, private jets courtesy of her friend the Saudi prince – now that's the story and suddenly, "Nothing to see here, folks," she says. Will the Premier explain to Albertans her recent change of heart when it comes to entitlements?

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, it's true. The Premier went to Saudi Arabia, and it's true, the Premier took a noncommercial flight, and it's true, the Premier did that to make sure that she could survey places that you cannot fly over in a commercial airline. Are they suggesting the Premier ... [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. We got questions about this; maybe we might want to hear the answer. I'm just guessing. Go ahead.

Mr. Schow: Are they suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier get a commercial flight, sit window seat, and have a little peek out the window as she flies by these oil sands? I can tell you that the Premier ... [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Go ahead.

Mr. Schow: Getting my legwork out in here, Mr. Speaker. Up and down. I wish the members would show a little more decorum and respect for the people that they serve. What I can tell you ...

The Speaker: Okay. Well, I'm going to be in good shape at the end of the day.

Mr. Eggen: Well, given the fact that the member opposite used to rail against PC corruption and entitlement and given that the member even suggested that the Premier could travel on economy or other more affordable flight options and given that we've tabled that this Premier had lots of commercially available flights to choose from instead of the one from her friend on the prince's private jet, why won't the Premier practice what she used to preach? Why would she accept these ridiculous trips in Saudi Arabia?

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to reinforce the job of the Premier, which is to sell the province as a place to invest and attract new businesses and expand exports in other jurisdictions. That's exactly what the Premier has done in this instance and many others as she travels to other foreign jurisdictions to ensure they know that Alberta is a safe place to put their money, to invest, and create jobs. I applaud the Premier and all members of the front bench for the work they've done selling this province because it's something the NDP failed to do for four years from 2015 to 2019. On this side of the House you can count on us to keep building the Alberta advantage.

Mr. Eggen: Given that the Premier feels entitled enough to travel the world in luxury on a prince's dime and given that the Premier, in her former role as opposition leader, would have railed against this kind of entitlement and given that the luxurious gift is beyond anything that the former PCs would have accepted, will the Premier apologize for this error in judgment and do the right thing, not just what she thinks that she can get away with?

10:40

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, I can assure the members opposite and everyone watching at home that there is no apology coming from the Premier for defending Alberta and our best interests and selling our province. This is a pipe dream from the opposition to think that we're going to stop attracting investment and building relationships. Nobody wants to be their friends. Nobody wants to talk to the opposition because they recognize they have nothing to offer. On this side of the House, as the government of Alberta, we understand that creating an environment for wealth to be created and jobs is our job, and we're going to keep doing it well. [interjections]

The Speaker: When I'm up on my feet, it should be quiet here.

The next question belongs to the hon. Member for Camrose.

Bill 18

Ms Lovely: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Medical assistance in dying, or MAID, was legalized in 2016 and meant to be an option of last resort for terminally ill patients, but when MAID was significantly expanded in 2021, we've seen blatant gaps where vulnerable people are not protected. To the Minister of Justice, can you explain to this House why it is necessary for Alberta to introduce strong protections for MAID?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is absolutely right. We've seen obvious gaps in the federal MAID framework. MAID was always meant to be a last resort, but Canada has logged the fastest growing MAID deaths in the world. In fact, track 2 MAID here in this country has increased by 136 per cent

since 2021. That is alarming. That's why we've introduced Bill 18. This government is taking action to protect our most vulnerable.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Minister, for the answer. Given that the federal government is planning to expand MAID eligibility next year to include those who have mental illness and given that even the United Nations committee has recommended that Canada repeal track 2 MAID for individuals with mental illness and people with disabilities, can the minister please explain how Bill 18 will protect the most vulnerable and keep patients safe?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Under Bill 18 we're doing away with track 2 MAID, that is to say, deaths where death is not reasonably foreseeable. We're prohibiting MAID for those with mental illness as a sole underlying condition, and we're ensuring that MAID will never be available for minors here in Alberta. There needs to be oversight, and there must be a consistent process in place in Alberta's MAID system. That's why we introduced Bill 18, and that's what Bill 18 is going to do.

The Speaker: Camrose.

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for that answer. Given that Alberta is lucky to have extremely dedicated health care professionals working in our province who care for some of the most vulnerable people in our communities and given that many patients want to be given the proper treatment and support, not doctor-assisted death, can the minister tell the House how this important piece of legislation will protect conscience rights and respect Albertans who don't want to be exposed to MAID?

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, Bill 18 brings in important protections for physicians and health facilities who don't want to provide MAID, but most importantly, patients will never be pressured or coerced to consider MAID as the only option. No longer can a physician bring up MAID if the patient hasn't requested it first, and the exclusion zones that we talked about will give a sense of safety and security for Alberta's most vulnerable. Hope, as I said earlier, should always be more preferable to despair.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The point of order at 10:33 has been withdrawn.

Provincial Intelligence Service

Mr. Sabir: This Premier is undermining Alberta's security. Earlier this week she said that the new Alberta sheriff police would have as one of its components a new, quote: intelligence arm. End quote. Let's be clear what this is. The Premier says the UCP government will be building their own spy agency instead of receiving intelligence briefings from the RCMP and CSIS. To the Premier, a simple question: why does this government need its own spy agency?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time now in two days, nothing what the member is saying is accurate. All police agencies in Alberta have an intelligence component to them. That's how they co-ordinate. We of course have a public service intelligence office that we are looking, of course, to work with as we make sure that they do the duties to make sure that we protect members of the NDP and members of the UCP and all members within this House. I appreciate all the work that law enforcement does in this.

Mr. Sabir: Given that the UCP continues to ignore warnings from CSIS about foreign interference in an Alberta separatist referendum and given that not one member of this government has had the courage to sign our pledge to oppose separatism and given that no other province or state in North America operates their own local spy agency, will the Premier admit that this undermines our national intelligence agencies as just one more attempt to cater to separatists?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Ellis: Okay. Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Again, nothing what the members are saying over there is even reasonably close to being accurate. What I can tell you is that, again, I want to thank all law enforcement in this province, from the RCMP to the Alberta sheriffs, the Edmonton and Calgary police services, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Lacombe, Taber, as an example. All law enforcement: they're doing a fantastic job as they co-ordinate intelligence to stop organized crime. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sabir: Given that this UCP government has changed our laws to allow unconstitutional referendums and given that this Premier refuses to respect the independence of the judicial system or the ability of the Law Society to govern itself and given that building this spy agency within the sheriffs risks isolating Alberta from the Canadian intelligence community, how can Albertans trust this government to build a spy agency that will respect their civil rights when this government refuses to respect the rule of law?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Ellis: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, saying something that is not true over and over and over again doesn't make it true. Again I will say that I want to thank the public security intelligence office for the work that they do to keep all members of this House safe, the great work they do regarding threat assessments as they collaborate and work with all members in law enforcement within not only Alberta but also the country to make sure that we as Canadians stay safe. Thank you to all law enforcement.

Hospital Emergency Services

Member Batten: A constituent of Calgary-Acadia sat in an emergency room confused, disoriented, alone, and unable to advocate for herself. She was experiencing a transient global amnesia event yet was left vulnerable because this government has failed to address the crisis with paramedics or in our emergency rooms. Even the best health care workers are being set up to fail, and Albertans are not getting the care they deserve. To the minister: how many more Albertans will be put at risk before this government takes responsibility and acts?

The Speaker: The hon. minister of hospitals.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do hear too many of these accounts of long wait times in our emergency departments. That's why we're addressing the problem in many different ways. First, we're adding record numbers of physicians, over 2,000 over the last five years. I've already highlighted the over 10,000 registered nurses that we've added and the 10,000 health care aides. Then we need to update our facilities. I've also highlighted that we're building thousands of new acute-care spaces, with two bed towers in Edmonton at the Misericordia and Grey Nuns hospitals and one in Calgary at the South Health Campus, which will be about 400 beds. That's going to improve patient speed of care.

Thank you.

Member Batten: Given that my constituent's case is rare but overcrowded emergency rooms are not and given that every day Albertans need care – a senior with a UTI who's confused, a youth with a concussion, patients who may not look critical but certainly need prompt attention – and given that they're left waiting because this government fails to act, instead makes promises without any dedicated money to – I don't know – capital to building those towers, to the minister: why are Albertans being left behind?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In actual fact, we have 300 acute-care beds under construction today and 2,000 in planning and design. It is an unfortunate reality that we should plan and design billion-dollar facilities before constructing them or they may not be safe for patients and overwhelm our emergency departments.

As I've also outlined, we are also improving flow in our hospitals. One of the barriers to moving patients through hospitals has been alternate level of care patients who have been waiting in hospital beds instead of long-term care. We've reduced that by 20 per cent over the last six months.

10:50

Member Batten: Given that this government is running a \$9.4 billion deficit while Albertans are seeing nothing to show for it, especially in our overcrowded emergency rooms, and given that almost a million Albertans still are not connected with a family doctor and patients are still waiting, still at risk, while this government delivers plans for plans instead of results and given that this Premier seems more intent on collecting private Air Miles instead of investing in Albertans and given this government has been in government for seven years, plans for plans: it's really too late for that. Build the darn hospitals.

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite have just indicated that we're spending money. One of the primary areas we're spending money on is health care, and what is the largest component of health care spending? Well, it's our health care workforce. So is the member opposite saying that we should not have hired, through you, Speaker, over 2,000 new physicians over the last five years, or maybe we shouldn't have added the 11,000 registered nurses over the last five years? I think we could probably use the 10,000 health care aides. You can't say it both ways. You can't say that we shouldn't be spending money on health care and then ask us to spend money on health care.

Recovery Community Contracts

Mr. Guthrie: In fall of '24 as minister I was made aware that the Mraiche family had ownership ties to multiple recovery centres funded through sole-source contracts. Given the seriousness of this matter and concerns over impartiality in the Ministry of Justice my office independently verified that ownership. This evidence was then provided to the Department of Mental Health and Addiction, yet that minister stated publicly that he investigated and found no such relationships. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs: based on the *Globe and Mail* article and search warrants just issued, now would be a good time to set the record straight.

The Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's another day and another conspiracy coming from the member opposite. What I can tell is that Judge Wyant's report makes it very clear. What he found: that no politician, no political staff acted improperly in this matter, and that is all there is to say about it. If the member opposite has something of real

substance to talk about in this Chamber regarding government policy, we're happy to take those questions, but I don't think that the member really is actually inquiring about government policy in this specific instance.

Mr. Guthrie: Mr. Speaker, given the Department of Infrastructure provided documented evidence to the Mental Health and Addiction department in December of '24 and given in January '25 the registered ownership behind those same recovery centre contracts changed and given it was only after that change that the Member for Peace River claimed no relationship existed, to the same minister: did anyone in your department or office tip off parties connected to those recovery centre projects before the change in ownership?

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's unfortunate to see now an independent member taking the line of questioning that the NDP are taking, going after individuals who are not in this Chamber to be able to answer questions. To be clear, this has been tabled already in this Legislature, how First Nation communities have went through the procurement process. All members can look at it. The NDP and the other opposition members keep saying that they want to stand with First Nations, but evidently not when they're trying to make fake political scandals to stop their sliding poll numbers.

Mr. Guthrie: Mr. Speaker, given public confidence depends on decisions being influence free and given members of the Mraiche family held multiple jobs in various ministries, including Justice, energy, environment, labour, and jobs, and given this same network repeatedly appears in procurement controversies, court proceedings, RCMP investigations, with search warrants now issued, and given this government continues to reward insiders with access to power and public funds, to the entire UCP caucus: where do you draw the line? Is anybody, anyone amongst you going to stand up? [interjections]

The Speaker: Let's just hear from the minister now, shall we?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think what we see here is projecting going on. Actually, I find it alarming that this is how the NDP and others think. Thank God they're not in government because they continue to project maybe what they would do here. Now, here's what happened on procurement when it comes to recovery centres. It's been tabled in this place. Procedures were made. First Nations voted on the locations where those would take place and then made decisions on which companies they would hire. We have tabled that process. We stand with our First Nation chiefs being able to make the best decisions they can . . .

The Speaker: The next question belongs to the hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills.

Premier's Acceptance of Gifts and Benefits

(continued)

Member Ellingson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a good thing to build better trade opportunities for Albertan and Canadian businesses, but accepting luxury gifts isn't necessary to build those important relationships. In fact, it's wrong. Does the Premier understand that accepting private flights and luxury hotels from a foreign government hurts our province's reputation and instead makes it look like access to power is for sale?

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, it is truly discouraging to hear members of the opposition criticize trade missions, missions that go to other jurisdictions to promote Alberta as a premier destination for investment. Our total exports to the U.A.E. are \$414 million; Saudi

Arabia, \$96 million; Oman, \$46 million; Israel, \$20 million; and Egypt, \$34 million. The Premier is keen on building relationships with foreign governments and businesses so that Alberta businesses can also use that relationship to expand their own interests.

Member Ellingson: Given that this government has changed the ethics rules multiple times to permit the Premier to accept luxury gifts and given that these rule changes make it seem like access to her decision-making is just one gift away from a deal and given this is no way for a modern government to conduct business, especially in trade with countries who are also our competitors in our vital energy industry, is a luxury gift all it takes to get a deal with this Premier?

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, this is an absurd line of questioning. The members opposite couldn't get off their hands when they were in government to go on trade missions and meet with foreign delegations and create business relationships. You know, the Leader of the Opposition sold himself for a pair of opera tickets, apparently, or maybe something for the ballet. Again, how hoity-toity.

Ms Gray: Point of order.

Mr. Schow: I withdraw and apologize.

What I can say is that on this side of the House we are going to continue to go on these trade missions which help us to build relationships with businesses, and Alberta businesses are grateful for the work we're doing.

The Speaker: To be clear, did you just apologize and withdraw, hon. Government House Leader?

Mr. Schow: Indeed, I did, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: I guess I'm kind of in no-man's-land here. Next question.

Member Ellingson: Given that no one in the government thought it was worth while to tell Albertans about these private jet trips, given that the Premier never took the opportunity to mention even to her own MLAs that she took these luxury gifts from a foreign government, given that the Premier could have travelled on a commercial airline but chose instead to go on her friend's private jet, to the Premier: how was the orange juice on those private flights? Was it freshly squeezed?

The Speaker: I am not sure that question was about government policy, but I will offer the government an opportunity to respond.

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see the members opposite have a sense of humour about this, but what I can say is that there's nothing funny about the record of the members opposite when they were in government when they chased away businesses out of this province. They told people to go to other provinces to find work because the only job you could find here was changing light bulbs and shower heads.

These trade missions are key to Alberta's success so we can continue to build on the exports we have to the U.A.E., Saudi Arabia, Oman, and other jurisdictions. We have a huge export advantage there, and we'd like to build more relationships by also buying more of their products as well, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The next question belongs to the only one we should hear from now, the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul.

Crime and Public Safety

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul is one of the finest areas in the province to live, work, and raise a family. In the lakeland region we are proud of our communities, but it's no secret that crime is an issue in our neighbourhoods. In fact, the most recent crime severity index statistics show that five in the top 10 with the highest crime rates in Alberta are in the Lakeland region, Mr. Speaker. To the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services: what is the government doing to crack down on crime and career criminals for Alberta?

11:00

The Speaker: The hon. minister of public safety.

Mr. Ellis: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the member for the question. Of course, I hope everyone in this House has an opportunity to read and support Bill 15, which is going to help us to put more police officers in the streets of rural Alberta, as an example, the safer communities neighbourhoods teams, our surveillance teams, fugitive apprehension teams, and, of course, our highway patrols that are out there policing our areas. I want to thank our joint forces operations, which would include those in the Alberta sheriffs and the RCMP and the Edmonton Police Service that work together to put offenders in jail.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for that response. Given that mental health issues and drug abuse are key indicators of criminal activity, including gang activity, public disorder, and theft, and further given the government's historic investments in mental health and addictions treatment by building recovery centres across the province, to the Mental Health and Addiction minister: how will Alberta's recovery-focused approach to addictions treatment help decrease crime in communities throughout Alberta?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Mental Health and Addiction.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question. I'm so proud of the work our government is doing with our people who are incarcerated in our provincial prisons. We actually have treatment centres right in our prisons now. We call them therapeutic living communities, and we'll take people from general population and put them into treatment right in the prisons. I met a young fellow right from my constituency. He literally turned down parole to stay in the program. Can you imagine? He's doing so well. He's now working to become a recovery coach to give back to his community, and that's what we want to see, people coming from addiction into recovery.

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

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that being a first responder is one of the toughest jobs out there – we owe a great debt of gratitude to these men and women who serve to protect our lives and our families – and further given the importance of preventing burnout and job-related mental health issues, to the Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration minister: what are we doing to aid our front-line heroes to ensure that they are getting the supports they need to protect our communities and our families?

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First and foremost, we are so deeply grateful to first responders who put their lives on the line

every day to protect our communities. Now, through budgets 2025 and '26 we have an ongoing investment of \$1.5 million annually specifically for supporting the psychological health and first responders grant program. This goes towards research and organizations working to improve first responder mental health for posttraumatic stress injuries, and we will continue to provide front-line heroes with the tools that they need and the training for mental health resources to help keep Albertans safe. We thank them for their work.

The Speaker: The next question belongs to the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

Alberta Disability Assistance Program

Member Eremenko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance couldn't explain this week the community and workforce implications of the introduction of ADAP. The program is meant to help Albertans with disabilities earn employment income while also receiving income supports. Sounds good on paper, right? But the gap is glaringly obvious. In reality, ADAP pays \$200 less per month, and it assumes that a person has found work, but what if the jobs aren't there? Will the Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services explain the rationale for forcing AISH recipients on to ADAP to reduce their commitment to the people with disabilities?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, maybe the NDP will explain why they continued with AISH and punished the 58 per cent of Albertans with disabilities that are in the workforce, clawed back their wages underneath the AISH program, and did not create an opportunity, like you have with ADAP, that the disability community has been asking for for a long time. Unfortunately, the NDP continues to misstate the facts. Not surprising. To be very, very clear, AISH remains. Anybody on ADAP actually has transition benefits, and over the next year and a half we'll see where everybody lands in the best spot that they can for their circumstances.

Member Eremenko: Given that people on AISH have always been allowed to work and that 50 per cent of the new ADAP program relies on jobs but they have done nothing to actually produce the jobs and given that thousands of AISH recipients will be moved to ADAP whether or not they can work and whether or not there are jobs and given that those forced on to ADAP are guaranteed \$200 less each month but not guaranteed a job, will the Minister of Finance tell us why people with disabilities still need to make do with less while the government runs a \$9.4 billion deficit and we're taking . . .

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, again, not true. Anybody moving from AISH to ADAP will have a \$200-a-month transition benefit being held exactly where they are on AISH while we work to be able to make sure everybody is in the best program for their circumstances. That's what will take place over the next period of time. Unfortunately, the NDP when they were in power did not help anybody on AISH. They did not index AISH payments. This government has the highest AISH payments in the history of the province. They did not change things that were causing people with disabilities not to be able to work, and they left thousands of people not able to get on AISH who needed disability . . .

The Speaker: Okay. Well, you've both actually gone long on your questions and your answers, so let's try to stick to 35 seconds.

Go ahead, Member.

Member Eremenko: Given that a job offer is worth nothing if a person can't get to it and given that an accessible Alberta should mean things like clear sidewalks and safe, timely transit options and given that Alberta remains only one of two provinces without dedicated accessibility legislation, I look forward to the government supporting our opposition Bill 206 to support and introduce accessibility legislation into this House. Will they work together with us to bring down the barriers that prevent people with disabilities from getting jobs?

The Speaker: The minister, also within the time limit.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this government underneath the leadership of the Premier has increased disability supports in Alberta by a billion dollars, almost 50 per cent from what the NDP were paying when they were in power. What people with disabilities need is that they need support. They don't need to be punished when they want to participate in the workforce. They need health supports. We're guaranteeing that those will be in place. And not everybody is eligible for AISH, which was designed for people who can't work. We've created ADAP now to make sure nobody is left behind like they were under the NDP.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

AISH Client Benefits

Mr. Kasawski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The federal government has done a good thing and created the Canada disability benefit. That benefit is a federal, tax-free, monthly payment of up to \$200 aimed at reducing poverty for low-income, working-age Canadians with disabilities. It provides direct financial support to Albertans with complex disabilities who are between 18 and 64 years old to help them escape poverty. Will the Premier please explain why this government is taking away the Canada disability benefit from disabled Albertans?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the federal government finally stepped up and helped take care of the disability community. They haven't done enough. That said, they put in their Canadian disability benefit program, and they told provinces the threshold they had to meet. This province already exceeds that threshold by 100 and some dollars a month. The real question is why other provinces are \$500 or \$600 behind Alberta. Again, we're investing \$3.7 billion in disability supports, a billion dollars more than the NDP invested. We've indexed AISH payments. We've created other disability programs that can support those with disabilities in the workforce. The real question is: why didn't the NDP do any of that when they were in power?

Mr. Kasawski: Given that the Canada disability benefit has been in effect since July of last year and the federal government is just catching up and the first payment to disabled Albertans was \$1,400 on February 19 for seven months of back pay, given that this government is using a call centre to call disabled Albertans asking them to send their \$1,400 to the UCP government, will the Premier explain by what right the UCP government is calling disabled Albertans demanding that they hand over their federal disability benefit?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, now we're in a total realm of fantasy. Nobody is calling people with disabilities and asking them to hand over \$1,400. Totally unfactually correct. There is a process in Alberta that has existed for AISH and other programs where you receive entitlements from the government, and that process continues exactly as it has for generations. It's very, very, very clear that we exceed the federal expectations when it comes to what we will pay on AISH.

We're proud of that, and we continue to call on the rest of the country to meet the ambition of our province.

Mr. Kasawski: Given that the government actually has no right to take away federal benefits from Albertans and given that the UCP keeps calling support programs for disabled Albertans overly generous, what can Albertans expect next from the UCP government? Will it take away the Canada child benefit from Albertans? Will it take away the Canada groceries and essentials benefit? Will it hire a call centre to demand Albertans give them their federal tax returns because the UCP can't balance a provincial budget?

11:10

Mr. Nixon: Here's the real question. Is the NDP going to vote against disability benefits that this government has brought in year after year? The NDP has voted against each time. The NDP voted against the increase in payments. The NDP voted against the indexation of AISH, Mr. Speaker. You know, at the end of the day, we're making it more affordable for Albertans. That's why you see rent down. That's why you see great policies taking place on the side of the government and nothing but bluster from the NDP, who abandoned the disability community and couldn't even be bothered to get them index payments when they were in power. They don't care about the disabled. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Hon. members, in 30 seconds we'll continue with the daily Routine.

We are at the point of points of order. At 10:06 the hon. Government House Leader called one, I think, after a member's statement.

Point of Order

Referring to the Absence of a Member

Mr. Schow: Yes, I did. At the time the Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood was speaking and said, with my unofficial records, "while the government stripped away the Charter-protected rights of Albertans, the Premier was enjoying the hospitality of her friend the Prince of Saudi Arabia," and then goes on to say a number of things. This was ruled out of order yesterday. Insinuating the presence or absence of a member in the Chamber is out of order, Mr. Speaker. I leave it in your hands. I suspect you have similar records to me.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize and withdraw.

The Speaker: Well done. Thank you.

Point of order 2, about 10:21 a.m. The hon. Government House Leader.

Point of Order

Imputing Motives

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to the point of order. At the time the Leader of the Opposition was asking questions to the Premier and said: chemtrails are a conspiracy theory, but the Premier believes them. You've ruled a number of times that you cannot suggest or insinuate what the person does or does not believe. I believe, in my own opinion, that this is a point of order and ask that the member apologize and withdraw under 23(h), (i), and (j).

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, I do not have the benefit of the Blues, but I have refreshed my understanding of the debate around chemtrails in this place and when it has been called a point of order in the past. In previous instances it has not. It has been ruled a matter of debate, specifically

because we know that the U.S. Department of Defense and NORAD had to specifically deny when the Premier suggested they may be responsible for chemtrails over Alberta. It has not been ruled a point of order in the past, and I look forward to your ruling.

The Speaker: Okay. Well, I have the benefit of the Blues, and this is what they say. "Of course, the government has commented on this . . . sending up Mraiche's cousin to defend him and the Premier herself calling this a conspiracy . . ." Order. "Mr. Speaker, chemtrails are a conspiracy theory, although the Premier believes in them, and corrupt care certainly is not." I will say to the hon. Opposition House Leader that you cannot say what the Premier believes. You know there are ways to do this here, and you all know what they are. You can say, "the Premier seems to believe" or "the hon. members." When you say what they actually believe, you can't say that. Consequently, somebody owes an apology and a withdrawal.

Mr. Nenshi: That's very helpful, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I apologize and withdraw.

The Speaker: Point of order 3, at or around 10:31. The hon. Government House Leader.

Point of Order

Allegations against a Member

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the time noted, the Premier was speaking, and the Leader of the Opposition heckled that the Premier was, quote, bribing them with private jets when referencing the fact that we bring foreign dignitaries here, take them on noncommercial aircraft so they can survey things like Alberta's oil sands, something you cannot do with a commercial aircraft. I'm not sure if the ambient mics picked this up, but to suggest the Premier is bribing anyone with anything would be wildly inappropriate and out of order in this Chamber under 23(h), (i), and (j).

Ms Gray: Apologies, Mr. Speaker. The Chamber was incredibly raucous. I didn't hear this, but if the Government House Leader is correct and the Blues has that – I believe he said, "Bribed them with private jets," in speaking to taking people up to Fort McMurray – that strikes me that that would have been a joke because we do not bribe people by touring Fort McMurray in the jets that we have here. It's not equivalent to what was happening in the debate in this place when we were talking about princes taking private jets and flying people around. So I think this was a joke, but I also may not have caught it, and I look forward to your ruling.

The Speaker: Well, we need to be careful about what we say in here, including when we are joking. The Blues did catch it, and this is what it says. The Premier said, "In order to . . . have them go . . . see our oil [sands]," and the Leader of the Opposition said, "We bribed them with private jets." Well, it's a criminal offence, on either side, of bribing; consequently, you don't get to accuse people here of criminal behaviour; consequently, this is a clear-cut point of order which requires a withdrawal and an apology.

Mr. Nenshi: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. No accusation intended. I apologize and withdraw.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Gosh. Thank you all for providing me this much paper on points of order. The next one. Opposition House Leader, was it 10:58 thereabouts, 10:57? The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, I believe there's a point of order called before that, at 10:32, by the Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Ms Gray: That was withdrawn.

The Speaker: That was withdrawn. Yeah.

Mr. Schow: I don't believe he – did he withdraw it?

The Speaker: He did.

Mr. Schow: The things you learn.

The Speaker: No. No. You know what? They sent the note to me, so it's not your fault. It's not your fault, Government House Leader. You didn't know because the note was sent to me and not you, probably.

The next one is the Opposition House Leader.

Ms Gray: At 10:57 I think the Government House Leader was unparliamentary, but he recognized that and apologized and withdrew in the moment, so I consider it dealt with, but it's your ruling that is important, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: No. It was already apologized and withdrawn, but it was because you don't get to make serious accusations, as we've discussed here, in either direction. You deserved a chance to stand up and say something; you just did. The matter is dealt with and concluded because the apology and withdrawal has already been received by this House.

11:20

Orders of the Day Committee of Supply

[Ms Pitt in the chair]

The Chair: Hon. members, I'd like to call the committee to order.

Prior to beginning, I will outline the process for this morning's Committee of Supply. I will first call on the chairs of the legislative policy committees to report on their meetings with the various ministries under their mandate. No vote is required when these reports are presented according to Standing Order 59.01(10). Members are reminded that there was an amendment introduced during the legislative policy committee meetings, so the committee will vote on the proposed amendment here today. The committee will then proceed to vote on the estimates of the offices of the Legislative Assembly, and then the vote on the estimates will take place. Finally, I would like to remind all hon. members of Standing Order 32(3), which provides that after the first division is called in Committee of Supply, the interval between division bells shall be reduced to three minutes for any subsequent divisions.

Committee Reports

The Chair: I would now like to invite the chair of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future to present the committee's report. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Mr. Wiebe: Thank you, Madam Chair. As chair of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future and pursuant to Standing Order 59.01(10) I am pleased to report that the committee has reviewed the 2026-2027 proposed estimates and business plans for the following ministries: Ministry of Advanced Education; Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation; Ministry of Arts, Culture and Status of Women; Executive Council; Ministry of Infrastructure; Ministry of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration; Ministry of Service

Alberta and Red Tape Reduction; Ministry of Technology and Innovation; and Ministry of Tourism and Sport.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'd now like to call on the chair of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities to present the committee's report. The hon. Member for Camrose.

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Madam Chair. As chair of the Standing Committee on Families and Communities and pursuant to Standing Order 59.01(10) I'm pleased to report that the committee has reviewed the 2026-27 proposed estimates and business plans for the following ministries: Ministry of Assisted Living and Social Services, Ministry of Children and Family Services, Ministry of Education and Childcare, Ministry of Hospital and Surgical Health Services, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Mental Health and Addiction, Ministry of Primary and Preventative Health Services, Ministry of Public Safety and Emergency Services.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, hon. Member for Camrose.

Would the hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti – we may have missed it – please just indicate if you have an amendment in your committee to report.

Mr. Wiebe: Yeah. Sorry. I would also like to table the amendment introduced during our meeting for the Committee of Supply's consideration: Ministry of Infrastructure, one amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, hon. member. The copies should be on your desk.

Now the chair of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship, the hon. Member for Grande Prairie.

Mr. Dyck: Excellent. Well, thank you very much, Chair. As chair of the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship pursuant to Standing Order 59.01(10) I'm pleased to report that the committee has reviewed the 2026-2027 proposed estimates and business plans for the following ministries: Ministry of Affordability and Utilities, Ministry of Energy and Minerals, Ministry of Environment and Protected Areas, Ministry of Forestry and Parks, Ministry of Indigenous Relations, Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Ministry of Transportation and Economic Corridors, and, finally, Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Vote on Main Estimates 2026-27

The Chair: The next item of business is the vote on the amendment introduced during the legislative policy committee meetings. The amendment will now have been identified as amendment A1, and all members should have a copy on their desk.

A1. Ms Hoffman moved that the 2026-2027 main estimates of the Ministry of Infrastructure be reduced for property operations under reference 3.1 at page 140 by \$30,000,000 so that the amount to be voted at page 137 for expense is \$501,338,000.

[Motion on amendment A1 lost]

The Chair: No more amendments today.

We shall now proceed to the vote on the 2026-27 offices of the Legislative Assembly estimates general revenue fund. Pursuant to Standing Order 59.03(5), which requires that these estimates be

decided without debate or amendment prior to the vote on the main estimates, I must now put the following question on all matters relating to the 2026-27 offices of the Legislative Assembly estimates general revenue fund for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027.

Agreed to:
 Offices of the Legislative Assembly
 General Revenue Fund \$217,670,000

The Chair: Shall the vote be reported? Are you agreed?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? That's carried.
 We'll now proceed to the final vote on the main estimates.

[The voice vote did not indicate agreement]
 [Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 11:26 a.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Ms Pitt in the chair]

For the motion:

Amery	Jones	Schow
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Schulz
Boitchenko	Loewen	Sigurdson, R.J.
Bouchard	Long	Sinclair
Cyr	Lovely	Singh
de Jonge	Lunty	Smith
Dreeshen	McDougall	Stephan
Dyck	Nally	Turton
Ellis	Neudorf	van Dijken
Fir	Nicolaides	Wiebe
Glubish	Nixon	Williams
Horner	Petrovic	Wilson
Hunter	Rowswell	Wright, J.
Jean	Sawhney	Yao
Johnson	Sawyer	Yaseen

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Eremenko	Miyashiro
Arcand-Paul	Goehring	Nenshi
Batten	Gray	Pancholi
Boparai	Haji	Renaud
Brar, Gurinder	Hayter	Sabir
Brar, Gurtej	Hoffman	Schmidt
Chapman	Hoyle	Shepherd
Dach	Ip	Sigurdson, L.
Deol	Irwin	Sweet
Eggen	Kasawski	Tejada
Ellingson	Kayande	Wright, P.
Elmeligi	Metz	

Totals: For – 45 Against – 35

[Motion carried]

The Chair: Another question for you. Shall the vote be reported? Are you agreed?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? Carried.
 I will now invite the hon. Government House Leader to move that the committee rise and report the 2026-27 offices of the Legislative Assembly estimates, general revenue fund, and the 2026-27

government estimates, general revenue fund. The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Madam Chair. So moved.

[Motion carried]

[The Speaker in the chair]

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

11:40

Ms Pitt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain resolutions relating to the 2026-27 offices of the Legislative Assembly estimates, general revenue fund, and the 2026-27 government estimates, general revenue fund, reports as follows, and requests leave to sit again.

The following resolutions for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2027, have been approved.

Offices of the Legislative Assembly: support to the Legislative Assembly, \$91,813,000; office of the Auditor General, \$37,960,000; office of the Ombudsman, \$5,433,000; office of the Chief Electoral Officer, \$51,180,000; office of the Ethics Commissioner, \$1,173,000; office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, \$10,276,000; office of the Child and Youth Advocate, \$18,219,000; office of the Public Interest Commissioner, \$1,616,000.

Government main estimates.

Advanced Education: expense, \$3,090,588,000; capital investment, \$50,000; financial transactions, \$886,900,000.

Affordability and Utilities: expense, \$106,551,000; capital investment, \$50,000; financial transactions, \$94,279,000.

Agriculture and Irrigation: expense, \$782,844,000; capital investment, \$6,177,000.

Arts, Culture and the Status of Women: expense, \$194,296,000; capital investment, \$2,331,000; financial transactions, \$3,590,000.

Assisted Living and Social Services: expense, \$11,926,347,000; capital investment, \$6,652,000; financial transactions, \$19,700,000.

Children and Family Services: expense, \$1,284,941,000; capital investment, \$2,109,000.

Education and Childcare: expense, \$8,507,572,000; capital investment, \$15,565,000; financial transactions, \$18,421,000.

Energy and Minerals: expense, \$462,682,000; capital investment, \$6,000,000.

Environment and Protected Areas: expense, \$452,768,000; capital investment, \$16,694,000; financial transactions, \$1,147,000.

Executive Council: expense, \$103,735,000; capital investment, \$50,000.

Forestry and Parks: expense, \$382,209,000; capital investment, \$146,546,000; financial transactions, \$1,310,000.

Hospital and Surgical Health Services: expense, \$9,923,143,000; capital investment, \$11,000,000.

Indigenous Relations: expense, \$261,435,000; capital investment, \$25,000.

Infrastructure: expense, \$531,338,000; capital investment, \$2,526,503,000; financial transactions, \$26,000,000.

Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration: expense, \$362,690,000; capital investment, \$4,675,000.

Justice: expense, \$759,086,000; capital investment, \$29,903,000.

Mental Health and Addiction: expense, \$2,011,937,000; capital investment, \$7,025,000.

Municipal Affairs: expense, \$1,364,933,000; capital investment, \$25,000.

Primary and Preventative Health Services: expense, \$14,901,507,000; capital investment, \$22,230,000; financial transactions, \$149,240,000.

Public Safety and Emergency Services: expense, \$1,395,131,000; capital investment, \$11,953,000; financial transactions, \$104,588,000.

Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction: expense, \$220,033,000; capital investment, \$67,567,000; financial transactions, \$5,500,000.

Technology and Innovation: expense, \$970,990,000; capital investments, \$153,522,000.

Tourism and Sport: expense, \$127,143,000; capital investment, \$25,000.

Transportation and Economic Corridors: expense, \$2,106,494,000; capital investment, \$1,715,232,000; financial transactions, \$134,406,000.

Treasury Board and Finance: expense, \$245,389,000; capital investment, \$8,350,000; contingency, \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my report.

The Speaker: Hon. member, in the report you just read, on Technology and Innovation, would you confirm for me that the number is \$970,990,000?

Ms Pitt: Agreed.

The Speaker: A little louder.

Ms Pitt: Yes. The expense for Technology and Innovation is \$970,990,000.

The Speaker: Okay. Thank you so much.

On the report which you just heard, if you concur, would you please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Speaker: If you disagree, would you please say no. The ayes have it. That is carried.

Now, at this point I would like to alert the hon. members that pursuant to Standing Order 59.03(7), everyone's favourite, following the Committee of Supply's report on the main estimates, the Assembly immediately reverts to Introduction of Bills for the introduction of the appropriation bill.

Introduction of Bills (reversion)

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

Bill 19 Appropriation Act, 2026

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce Bill 19, the Appropriation Act, 2026. This being a money bill, Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

It provides the spending authority required for the offices of the Legislative Assembly and Alberta's government for the 2026-2027 fiscal year. Specifically, the bill authorizes \$218 million for the Legislative Assembly, \$62.5 billion in government expense, \$4.8 billion in capital investments, and \$1.4 billion for financial transactions. It also includes a \$2 billion contingency to address unexpected pressures during the year, including support for Albertans and communities facing emergencies such as natural disasters.

Our priorities – strong public services, responsible spending, and investments that support growing communities – are reflected in the bill before the Assembly today. Mr. Speaker, Bill 19 ensures that Alberta's government has the authority required to deliver the

commitments made in Budget 2026. It provides the financial framework necessary to support Albertans and keep essential services operating throughout the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to move first reading of Bill 19, the Appropriation Act, 2026. Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 19 read a first time]

11:50 Transmittal of Estimates

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

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I have received a message from Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, which I now transmit to you.

The Sergeant-at-Arms: Order! All rise, please.

The Speaker: The Lieutenant Governor transmits supplementary supply estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Please be seated.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I now wish to table the 2025-2026 supplementary supply estimates, including the update to the 2025-2026 fiscal plan as required by the Sustainable Fiscal Planning and Reporting Act. The document I'm tabling today reflects the government's ongoing commitment to support Albertans and their communities, including some of the issues we've faced and the needs we've addressed since Budget 2025 was tabled in February of last year.

Our government is committed to keeping our province as the best place in Canada to live, work, and raise a family. When passed, the estimates will authorize approximate increases of \$326 million in expense funding, of which \$113 million is off-set by increased revenue; \$18 million in capital investment, of which \$10 million is off-set by federal funding; \$202 million in other financial transactions; \$18 million for the offices of the Legislative Assembly; and \$734 million in expense transfers between ministries.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Government Motions

32. Mr. Horner moved:
Be it resolved that the message from Her Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, the 2025-2026 supplementary supply estimates for the general revenue fund, and all matters connected therewith be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Anybody that would care to speak to this? Seeing none.

[Government Motion 32 carried]

33. Mr. Horner moved:
Be it resolved that pursuant to Standing Order 61(2) the Committee of Supply shall be called to consider the 2025-2026 supplementary supply estimates for three hours on Monday, March 23, 2026.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: This motion is not debatable.

[Government Motion 33 carried]

Government Bills and Orders
Committee of the Whole

[Ms Pitt in the chair]

The Chair: Hon. members, I'd like to call Committee of the Whole to order.

Bill 15
Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes
Amendment Act, 2026

The Chair: I am now looking for speakers who wish to speak to this bill. The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak to Bill 15 at second reading. Pardon me; Committee of the Whole. Apologies. It's been an early morning. Just got going on the coffee.

What we have in front of us is the next step in this government's plan to establish the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service. Let's be absolutely clear, Madam Chair. This is also this government's next step in creating an Alberta provincial police force. We've heard the minister go on at length with multiple complaints about the RCMP, being, shall we say, less than generous in assessing the facts and their record. We've heard UCP members stand and tell the worst possible tales they can find about the RCMP in their areas, some of which then had to be retracted in the media because they acknowledged that they did not in fact have the facts correct.

What we have now, indeed, is them taking that next step. The minister has said that this is absolutely essential because he swears this is the fastest way to get more boots on the ground, to help folks who need to see police response when they call, particularly in rural Alberta. That's the minister's contention, that this is the best and most efficient way for him to do that.

I had the opportunity to sit down with the minister at estimates on Tuesday night and talk about some of those numbers. What we're talking about right now is that the minister says he has around 1,200 people working in Alberta sheriffs, and of those, he says he has around 600 sheriffs that are already performing policelike functions. Indeed, what he told us is that some of them have already been going out and responding to some calls, enough so, in fact, that he admitted for the first time on the record that Alberta sheriffs have been falling short on being able to keep up in some of the key areas like court support or prisoner transfer, which is indeed what I've been hearing from members of the RCMP and others, that RCMP officers have had to step up and do prisoner transfers because Alberta sheriffs are not available.

Now, Madam Chair, it's kind of a ridiculous state when we have that, when the minister is complaining that there are not enough RCMP officers to respond to a call; therefore, he takes Alberta sheriffs and sends them out on calls, which then means that RCMP officers have to backfill the duties of Alberta sheriffs. That is hardly an efficient and reasonable approach. What that is is politicking. What that is is the UCP trying to do through the back door what Albertans have very clearly told them they did not want through the front; that is, establishing an Alberta provincial police force. So it is in fact undermining the system, creating inefficiency for the sake of shaking their fist at Ottawa and pleasing Alberta separatists. That's not helpful to anyone.

What we know, again, Madam Chair, as the minister said, is that he has about 600 officers that he intends to transfer over, to transition to become full police officers in the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, which this bill will allow him to do. He says that he intends to move about 200 sheriffs per year, so over the next 3 years

put 200 sheriffs through training, a few at a time, so these are not going to be huge groups at a time. Over the course of a year 200 sheriffs transition, do the training, have the ability to act as full police officers.

But the fact is that net new boots on the ground, according to the minister's own paperwork, according to the government's own fiscal plan, schedule 22, is 41. Forty-one net new boots on the ground for the entire province of Alberta. That is the minister's plan. That is the way he says is the most efficient, the best way for him to be able to offer more support in rural Alberta. Forty-one. Of those, the minister said that 30 will be actual officers on the ground; 11 will be civilian. So 30 new officers on the ground. That is the extent of it.

The fact is, Madam Chair, that even if the minister does put through those 200 sheriffs this year and they do get that training of six to eight weeks and they become able to act as full police officers, there is no gain. These are officers the minister says are already doing policelike functions, so there is no addition. They are not adding any benefit. There is one change, and that is simply that those sheriffs, once they're full police officers, will not require the assistance of an RCMP officer to do a full arrest. That's the only gain. So there will be a small gain in efficiency but absolutely no gain in terms of the boots on the ground. That's what the minister says is his plan to address what he says is a crisis.

12:00

But here's the thing, Madam Chair. This government doesn't actually take action on crises. We've seen this time and time again. You know, we see it right here on the streets of my constituency. We have a crisis on the streets here of folks who are overdosing. Edmonton has the highest level of drug poisonings in the province. Numbers are dropping in some other areas, not here, and they have not been for some years. Under seven years of this government their response to the crisis is to promise to build 11 recovery communities, of which they've managed to get five in seven years across the province, a single one for the Edmonton area. The one that they promised for Enoch has been tied up in all kinds of things and indeed seems to be tied up now in this new aspect of the corruption scandal. This government can't seem to do anything without getting their hands dirty. The fact is that that does nothing to actually address the crisis on the ground. It's politicking. That leaves Albertans suffering, both the individuals that need that help on the street and the impacts on our community. In seven years they failed to move the dial.

The Minister of Mental Health and Addiction stood today and talked again, the same story he tells, about these treatment units in prisons. Nothing against those, Madam Chair. Those are wonderful. But the fact is that in seven years if that's all they've got done, folks on the street here, I'm told by the folks on the front line, still face six to eight weeks to get treatment. Is the government's solution that they should go to prison to get it?

We talk about our hospital crisis. Again, we have a crisis. They like to deny it. Of course, the Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services told me that this was a made-up NDP crisis. I mention that every time I talk with the business community downtown, Madam Chair. They have a good laugh. They see it every day. When we talk about the health care system – and that is a very real crisis – where we have people dying in our emergency rooms, what is the UCP solution? Well, we'll talk about building some bed towers years down the road.

We talk about the education system, the crisis we have in our classrooms now. Oh, well, they're going to build some schools eventually. No dollars in the budget to actually put a shovel in the ground.

So I shouldn't be surprised, I suppose, then, that the minister's solution here of a new Alberta Sheriffs Police Service is just the same. Thirty new officers for the entire province in the next year: that's what he's done with four pieces of legislation, three years of planning. That's his solution for what he claims is a crisis. He has to do this because the RCMP are failing Albertans so badly. You know, the story keeps shifting, Madam Chair. First, it's: well, you know, we can't get the officers; there are too many vacancies. Then we notice how many vacancies we have in Alberta sheriffs, and suddenly we're not talking about vacancies anymore. Now suddenly we're talking about costs. Now that the minister has a chance to put out a new police funding model where he gets to tell municipalities what they're going to pay, all of a sudden, oh, my goodness, the RCMP are just charging so much money. He can't help it. He has to dump that onto municipalities now. Of course, we know that's been the record of this government with pretty much everything. They keep dumping more costs on municipalities because they don't want to step up to their responsibilities. Nonetheless, they are running a \$9.4 billion deficit. We've never had a government spend so much to deliver so little. Municipal leaders know that acutely.

Now, the minister is going to go about on this tour with the new police funding model to try to continue to undermine the RCMP. Of course, the Minister of Municipal Affairs is going to join in on that, too. He wants to put it on people's property tax bills to try to create a little more resentment against the good men and women of the RCMP who are out there doing the real work in the field.

The fact is, Madam Chair, that, again, we know that we continue to have gaps in Alberta sheriffs. Here's the challenge. When I asked the minister, "So you're going to transfer these 200 sheriffs from the Alberta sheriffs over to the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service?" I asked him if he has plans to backfill those positions. Is he going to hire more sheriffs? The answer was no. There is no intention over the next year to hire more sheriffs to cover those key and core duties. Again, we are not solving any problems; we're just shuffling things around on the same game board. Again, this is not about the minister actually trying to solve a problem. This is about political posturing on the part of this provincial government. This is about them continuing to undermine the RCMP for the sake of trying to keep pushing the separatist narrative, shaking their fist at Ottawa to try to distract people from this government's own poor record.

Indeed, municipalities are sitting up and taking notice, Madam Chair. The Rural Municipalities association, you know, when they saw the minister's new police funding model, noted that he's framed the introduction of the ASPS as another policing option. They said: well, if that's the case, then this introduction had better not put us in a bad place if we choose to want to stay with the RCMP. Now, here's the thing. Who gets to decide the pricing for policing in the province of Alberta? The minister of public safety. He gets the bill from the RCMP. That bill is not made available to the people of Alberta. Now, the minister says that it's an increase of about 57 per cent. We take him at his word. We haven't seen the documents. He divides that up, but the fact is he is seeing a 57 per cent increase from the RCMP. We have municipalities that are facing a 300 per cent increase in their costs for the RCMP.

I asked the minister about this at the estimates table. I said: "You know, you are seeing a 57 per cent increase. We have folks that are seeing a 300 per cent increase. Can you reconcile that?" Now, the minister claims that he is not charging a single extra dollar above what the RCMP is billing the province of Alberta. We don't have the paperwork. We can't verify. On that we have to take him at his word, but the fact is that we don't know how much of that cost the minister is choosing to download onto municipalities compared to what we had before. Again, just to note, the minister gets to decide that bill. Also, who gets to decide, then, what the cost is going to be

for anyone that wants to switch over to the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service? When I asked the minister this, he said: well, it won't be me; it'll be the civilian board that oversees. The civilian board which the minister appoints, Madam Chair. We've seen how independent boards and agencies that are appointed by this government get to be, which is not very.

The fact is that the minister has the opportunity to put his thumb on the scale and decide to make the RCMP a little more expensive and make the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service a little less. Now, I asked him if he would commit on the record not to do that. He didn't quite say so clearly. He didn't want to make a clear statement on the record, Madam Chair. What he said was: well, I treat everybody fairly. I couldn't get a simple yes or no, but what I can say is that there's not going to be the opportunity any time soon for any municipality to be able to make that choice because, again, all the minister is doing in the next year, according to this \$22 million he's been allotted for the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service in his budget, is training 200 sheriffs that already exist to act as full police officers and 30 net new officers on the ground.

It's not enough to staff anybody. That's not enough to start a new division for any municipality. That's only enough to maintain the status quo, so while the minister continues to undermine and attack the RCMP, claiming he has to do all of this work because it is a crisis, he's sure not acting like it's a crisis.

The disappointing thing is that this minister stands and talks about how well he collaborates, you know, whether he's talking about this new intelligence arm that he wants to create within the Alberta Sheriffs Police Services that the Premier seems to think is going to be able to provide her with international intelligence in time for the fall referendum. While he talks about how well he collaborates, when I asked him questions here the other day about collaboration with the RCMP and supporting them at their Real Time Operations Centre, whether he'd even just go over there and take a look, maybe at the desk where he refuses to appoint someone from the Alberta sheriffs to work, to collaborate – I talked about a particular case where the RCMP had to step in, where Alberta sheriffs, unfortunately, had a suspect that escaped them, escaped in their vehicle. The RCMP worked through the Real Time Operations Centre to be able to help.

12:10

It's interesting that the minister talks about a bunch of other cases where there's collaboration, but you know what? During that incident the RCMP were told, the RTOC, that the incident happened in the Beaverlodge area, so they were marshalling their resources. They were getting ready. They were getting ready to go and look for it there. Then shortly after that suddenly they were told the vehicle was actually moving south at high speed near Sangudo. It's a big gap. Then they had to quickly sort of pivot. They had to co-ordinate. Thankfully, again, because of the co-ordination at the Real Time Operations Centre they were able to do so and intercept that suspect before he got into Spruce Grove.

You know what would have solved that problem, Madam Chair? If the minister would have allowed Alberta sheriffs, as they had planned to do before he announced his new police service and it got cancelled, to actually put someone from the Alberta sheriffs communications team at a desk in the RCMP's Real Time Operations Centre and had that direct co-ordination. Again, that's how you respond to a crisis. You don't make a bunch of big, flashy announcements. You don't go for a bunch of big moves in bureaucracy and infrastructure first. You take care of the little things on the ground, and what we have been hearing is that this minister has continued to drop the ball on all kinds of small things that make a real difference for people right now in the community

because they're so busy trying to build this fantasy that comes straight out of the Alberta separatist manual.

So when we're talking, again, about Bill 15, I mean, hey, the minister is on his way. He's already built this thing. He's hired a chief. He's set up a board. He's got all these pieces in place, but much like this government's massive expansion of bureaucracy in the health care system, he's not going to have much to actually deliver for that in the next year. What would help, Madam Chair, is actually sitting down at the table with the RCMP, sitting down with the federal minister of public safety. Again, this is a government that says, hey, they want to provide choice to municipalities. But to quote the minister himself during question period today, "saying something . . . over and over again doesn't make it true."

The minister says that he wants to provide choice, but here's the thing. The UCP does not provide choice. They manipulate choice, which is why they had these videos making all kinds of ridiculous claims about the RCMP touring around the province on the taxpayer dime with the Alberta Next town hall tour last summer. That's not a government looking to provide choice; that's a government that's looking to skew choice. I have a difficult time trusting this minister when he says that he's not going to play games when it comes to the police funding model in providing that choice to municipalities because this government has shown time and time again, whether it's between public and private surgery or public and private education and now the RCMP and the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, that they're quite happy to put their thumb on the scale to favour their friends and the ideological option they prefer.

When it comes down to it, our municipal leaders deserve better, these folks who are facing these massive increases. I was told that for Sturgeon county the amount of their increase in their police funding model is equivalent to their entire property tax for agriculture. Ponoka: I'm told their entire agriculture assessment plus half their residential. That's the cost this minister is putting on their backs, and in return he is failing to deliver because he is refusing to sit at the table with the RCMP to negotiate a new agreement because he spent two years going around saying, "Well, I don't know if they're going to do it; I don't know if they're going to do it" even while the federal minister of the RCMP was saying: absolutely, we're going to do it. Now that they've made that announcement, suddenly he changes his tune and is all concerned about cost and, "Gee, I don't know; they haven't told me how much they're going to charge me," when he himself left municipal leaders hanging until early February, after they'd done their budgets.

The Chair: The hon. Member for Livingstone-Macleod.

Mrs. Petrovic: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I have to say that it's an honour to rise today and speak in support of Bill 15, Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. Before I get into the details of this legislation, I want to ground this conversation in something real. This past summer my rural home was targeted multiple times, and I'll tell you honestly, Madam Chair, that when my family made those calls for help, we weren't thinking about what badge or what service would show up. We didn't care the colour of the uniform stripe. We just cared that someone came and that they came in time. In those moments when your home, your sense of security, and your family are on the line, nothing else matters. I want to say this clearly. The RCMP members who responded were absolutely incredible. They were professional, compassionate, committed. They did everything they could do to support my family in this difficult situation.

They also shared something with me that has stayed with me. They told me how stretched they were. They spoke about the strain they were under, about vacancies, about the increasing complexity

of crime, and about the frustration of seeing the same offenders cycle through the system because of the federal catch-and-release policies.

Madam Chair, that reality is not unique to my experience. It's being felt in rural communities across Alberta, and that's exactly why Bill 15 matters. This legislation represents an important step forward in strengthening our public safety system, not by replacing our existing partners but by supporting them. Albertans deserve a system that is responsive, reliable, and capable of meeting the challenges we are facing today because the reality is that crime has changed. Organized crime is becoming more sophisticated, rural crime continues to impact families and businesses, and communities are asking for a more visible and dependable police presence. For years municipalities, local leaders, and residents have been asking for additional policing options, something that complements the work already being done and helps fill the gaps where resources are stretched too thin.

Bill 15 answers that call. It enables the transition of Alberta sheriffs into the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, creating a more agile, responsive, and locally focused policing model. It allows for a seamless transition of existing personnel, ensuring that experienced officers can continue their work without disruption, and most importantly, it builds capacity. At the end of the day, Madam Chair, when someone calls 911, they're not asking for a jurisdictional breakdown; they're asking for help. They're asking for someone to show up. This bill is about making sure that that happens. It's about ensuring that no community, especially a rural community like mine, is left waiting in moments of crisis.

I want to be clear. This is not about replacing the RCMP. They continue to serve our province with dedication, and we are grateful for their work. It's about supporting them. It's about recognizing the realities they themselves have shared with me, that they are stretched thin, and stepping up to ensure that they have the backup is needed.

Bill 15 also strengthens the Safer Communities and Neighbourhoods Act, or SCAN. SCAN teams have been critical in shutting down properties linked to drug activity, gang operations, and other serious criminal behaviour, the kinds of issues that, if left unchecked, can quietly erode the safety of a community. The amendments in this bill ensure that this important work continues without interruption under the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service. That continuity matters because proactive enforcement, stepping in before problems escalate, is one of the most effective ways to keep communities safe.

Madam Chair, this legislation is about more than structure. It's about people, it's about families who want to feel safe in their homes, it's about business owners who want to protect what they have worked so hard to build, and it's about front-line officers, whether RCMP or sheriffs, who are doing everything they can, often under significant pressure, to keep our communities safe. Bill 15 gives them that support, the tools and the capacity that they need. It ensures that we are not asking them to do more with less. It ensures that when Albertans call for help, someone is there to answer that call.

Madam Chair, I urge all members of this Assembly to support Bill 15 because it's not theoretical. For many of us this is personal, and it is our responsibility to ensure that every Albertan, no matter where they live, can feel safe, supported, and protected.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise today to speak in opposition to Bill 15, Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. This bill is being sold to Albertans as a

technical modernization, a simple administrative update, and a routine housekeeping exercise, but anyone who's read the bill and the legislation knows that bill 15 is anything but routine. It is a structural shift in how policing is going to be governed, how public servants are going to be treated, and how power is centralized in the hands of the minister and is yet another step towards a provincial police service that Albertans have repeatedly, consistently, and overwhelmingly rejected.

12:20

Madam Chair, let me begin with the most fundamental point. Albertans do not support replacing the RCMP, not in theory, not in practice, and certainly not through the backdoor mechanisms embedded in Bill 15. The government's own Alberta Next Survey showed that the creation of a provincial police force was the only initiative that failed to gain majority support. More than half of the respondents expressed concerns that a new policing service would cost more and deliver less than the existing RCMP contract. Rural municipalities have passed resolutions opposing the transition, Indigenous communities have raised concerns about lack of consultation, and over 100,000 Albertans have written letters urging the government to keep the RCMP. Albertans have spoken loudly and clearly. This is the problem. The government is just refusing to listen.

Madam Chair, Alberta is currently served by approximately 3,700 unionized RCMP members. These officers provide policing to 99 per cent of Alberta's geography. They are fully trained, federally supported, and backed by national investigation units, forensic labs, emergency response teams, and intelligence networks that no provincial police service could replicate without massive spending. Replacing these officers will require Alberta to recruit, train, and fund thousands of new personnel at a time when policing vacancies are already strained in rural detachments. We are facing a recruitment crisis across the public safety sector, yet this government believes it can somehow conjure up an entire police service from thin air.

Madam Chair, Albertans are asking a simple question. Why would we spend hundreds of millions of dollars to replace a police service that is already working? This government has never provided a credible answer. Instead, they have chosen to move forward through legislation like Bill 15, legislation that quietly shifts authority, restructures employment relationships, and lays the groundwork for a policing transition that Albertans do not want.

Let me turn to the most alarming component of the bill, the minister's new power to issue transfer orders that override employment contracts. Bill 15 allows the minister to unilaterally move employees from the government of Alberta to a new successor employer, in this case the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, notwithstanding the terms of an employment agreement. Madam Chair, this is extraordinary, and it's unprecedented, and it's absolutely unacceptable. This government is granting itself the authority to tear up contracts, move workers without consent, and fundamentally alter the terms of their employment. These are public servants with families, mortgages, and careers built on the expectation that their employer will honour the agreement that they both signed. Bill 15 is shattering that trust.

Let us be honest about why this clause even exists. It exists because the government knows that public servants will not voluntarily join a new provincial police service. It exists because the government is trying to build a police force without a mandate, without public support, and without the workforce required to staff it, so instead of earning the support, they are choosing to legislate it away. Madam Chair, this is not modernization; this is coercion.

Bill 15 also grants the minister the power to publish transfer orders or to withhold them. This is selective transparency, and it's deeply troubling. If the government is confident in its decision, why

is it choosing to hide them? Why give the minister the discretion to decide which transfers the public gets to see and which ones remain buried? Albertans deserve to know who is being transferred, why they are being transferred, and how these decisions affect public safety and public spending. A government that picks and chooses what it reveals is a government that cannot be trusted with sweeping new powers.

Madam Chair, this bill does nothing to address the real challenges facing policing in Alberta. It does not increase the number of officers in rural communities. It does not improve emergency response times. It does not address the recruitment and retention crisis. It does not provide new tools to combat rising crime. What it does do is centralize authority, destabilize existing police structures, and advance a costly and unproven provincial police project.

[Mr. Rowsell in the chair]

Budget 2026 allocated \$36.9 million to the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service despite a projected \$9.4 billion deficit, yet the government has proven no evidence that this spending will improve public safety: no cost-benefit, no analysis, no operational planning, no staffing strategy, no explanation on how this will make life safer for Albertans.

Mr. Chair, this bill is part of a broader pattern, a pattern of centralization, a pattern of government overreach, a pattern of restructuring public services without consultation, a pattern of ignoring municipalities, front-line workers, and the very people who rely on these services, and Albertans are tired of it. They're tired of a government that refuses to listen. They're tired of ideological experiments that cost more and deliver less. They are tired of being told that sweeping changes are just administrative when consequences are anything but. Bill 15 is not about public safety. It is about political control. It's undermining workers' rights, destabilizing policing, and advancing a policing transition that Albertans do not want and cannot afford.

For these reasons, I stand firmly against Bill 15. We stand with the 3,700 RCMP members who serve this province with dedication. We stand with rural municipalities who said loudly and clearly that they do not want a provincial police service. We stand with the public servants whose contracts should be respected and not rewritten. Most importantly, we stand with Albertans, Albertans who expect transparency, accountability, and respect for the rule of law.

Mr. Chair, we urge the government to withdraw this legislation, return to the drawing board, and come back with something that Albertans actually want.

The Acting Chair: Other speakers? Lethbridge-West, go ahead.

Member Miyashiro: Mr. Chair, thank you for the time. I certainly won't be able to speak as eloquently as my colleagues. I'm going to be a little more technical than them. I look at Bill 15 to sum up, I think, some of the things this government is doing. I would say: so much desire for control, so little time to ram through legislation. What makes this approach particularly egregious to me is that government proceeds with minimal public consultation, especially with the stakeholder groups that are most effective. But I'll come back to that in a minute.

First, the long and winding road to get here. Please forgive the plethora of initialisms that I will mention. Bill 15 is the fourth piece of legislation in a series that began in 2024 with Bill 11, which sets the table for subsequent bills. Bill 11 amends the Police Act to establish a new policing organization. Next up in the spring of 2025 was Bill 49, which allows for the establishment of a Crown corporation to form the Independent Agency Police Service, or IAPS,

and deliver police services independent of the government. Then came Bill 4 last October, which focuses primarily on establishing labour and human resources frameworks for the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, or ASPS. Oh, wait a second. ASPS? Yeah. Last July the government announced regulations for the IAPS to provide further context for the duties and functions of the different policing committees, board of directors, and oversight board. One of the main outcomes of these regs is the formal establishment of the ASPS, the official title of the IAPS. You still with me? Okay. Now we have Bill 15, which is intended to make changes that enable ASPS to continue towards becoming a policing agency.

Let's go back to stakeholder and public consultation. There's actually no larger stakeholder in this process than rural municipalities, represented mostly by Rural Municipalities of Alberta, or RMA. I'll get to that more in a second.

Let me give you some more history. In October of 2021 the government of Alberta released the Alberta Provincial Police Service Transition Study. Oh, yes, that's APPS. This was developed by PricewaterhouseCoopers. This study was the result of a recommendation made by the Fair Deal Panel – everyone remember that – which states that the creation of a provincial police force that replaces the RCMP should be explored. The government then conducted some stakeholder engagement regarding the potential transition to APPS.

At that time the RMA formally opposed its creation. They opposed it based on three major things. It hasn't been demonstrated that this move will improve the level of police service for rural Albertans. Secondly, there's no evidence that the transition will enhance local community input into policing. And thirdly, the government of Alberta has failed to demonstrate this move will be cost neutral to all municipalities.

12:30

Oh, yeah, getting back to stakeholder and public consultation. Well, according to the RMA further discussions regarding a transition to an APPS have not proceeded. Not. None. Let's look a little bit more closely at the RMA's concerns from a few years ago and see if the government has actually addressed them. Firstly, again, it has not been demonstrated that this move will improve the level of police service for rural Albertans. As my colleagues have mentioned, the Alberta sheriffs currently have about 1,200 employees. The minister has stated that roughly 600 of these sheriffs already perform policelike duties. The minister also claimed that many of these sheriffs could become police officers after six more weeks of training. Hmm.

Some Alberta sheriffs branches already have substantial vacancy rates, calling into question the UCP's ability to fill positions and get more boots on the ground, as they've stated. A FOIP from the summer of 2025 revealed that the sheriff highway patrol had a hard vacancy rate of over 22 per cent. Highway patrol has been highlighted by the minister as an example of sheriffs that do work that is substantially similar to police work. The sheriffs already have significant vacancies, but the UCP now wants to move hundreds of these sheriffs over to the new ASPS. Where will they find the people to fill the old but still necessary sheriff positions? The UCP has been critical of RCMP vacancies. How will they fill policing positions more easily than the RCMP? Can this government improve the service level for rural communities if a full staffing complement is not deployed?

The second thing the RMA brought up: there's no evidence that the transition will enhance local community input into policing. In November 2024 the province appointed an independent agency police oversight board to establish an oversight framework, develop guidelines and policies, and give input on recruitment. There's no

consideration for stakeholder representation on this board. Bill 49 redefines the IAPS as corporations with more defined governance, but it also allows for police service policing committees, which defines the relationship between the services and local government. This doesn't mean oversight, but it seems to be a contractual services agreement.

Truly, the UCP is not listening to experts or Albertans. They're forcing through a massive police restructuring that nobody in Alberta asked for or wants. Albertans have repeatedly rejected this plan. Albertans deserve genuine solutions to their safety concerns. I must say that the Alberta NDP caucus will demand that the government listen to rural communities and focus on real public safety solutions.

The third thing the RMA brought up was that the government of Alberta has failed to demonstrate that the move will be cost neutral to all municipalities. Above all else, this policing model does not make sense to rural municipalities because there's no cost advantage. The PricewaterhouseCoopers report that was mentioned earlier estimated the cost for transition to the APPS over six years is about \$366 million, \$241 million in operating costs and \$125 million in capital costs. In addition – this is important – the province will lose – yes, lose – \$170 million annually in federal funding, \$1.02 billion over six years.

So what's the potential cost of transitioning sheriffs? Sorry. I shouldn't say transitioning sheriffs because that might trigger some people on the other side. According to the National Police Federation converting roughly 600 sheriffs into fully trained police officers could cost \$29.36 million in salary upgrades because you have to pay people the salaries that they will now deserve; \$5.4 million in training in order to meet the Alberta policing standards; uniforms, equipment, gear, pistols, \$7.8 million; new or retrofitted vehicles, \$140,000 each for fully outfitted police vehicles; body-worn cams, \$1.8 million; infrastructure upgrades, estimated at \$32 million from the Alberta provincial police report. That's building upgrades, leases, related costs, and other significant costs for upgraded IT and IM dispatch systems, legal services, indemnification. It goes on and on and on. The estimated update in the budget, as my colleague mentioned, is going to be \$164 million, and an additional \$36.9 million is allocated to the new police service, bringing their budget to \$200.9 million.

Irrespective of the cost of a potential transition to ASPS, the province's latest version of the police funding model will create huge increases in policing costs for most rural municipalities, some up to three to four times more over the next five years. That increase, combined with excessive provincial education property tax and reduced provincial financial support for municipalities, has created serious budgetary challenges for rural municipalities. These entities cannot run operating deficits, unlike the provincial government, so their only recourse is to raise property taxes or find other stable sources of revenue, both of which are difficult. It's safe to say that the concerns expressed by the RMA years ago have not been resolved to date.

You know, I haven't even touched on the government's much-touted border patrol, for which they only spent a third of its budget, quickly realizing the province's limited role in a largely federal responsibility.

The last thing I'm going to say before saying that – well, I'll say it now. The government should withdraw this and rethink it, definitely. The National Police Federation has stated that “independent municipal reviews across the province have repeatedly found that replacing the RCMP would increase costs, reduce service levels, and destabilize rural and small-town policing.” Why won't this government listen? That's a question I think we all need to ask ourselves.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Acting Chair: Thank you.

Are there others? The member for Anthony Henday. Right?

Member Arcand-Paul: West Henday.

The Acting Chair: West Henday. Sorry. Okay. Go ahead.

Member Arcand-Paul: Mr. Chair, well, surprise, surprise. The UCP is not listening to Albertans yet again. I can tell you that my office has received hundreds of letters urging this government to abandon their plans to create a provincial police force and move away from the RCMP. Because I listen to my constituents, I cannot in good faith support this bill.

Late last year we had the chance to sit down with the National Police Federation, which at the time was only given an opportunity to meet with some of the backbencher UCP members who even gave a scintilla of respect with a follow-up with their request to sit down and meet with them. I'm not sure if those backbenchers did meet with them, but given this government's continuation of their provincial police force it would appear that the advice was not followed.

Mr. Chair, this bill is a further slap in the face of our hard-working RCMP here in Alberta. While Indigenous peoples have a unique history with the RCMP on our territories, we also have a deep respect for this relationship under treaty that First Nations have every single year. Every year I get the opportunity to shake the hand of our local RCMP member when I receive my treaty annuity of a whopping \$5. I do so because the RCMP represents so much to the folks in this province.

I hear from my constituents. While they are not served by the RCMP, they deeply care about their history in Alberta and the ongoing commitment that the federal government has signalled in large part because of what they have heard from all Albertans, including rural Albertans, who are served by the RCMP. The federal government walked away from their white paper. They've signalled their intention to keep the RCMP in Alberta. Mr. Chair, I've heard from hundreds of those constituents who have told this government to step away from their provincial police force plans.

I've heard, just this morning during question period, from Peter, a constituent and a retired police officer who was

at one point, active in the Edmonton Police Association and am aware of the incredibly generous subsidies that Alberta municipalities receive from the federal government for having the RCMP as their municipal police [forces].

A quick Google search will show that municipalities with less than 5000 people pay 30% of the cost of policing while municipalities over 5000 pay 70%, a huge windfall to those taxpayers. Granted they don't have as much oversight into policing as larger municipalities have, but a small price to pay, given the savings.

I know that the RCMP could do a better job in staffing and improving their response times, among other things, but to suggest that this is a matter of dollars and cents is ludicrous. The new proposed police "service" will cost Albertans, including those of us who [would] pay the full tab in municipal taxes for policing, far more than the RCMP does with little to show for it except direct control.

12:40

Peter is not alone. Since that time this fall and this government's Bill 4 those conversations have only increased. Mr. Chair, this government must stand down because they did not campaign on a provincial police force, but here they are with their fourth bill to facilitate the development of a provincial police force without the

actual force to meet this government's fantasyland ideas to create their own police force.

Mr. Chair, what is the most concerning and what I have heard loud and clear from experts and which my learned colleague has aptly called into question: where are the boots on the ground going to come from? The old adage robbing Peter to pay Paul is certainly appropriate here. There are zero gains from this government taking already scarce resources away from our systems to set up this entirely ideological police force that, again, the UCP did not campaign on. For what? To appease a base who is chomping at the bit to stick it to the feds? Depriving one agency to set up an ideological soon-to-be boondoggle is ludicrous. There is one thing that this entitled government is good at; it's wasting the hard-earned dollars of Albertans for ideological Ls like this one.

That's not even mentioning the fact that just this summer the sheriff highway patrol had a 22.5 per cent vacancy rate, and the RCMP are currently dealing with vacancies themselves across the country. This government has itself been critical of these vacancies yet are doing nothing to address that. These vacancies are concerning. Let's look at what is happening in Grande Prairie, because it is a telltale sign of what is about to come under this provincial police force that the UCP is moving full steam ahead with. Albertans have been informed that the Grande Prairie city council

insisted that a lot of the staffing for the new police service would come from experienced GP RCMP members patching over. Unfortunately this has not been the case. With a few exceptions, almost all of the RCMP members that have patched over are members in senior management who have retired from the RCMP.

Mr. Chair, what is the plan when these retired RCMP members are no longer able to serve the city of Grande Prairie or, in fact, any of the provincial police force bodies that this government is putting in place?

This is going to be replicated across the province? My question is: how? I've already focused on that dollar piece in previous provincial police force bill debate, but I want to focus on the content of this bill because it is highly focused on the employment context. Looking at what is happening in real time in Grande Prairie, well, things are not looking good. To quote my friend the Member for Calgary-North East, this government must have magic glasses on; in this context, where the minister can only see the boots to actually get on the ground for their provincial police force. According to the minister, though, the sheriffs have a vacancy rate of up to 12 per cent.

Make it make sense. Why is this government so focused on the wrong priorities while Albertans are asking for relief during things like the affordability crisis? They sit across the aisle and vote against the interests of Albertans on pet projects like a provincial police force. Well, Mr. Chair, I guess they are also entitled enough to sit in private jets in Saudi Arabia or at the tables with the lead architects of the Alberta Prosperity Project or PragerU influencers, or, heck, on the tarmac in Calgary, desperately seeking the attention of Donald Trump, also known as a close associate of Jeffrey Epstein.

Mr. Chair, it is no wonder that this government is so bent on creating a provincial police force while also stomping on the rights of workers in these fields by unilaterally modifying their labour rights. We've seen this government do it once, and I know sure as the day is long that the UCP are willing to trample on the rights of workers in this province, whether it's in their hard-earned pensions or the investments their pension managers are allowed to make, or, heck, even their Charter rights. The UCP knows no bounds to go after labour rights of Albertans that they fought so hard to achieve, these Albertan workers achieved. Let's remember – we hear it in this

Chamber time and time again – this government does not like unions. It does not like organized labour. It does not like workers. Oh, wait, sorry; they do like economic migrants, whatever that means, but apparently not other kinds of newcomers to this province.

Let's be frank, Mr. Chair. This bill is just another consecutive bill that sets up a provincial police force that this government did not campaign on. It is for these reasons that I cannot betray the good people of Edmonton-West Henday and even those constituents of the many members across the way who have indicated that they do not want a provincial police force. They want our hard-working RCMP members in their famous red serge to serve and protect our communities for as long as the sun shines, the grass grows, and the rivers flow.

Mr. Chair, I know we have a difficult situation in front of us of personnel, but we do need to focus on those issues to make sure that our communities are getting the services that they need. That is the job of us in this Chamber. It is our responsibility to ensure that Albertans have their needs met, and this bill does not do that. This bill tramples on the rights of workers in this field, and to sit there and laugh while we are making this big conversation and having these constituents come forward – it is incredibly concerning to me that the government refuses to listen to Albertans when they say that they do not want an Alberta provincial police force, not only because it is an expensive waste of their hard-earned dollars but also because they value the work that the RCMP provides in their communities.

Let's focus on the actual priorities of Albertans. Let's focus on making things a little bit better for them. Right now we are focusing on the wrong priorities. This government has to be focusing on the right priorities of Albertans. I just cannot in good conscience support this bill because I will be betraying my constituents and the constituents of the members across the way.

When we look at the RCMP, we look at the national identity that they provide and how Canada has been formed. Yes, they have a difficult history on these territories with my people, but they do have a place in our communities because some things, Mr. Chair, you just cannot replicate. This government ought to learn something from our history so it knows where it's going. [Remarks in Cree]

The Acting Chair: Are there others? The Member for Grande Prairie, go ahead.

Mr. Dyck: Well, thank you very much, Chair. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill 15, the Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. Several things that I want to talk about here today. One is that there's been lots of conversation around rural Alberta, RCMP, and various other things. In my role I have been able to speak to many different people across the province, and there's great interest in this. Everyone in Alberta is interested in public safety, and this is something that we also have to grab hold of and we have grabbed hold of in this bill. Public safety is important, and we have committed to it, and we will continue to commit to this as a government.

Now, I do want to mention – a few people have mentioned the great constituency of Grande Prairie, which I represent, and I just want to make a couple of key points. Just this last week on Friday they had their third graduating class of new recruits as well as their sixth experienced class as well. Now, these classes: I'm very excited about the interest and also the training being offered to these recruits and also to the experienced officers. We have a great future in Grande Prairie. There has been a huge amount of encouragement locally by what is happening on the ground through these graduating classes.

It is challenging to hear the opposition be opposed and speak so down on the public service and on police services. Chair, one of the

challenges that many members of the opposition are facing is that their police services are a municipal police service. They are not represented by rural members and by the RCMP. The RCMP on the ground are doing a great job, and we see that reflected across the province. Now, here's the reality. Much of this is a rural conversation, and we will continue to participate and encourage public safety because public safety matters. No matter if you're in Edmonton or you're in northern Alberta, southern Alberta, central Alberta, service should be there, and that's what this is delivering. I would hope that they would actually encourage people to go into both policing service and public service, unlike they have been, disparaging on municipal police services here throughout the day. It's very discouraging.

I do want to talk about this legislation as well and go over some of the things we are doing. This is practical. It is necessary. As we strengthen Alberta's policing model, what we want to deliver are safe, reliable law enforcement services across our province. Chair, that is a reasonable expectation that every single Albertan should have.

12:50

At its very core Bill 15 amends the Police Act to allow government to transfer all employees of the Alberta sheriffs branch into the Alberta Sheriffs Police Service, or ASPS, through a ministerial order. I just want to thank all the members of the sheriffs service right now. You're doing great work. We really appreciate all the work that you are doing across the province. This allows the Alberta sheriffs currently to perform policelike duties, which are being performed by the Alberta sheriffs, to be carried out by fully authorized police officers under the Police Act. There's an opportunity here for them to expand through becoming police officers.

One of the reasons we're doing this is because Alberta is growing. There needs to be another option available for municipalities to have public safety, and that is a really important feature of this. The ASPS is meant to complement the services. We're not replacing. We're complementing existing police services. By bringing sheriffs into the ASPS as it develops, we will be able to improve the co-ordination. We'll be able to strengthen the operations and build a stable foundation for future policing capacity as well.

One of the key aspects of this, Mr. Chair, is that this is going to be a stable transition. This transition won't interfere with law enforcement or compromise public safety. In fact, sheriffs will continue doing the important work that they do today. They'll do it tomorrow, and once this bill passes, it'll be very similar work.

Now, there is an opportunity for sheriffs that are serving in that capacity right now as peace officers for further training to become police officers if they would choose. This is an important opportunity for them to expand this. Mr. Chair, we spoke with many experts, and we looked at a handful of different options as well. Ultimately, this is the best option and the most effective, stable approach to building the ASPS. This is very important. We want public safety across Alberta, and this is the way forward. It ensures continuity for staff. It continues clarity for Albertans and steady development for modern policing services, which this government is doing.

Once again, sheriff operations won't see a change, Chair. Albertans will still see sheriffs providing court security, transporting prisoners, supporting police investigations, and keeping communities safe. Those who perform policelike duties today will continue doing so but with the full authority of the Police Act once they become ASPS members.

Now, the ASPS is being built to support Alberta's policing landscape, as I said, not to replace the RCMP or municipal police. It's an additional option to augment these services. This is going to

be especially helpful for rural and smaller communities. Since his appointment – I just want to talk specifically about Chief Sat Parhar – he’s been meeting with sheriffs and stakeholders across Alberta, and their feedback is shaping the ASPS. This is a model of service. What they need is important, and he has taken their feedback in crafting this according to local needs.

As the new service stands up, government will continue applying best practices to ensure co-ordinated, effective law enforcement, which is key. We want to keep officers safe, but we also want to keep people safe. This is the role of the ASPS. The ASPS is currently building out its executive team and senior policing roles, and then right away here recruitment into the policelike functions performed by sheriffs will begin soon. Sheriffs will be eligible to apply for further training if they choose. I’m really excited for that because we are expanding public safety across Alberta.

[Ms Pitt in the chair]

Now, once again, the ASPS is designed to complement existing services, support policing capacity, and give communities more choice, not to replace any existing police service but to complement. This is what this bill does. It gives the opportunity for us to continue to expand this.

As I said, Grande Prairie has been transitioning. They’ve been doing a great job. As a community that has had higher crime rates throughout the years, our residents do feel the impact of that, even myself, Madam Chair. I’ve had my vehicle broken into a couple of times. I’ve lost a couple of gym bags. I’m thankful that’s all, but these are serious concerns that have hit close to home.

This will be an opportunity for further training as well, and I do believe that this is an opportunity for people to be able to feel safe, where they don’t have to worry about their car being broken into or stolen, and faster action on any illegal activity happening near their home or workplace. This is a super key aspect.

I want families to feel safe, and I want my friends to feel safe, and I want every Albertan to feel safe. This is what this bill is accomplishing, for Albertans to be able to feel safe in their homes, in their workplaces, and across the province. I would encourage every single member in this Chamber to support this bill. It’s an important bill as we continue to see public safety expand, and I would encourage support from every single member here.

Thank you.

The Chair: Are there others to speak to Bill 15 in Committee of the Whole?

Seeing none, I will call the question.

[The clauses of Bill 15 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

The Chair: Shall the bill be reported? Are you agreed?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Bill 16

Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act

The Chair: I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Ms Goehring: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. It’s my pleasure to rise this this afternoon to speak to Bill 16, the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act. You know, this is a piece of legislation that I think is generally supported by the hotel industry. It’s something that I know Albertans expect. It talks about

creating transparency. That is something that I think we should expect from all levels of government when we’re requiring a tax or a collection of fees.

When the minister had introduced this piece of legislation at second reading, his speech was quite wonderful. It talked about the urgency for ensuring that any money collected has a transparent reporting to it. You know, then I went on to explain how the entire tourism industry, after seeing the budget, expressed significant concern about transparency and how the 150 per cent increase through the tourism levy, which is essentially a tax on Albertans, is not enhancing transparency. So while Bill 16 is coming out at the same time that we’re reviewing the budget, the Alberta Hotel & Lodging Association has expressed some concerns about the levy and have been quite honest in saying that it’s essentially a hotel tax that flows into general revenue at the government’s discretion.

For those following along at home, we’ve been discussing at great length the decisions that this government has been making and their lack of transparency, specifically around, you know, the Premier going to Dubai, Saudi Arabia on private jets and staying in luxurious hotels. None of that was transparent. So we’ve asked that perhaps things related to transparency should be front of mind for this government.

Enhancing transparency is absolutely something that those on this side of the House agree with and support. This piece of legislation does just that. It enhances transparency despite what we’ve watched this government do with conflicting priorities about transparency. I think, in general, it’s something that we can support, and I think that it’s something that shows good faith when we’re asking taxpayers to contribute to destination marketing. If they, you know, inquire about where this money is being spent, the hotels and those that are collecting these fees can point to exactly where the money is going.

It’s something that I think, when we’re looking at the visitor economy and tourism-based economies – there are some significant goals this government has in increasing this. They’re doing it at a time when there is an affordability crisis, and essentially what’s happening is that they’re asking Albertans to pay more.

1:00

You know, I myself was born and raised in this province. I’ve raised my children in this province, and something that we’ve always done is what we call, like, a stay-cation. We stay in Edmonton. When we do road trips as a family, we like to travel all across the province and enjoy the beautiful sights. So as an Albertan I’m paying into this levy, which is a 150 per cent tax increase.

The hotel industry is quite upset. You know, they’ve stated since 2005 that they’ve carried the burden of collection of the levy, the remittance and compliance, including the credit card fees. In 2024 Alberta hotels paid an estimated \$2.8 million in fees. With the levy increase this will rise to roughly \$4 million. These are things that, on one side, government is introducing Bill 16 talking about this great piece of transparency and how it’s so wonderful and how when we’re charging these fees, they should be accountable, which we completely agree with, yet looking at the budget, it is now putting more cost onto hotels and issuing levies, taxes that the hotel industry has called a tax on hotels, that they’re quite concerned about.

When it comes to supporting the legislation, I think Bill 16 is something that we can support. The Alberta New Democrats one hundred per cent support transparency. When there are fees affiliated, you should be able to look and see where those fees are going. Here in this instance it’s going right to the destination marketing operators. It’s clear. It makes sense, but you know, I would urge this government to listen to them outside of this piece of legislation and look at the

general budget and what they're doing to the tourism industry, which is essentially punishing them for doing well. They've increased the levy; however, it's not being transparently reinvested.

With that, Madam Chair, I would encourage my colleagues to support Bill 16 but to go a little bit further and to, you know, question why the minister is so open to having others be transparent with tax related to destinations and tourism yet not the actual budget itself. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

The hon. Member for Banff-Kananaskis.

Dr. Elmeligi: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill 16, the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act. I really want to thank my colleague the shadow minister of Tourism and Sport for sharing her views on this bill.

This bill does do something that destination marketing organizations have been asking for for a long time, Tourism Canmore Kananaskis in particular. I've had many conversations with TCK about this idea requiring more transparency around destination marketing fees that are incorporated into how hotels charge guests. We know that in the past there have been some bad actors who charge the fee and it doesn't make it back to the destination marketing organizations, so this bill really does a good job of addressing that concern.

But what it highlights for me, Madam Chair, is that there's a little bit of hypocrisy here because this bill is basically asking hotels to increase their transparency by reporting on the destination marketing fee and the money raised and then making sure it goes where it's supposed to go, which is great, but this government doesn't want to display the same level of transparency. I think it was one of the ministers today in question period commented on leading by example and how it's really up to the government to lead by example and set the standard for businesses and for Albertans in how they operate. If that is the case, then this is really problematic because the government is not willing to lead by example when it comes to transparency in a whole array of fields and areas but in particular when it comes to the tourism levy.

I think that what we're seeing with this bill, Madam Chair, that I find most problematic is that it's a good thing to do, but it's actually not the biggest and most important thing given what the tourism sector has been asking for, which is more transparency around the tourism levy. Not only are we not seeing that transparency around the levy – we know how much money is raised, but it just goes into general revenue; we don't really know where it goes – but this year in the budget we see a 2 per cent increase in that levy, and that has upset tourism operators and hotels in the Banff-Kananaskis riding.

I am receiving e-mails and letters from some of the biggest hotels in my riding, including the Banff Park Lodge, who comments that since 2005 hotels have been responsible for collecting and sending this tax, the tourism levy, to the government. Hotels pay credit card processing fees on the levy when guests pay by credit card, and last year the Banff Park Lodge paid \$662,000 in these fees. Increasing the tourism levy thereby increases the credit card fees that hotels have to pay.

Now, I just want to be clear, Madam Chair. There's a little bit of a timing discrepancy here, too, because for the most popular tourism destination in Alberta, Banff and Canmore, people often book their hotels a year in advance, especially if they're coming during our busy season in the summer, which means that the hotels have already paid these credit card processing fees, but now they'll have to pay 2 per cent more and they can't charge that 2 per cent back to the customer if the customer has already paid. So for this year that the tourism levy increase comes into effect, we're actually

punishing and charging hotels in my riding more than they would have paid last year before the fee came into effect.

I can tell you, Madam Chair, that hotels in my riding are angry about this tourism levy increase. It will affect their bottom lines for 2025-2026. Part of the lack of transparency that's so annoying for everybody, myself included, is that it is expensive to host the world. It costs us money, and if we want to offer a high-quality visitor experience, we need to set the tourism sector up for success and we need to set municipalities that host the world up for success. I've said it so many times in this House, and I'll say it again. Canmore, Banff, and Jasper generate over \$2 billion a year for the provincial economy. You're welcome.

What do we get from that, Madam Chair? Not a whole heck of a lot, to be honest with you. Tourism-based infrastructure costs municipalities money. Do you want to know who pays for that? Me and every single property owner in Canmore, Banff, and Jasper because the increased cost of that tourism-based infrastructure comes out of our property taxes. It is another example of how this government downloading costs onto municipalities is actually just costing Albertans more. Quite frankly, I'm a little bit tired of paying for this government's ineptitude with my own bank account.

Tourism is a major economic driver, and it has great potential when we invest in it strategically. This government has a tourism strategy to double tourism spending by 2030, but what we see reflected in how that strategy is implemented is this idea of just making sure that destination marketing fees are paid. Okay. Great. This is the low-hanging fruit, Madam Chair. This isn't the most meaningful change that can be made to the tourism sector to actually strategically invest in this economy. This government wouldn't know strategy if it came up and bit them on the face.

An Hon. Member: Ouch.

Dr. Elmeligi: Yeah. I hope that hurt, because you know what hurts? My property tax going up every year because this government doesn't know how to manage a budget. That hurts a lot more.

The reality is that there are a lot of regulations that will come out of this bill of destination marketing fees, like how much is going to be charged and the rate it can be charged. We need to make sure that the tourism sector is consulted on those regulations. This government has a pretty poor track record when it comes to consulting with those impacted and making sure that their needs are reflected in the bill. I look forward to learning from the minister of tourism how he's going to consult with the sector around the regulations around these marketing fees.

1:10

The DMF is still voluntary and that's great, but I really want to make sure that it's fair and equitable. Is the government going to communicate with all lodging and tourism service providers why paying into a destination marketing fee is important? That includes Airbnbs, Madam Chair, which are becoming more and more popular and aren't necessarily run by a business.

This also highlights another inequity that I'm hearing from some of the hotels. Hotels have to pay this 6 per cent tourism levy, and now private Airbnbs, like private property owners, will also have to pay the levy. That's great, but they don't pay the same kind of taxes to the municipality that they're in. So the tourism sector is very interested in talking with the minister of tourism about that inequity also.

I really want to highlight that there are some directives in this act that are up to the opinion of the minister. I hate that language. I hate it so much. The opinion of the minister should not matter in legislation ever – ever – because the minister changes. What we've

seen with the All-season Resorts Act, which is another tourism disaster as far as legislation goes, is that the opinion of the minister can mean ignoring existing laws around provincial park boundaries in favour of large-scale commercial tourism development. The opinion of the minister can mean that Albertans don't have to be consulted when provincial park boundaries are changed. That is utter nonsense, Madam Chair. This is not the promise that the government makes to Albertans.

The government promises that it will represent Albertans and represent their needs, and "in the opinion of the Minister" that is not necessarily happening. The opinion of the minister is too much leeway. What if he just hasn't had any coffee that day and is kind of cranky? Is his opinion going to be different? I mean, my opinion was different this morning. Ultimately, the opinion of the minister does not generate certainty for the industry. Every industry needs certainty in rules and regulations. This government's approach to managing and planning tourism does not provide that certainty and in that way undermines the foundation of what could be a significantly more amazing economic driver than it already is.

This government likes to talk a big game when it comes to celebrating economy and businesses. What I see in my riding of Banff-Kananaskis, that has the largest tourism contributions probably in the province: we don't see that strategy. We don't see that business support. We see inequity, we see poor planning, we see poor strategy, and we see a government that demands transparency of businesses without actually honouring that transparency itself. That hypocrisy, that double standard, is getting harder and harder for businesses in my riding to take.

The government in Budget 2026 also proposes a new tax on rental vehicles and this tourism levy. Eighty per cent of people travelling to Banff-Kananaskis are Albertan. These new taxes actually make travelling in Alberta more expensive for people who are already suffering an affordability crisis. Come on. When are we going to stop charging Albertans for the total ineptitude of this government? When are Albertans going to have to stop paying more because this government can't figure out how to manage a boom during a boom?

Every dollar from public-sector spending in tourism generates \$12.50 in the private sector. Tourism is such a cool potential economically, culturally, all of those things, Madam Chair, but what we don't see is investment in tourism-based economies. I really, really wish this government would take steps forward to help support municipalities to host the world. It is truly our honour in the riding of Banff-Kananaskis to host the world and to celebrate our mountains and foothills and lakes and rivers with everybody who comes there, but it is expensive. It costs money. Tourism-related infrastructure comes out of municipal budgets. This government keeps downloading costs onto municipalities. It makes it harder and harder to offer the high-quality visitor services and experiences that we want to provide. In essence, the tourism strategy of this government is to actually hobble the tourism sector, which is just really unfortunate. There are a lot of things we could be doing here differently.

While I support changing transparency and increasing certainty around destination marketing funding, the rest of the way this government is managing tourism is embarrassing and not actually serving to meet their objectives. Thank you.

The Chair: Are there others to Bill 16? The hon. Member for Calgary-North East.

Member Gurinder Brar: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to begin by acknowledging the amazing speech from my colleague from Banff-Kananaskis. That's what a grassroots, connected, and

passionate MLA sounds like, and kudos to my colleague from Banff-Kananaskis for such an amazing, thoughtful, and insightful speech.

I rise today to speak in favour of this bill, the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act, and I want to begin by saying something simple, that this is a good step. It's not a perfect step. It's not a complete step, but it's a step in the right direction because at its core this bill is trying to solve a very real problem, that when people travel in Alberta, they deserve to know what they're paying for and where that money is going. Right now – let's be honest – that clarity hasn't always been there.

Madam Chair, most of us have had that experience. People book a hotel, they get a good deal, and then comes the bill. Suddenly there are three extra charges that people don't quite understand: a fee for this, a levy for that, and something called a destination marketing fee. At that point most people just don't ask questions; they just sigh and they pay. But they do wonder: where is the money going? That's exactly what this bill is trying to address.

Bill 16 introduces a framework for destination marketing organizations, DMOs, and regulates how destination marketing fees, or DMFs, are collected and used. It ensures that if a fee is charged, it must be disclosed up front. It ensures that money collected doesn't just sit somewhere or, worse, get pocketed but is held in a trust and used for tourism purposes. Frankly, Madam Chair, that's common sense. If you're asking Albertans or visitors to pay extra, the least you can do is to be transparent about it.

Now, I also want to acknowledge that the tourism industry itself has been asking for something like this for quite some time. They want a level playing field, they want bad actors out, and they want trust to be restored. From that perspective, Madam Chair, this legislation sounds to real concerns from the ground. So yes, we support it, but support does not mean silence. While the framework is here, many of the most important details are missing. They're left to regulation, and as my colleague from Banff-Kananaskis has already explained about the opinion part of the minister, I don't think I will be able to explain better than my colleague, so I'll leave to her expert opinion on that.

But that's where my concern is. Madam Chair, when legislation says, "Don't worry; the details will come later," what it's really saying is: trust us. Now, I want to trust the government. I really want to trust this government, but trust is not built through words. It's built through patterns, and the pattern we have seen raises some serious questions, most recently from the Saudi Arabia trip of the Premier: the missing flight, the missing bills, and accepting gifts from a foreign government. That's not how a government builds trust. This government needs to come up with some solid plans, some solid regulations that we can all debate in this legislation. We can talk about those; we can see in front of us. That's how trust is built.

We are told – we don't know, but we are told – that this bill will improve transparency, yet at the same time hundreds of millions of dollars collected through the tourism levy continue to go into general revenue with no clear, consistent accounting of how that money is reinvested into tourism. Again, my colleague from Banff-Kananaskis has given a concrete example that Banff-Kananaskis raises about \$6 billion, if I'm not wrong, from tourism, and how much of that money gets reinvested into those areas of tourism is a big issue. It's fair to ask: why is transparency expected from business owners, small operators, and local tourism groups but not held to the same standard at the government level?

1:20

Madam Chair, Albertans are not opposed to paying fees if they see value in paying. In fact, they have been paying lots and lots

of fees for so many different services. In this budget those fees are supposed to go up again. I raised this in the estimates as well that page 159 of the fiscal plan of the service Alberta ministry shows the following fee increases: residential and tenancy dispute resolution fee, doubled; introduction of new land titles and surveys resubmission fee; land titles fee, more than doubled; 33 per cent increase in licensing and registration fee for businesses and charities – 33 per cent – class 1 and class 3 vehicle registration fee, up 12 per cent; class 2 vehicle registration fee, whopping 20 per cent increase. These are the fee increases that we have seen. Government needs to come up a transparent, honest, accountable plan that we can all agree on.

We will support this bill, but these are the valid questions from industry and from colleagues on this side. I encourage all the members to support this bill, but at the same time I ask this government to come up with some solid plans.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

Mr. Dach: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm pleased to rise to speak to this piece of legislation this afternoon, make a few brief remarks about the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act.

While the minister in estimates was eager to crow about how great the return on investment for tourism was in this province – he mentioned the ratio of 31 to 1 as far as investment return was concerned – these investments are not being returned to the tourism and sport industry. What's happening with it is that it's going into the financial black hole called the general revenue fund of the province of Alberta. Of course, we all know what's happening with that and that we're seeing a \$9.4 billion deficit this year. The industry which the minister expounds about, suggesting that it's a great way to have a return on investment, is something that, in my view, that minister has failed big time to convince his cabinet colleagues to actually reinvest some of those dollars and make sure that the industry that generates those dollars understands where the money is going to be reinvested. Putting the money just into general revenue doesn't solve the many issues that exist right now in many of our tourism hot spots such as Banff, Canmore, and Jasper, where we find significant issues with respect to overcrowding and congestion and traffic.

The ministry has made no representations about how investments are going to be made so that those tourism numbers are going to be sustainable over the long term. We don't have any idea from the minister about the transportation concerns that are caused by having so many vehicles in the Banff and Canmore area in particular. If indeed people cannot get there, if they're in a national park traffic jam or going to Canmore and can't move around because of the number of cars, in fact, people are going to decide not to go there. We can do what we want and make sure we advertise and promote Banff, Jasper, Canmore, but indeed if they're congested by too much vehicle traffic, they're going to suffer.

We need solutions and not solutions that are 10 years down the road from a Banff-Calgary corridor railway aspect. We need solutions right now, which means rubber-tire transportation, some type of bus transportation or regional transportation network that actually serves the tourism industry well as well as the local community. The consultation has to happen with those local communities as to what those solutions might be.

Now, of course, we know on a wider scale, Madam Chair, the province has no rural bus transportation since the abandonment by Greyhound of the province. Western Canada suffers from that right across the board. Once again, the minister didn't seem to realize the

value of rural bus transportation. He deferred questions about the matter to the transportation minister, not realizing that tourism and transportation are twinned. Transportation is a necessity. How are you going to move your tourists if you don't have a method of doing so, if they're gridlocked in a traffic jam in Banff or Canmore?

I think that the bill certainly, as my good friend suggested, is a first step, but there's a lot more comprehensive consultation that has to happen with the stakeholders, including the communities and the industry members that are served by the ministry, and the minister has to recognize that the return on investment that he brags about has to be reinvested into the tourism industry. I mean, the minister, like myself, was a was a realtor for many years, and he knows well that indeed if he saw a 31 to 1 ratio return on investments he made in his real estate industry career, he would have been jumping all over that and invested every dollar he could have to create more business for him. That is the type of thinking, Madam Chair, that has to be applied here. We need to make sure that those dollars are reinvested in the industry so that we can grow it properly but also grow it in a way that is sustainable.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks, and I hope that others will contribute more comment.

The Chair: Are there others? The hon. Member for Calgary-Foothills.

Member Ellingson: Indeed, Madam Chair, there are others. I'm pleased to stand and talk about Bill 16, the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act. I think my colleagues have already shared how in general we're in support of the bill, that we recognize that the bill is responding to requests from the sector. We recognize that the bill is bringing better governance to something that was maybe causing some confusion to both those participating and from tourists. We realize that the bill brings some better accountability to, you know, some things that were happening in the sector. Now, if only we could say that, broadly speaking, from the government of Alberta we saw better governance and accountability. We'll talk about that maybe another day. What I'd like to chat about is just how we do or maybe do not grow a sector in our economy.

As we have recognized, tourism is growing in Alberta, and I really love the growth and opportunities that come with tourism because I think what's cool about tourism – it's interesting from two perspectives for me. One is that tourism gives us an opportunity to grow our economy across the province. Tourism touches every corner, every community, every region in this province, and not all industries do, so I think tourism is something that we should be really thinking a lot about. What also is really interesting: as we grow our tourism economy, it also increases in general the quality of life of Albertans. The amenities that appear in communities to support tourism are also there available to the people who live in those communities, so we get kind of, like, these ripples and, you know, additional effects from tourism when we really think about growing tourism.

Knowing that we're so interested in growing tourism, this bill, as I acknowledged, is a good thing, but the government did something else just recently in the budget, I think as we all know. We've talked about the tourism levy that is levied by the provincial government, collected by hotels, submitted to the provincial government. Not all of that tourism levy is going to developing tourism, which I think is curious. We have a Crown corp, Travel Alberta, which among other things markets Alberta to the world to bring tourism here. The grant to Travel Alberta is frozen from last year to this coming budget year. Curious to me that if we see the benefits of growing tourism and we're going to get more, you know, revenue from tourism, we would freeze the grant to the Crown corp that works to bring more tourists here.

Now, if we talk about that grant itself – Travel Alberta: frozen at \$75 million. The tourism levy, however, last year, the year that we're about to end, is estimated to bring in \$138 million. Next year that will be \$200 million. By 2028 that will be \$214 million. This leaves some money on the table, ostensibly to wonder: why are we not using that money that is not going to Travel Alberta to grow the tourism economy?

1:30

Now, at the same time when it comes to those communities that are hosting tourists and maybe need some infrastructure needs to host those tourists, what we see in this budget is that capital grants to municipalities to support tourism support have gone from \$5 million last year to zero next year. We also see that the local government fiscal framework is declining from \$820 million to \$799 million, so these municipalities are getting less money.

At the same time we're asking those municipalities to pay more for local policing. This government has chosen to reduce the cost-sharing amount for local policing. Those municipalities have said: now we need to think about service cuts or maybe increasing property taxes to make up for that loss of, you know, revenue from the province to pay for these needs. So we're not directing all of the levy into tourism. We are saddling those municipalities that are supporting tourists and hosting tourists. We are giving them less money to do so while they are struggling to provide the services for their own residents, never mind those tourists. This is not the way we grow a tourism economy. We grow a tourism economy by investing in it.

Last summer I had the opportunity to host round-tables with businesses, chamber members, and even tourism operators from around the province. We did hear of the incredible opportunities that are available to us across Alberta, but, you know, they also said that they want to have the government recognize what those regional opportunities are. They want the government to lean into supporting those regional opportunities. They want the government to lean into supporting the infrastructure that is needed to drive those tourism opportunities.

I think that while we're supporting this bill, we have a lot of questions about the government's choices and how we grow the tourism economy, and quite frankly we think that we can do a whole lot better.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Are there others? Seeing none.

Member Irwin: Over here. He's been up the whole time.

The Chair: Oh, I saw that, too. Wow. Dry eyes. Dry eyes.

The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Mr. Kasawski: Thank you, Madam Chair. What an opportunity to rise and discuss Bill 16. You know, I'm fond of saying that all roads lead to Sherwood Park. Tourism and the visitor economy of Sherwood Park in Strathcona county are alive and well, and I will happily discuss Bill 16 as it relates to my community of Sherwood Park. When people think about tourism in Alberta, they often think about Banff, Jasper, or the Rocky Mountains, but I can tell you that just minutes from Edmonton there's a region quietly building one of the most compelling, accessible, and authentic tourism experiences anywhere in the province.

Madam Chair, you know, Shaquille O'Neal, the famous celebrity and former basketball player, was recently travelling to Edmonton. He's a fan of the Edmonton Oilers, a fan of Oilers forward Zach Hyman because Zach rhymes with Shaq. True story. He had business dealings with The Brick, who had brought him to Edmonton to promote a larger size La-Z-Boy than you can get anywhere else. Fun fact: I used to work at The Brick. I started in the warehouse; worked my way up to

purchasing. Yeah. It's true. I used to buy about \$250 million worth of appliances a year for The Brick. Nothing to do with tourism. When Shaq was in Edmonton, do you know where he visited? The Mazati lounge in Sherwood Park. All roads lead to Sherwood Park.

Now, this government constantly spends more and delivers less for Albertans. We know that. And I'm extremely concerned with the entitled approach to governing this province that they're taking. We have a great story to tell about tourism in Alberta, which leaves me with a lot of questions about Bill 16 as it relates to the promise of growing tourism and our growing tourism sector in Alberta.

Tourism in Budget 2026 is a sector that the government is taxing more and investing in less in Alberta. The government proposes to increase the tourism levy by 50 per cent. The government also introduced a new tax on vehicle rentals of 6 per cent, the new UCP sales tax on car rentals. Public service announcement for Albertans: you're going to have to pay a UCP sales tax whenever you rent a car in Alberta. Thanks, UCP.

How did the government consult local tourism industries, communities, and municipalities like Sherwood Park and Strathcona county in the process of developing this legislation and the regulations that are to come? How is the Alberta government supporting tourism-based economies in Alberta in tourism and, in particular, Sherwood Park? How is the government's budget over the next three years going to support growth in Alberta's tourism and visitor economy? If the funds from the destination marketing fees are going back into marketing initiatives, what would inevitably invite more people to destinations? How much growth in visitor spending and population is the government predicting this legislation will enable?

The times sure have shifted. Does the government intend to introduce clarity around how it uses revenue generated by the tourism levy to show how it is reinvested into the sector? Tourism is growing. I come from a lifetime in business. If a business sector is growing, it needs investment to support growth, but the Alberta government is not investing more in the growing Alberta tourism industry. It's cutting investment in Tourism Alberta, and it's making things worse. It's increasing taxes on tourism. The visitor economy of Sherwood Park and Strathcona county deserves better from its provincial government. It deserves a New Democrat government.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: I see no other speakers to Bill 16, so I will call the question on Bill 16, the Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act.

[The clauses of Bill 16 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

The Chair: Shall the bill be reported? Are you agreed?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Anyone opposed? Carried.

I hope everyone tuning in now for QP enjoyed that.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I move that the committee rise and report bills 15 and 16.

[Motion carried]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports the following bills: Bill 15, Bill 16. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the Assembly concur in the report? All those in favour, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Deputy Speaker: Any opposed, please say no. So carried.
The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Williams: Well, sorry to disappoint. I will not be moving for unanimous consent that we return to Orders of the Day and question period. Instead, I will move that the Assembly be adjourned until 1:30 on Monday, March 23, 2026.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 1:40 p.m.]

Bill Status Report for the 31th Legislature - 2nd Session (2025-2026)

Activity to Thursday, March 19, 2026

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

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

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

Bill 1 — International Agreements Act (Smith)

First Reading — 6 (*Oct. 23, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 77-85 (*Oct. 28, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 109-18 (*Oct. 29, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 133-35 (*Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 184-87 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 250-52 (*Nov. 6, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force November 26, 2025; SA 2025, cI-3.8]

Bill 2 — Back to School Act (Horner)

First Reading — 26 (*Oct. 27, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Second Reading — 27-28 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 29-35 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 35-36 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 37-45 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 45-46 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 47-54 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Oct. 28, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on October 28, 2025; SA 2025 cB-0.5]

Bill 3 — Private Vocational Training Amendment Act, 2025 (McDougall)

First Reading — 65 (*Oct. 28, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 135-37 (*Oct. 30, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 187-93 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 215-16 (*Nov. 5, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 334-37 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 371-73 (*Nov. 19, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c17]

Bill 4 — Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Ellis)

First Reading — 121 (*Oct. 30, 2025, passed*)

Second Reading — 193-201 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 216-24 (*Nov. 5, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 289 (*Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned*), 323-34 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 408-13 (*Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 447-55 (*Nov. 24, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force November 26, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c18]

Bill 5 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Schow)

First Reading — 271 (*Nov. 17, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 322-23 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 407-08 (*Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 589-90 (*Nov. 27, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 11, 2025; SA 2025 c23]

Bill 6 — Education (Prioritizing Literacy and Numeracy) Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Nicolaidis)

First Reading — 150 (Nov. 3, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 252-60 (Nov. 6, 2025 aft., adjourned), 289-98 (Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned), 337-39 (Nov. 18, 2025 aft., adjourned), 341-51 (Nov. 18, 2025 eve., adjourned; amendments introduced), 455-65 (Nov. 24, 2025 eve., adjourned; amendments introduced), 504-14 (Nov. 25, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 681-86 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 713-21 (Dec. 3, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c19]

Bill 7 — Water Amendment Act, 2025 (Schulz)

First Reading — 121 (Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 224-35 (Nov. 5, 2025 aft., adjourned), 298-307 (Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned), 351-55 (Nov. 18, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 480-93 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 536-43 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 661-63 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c27]

Bill 8 — Utilities Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Neudorf)

First Reading — 478 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 663-70 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 737-44 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 766-71 (Dec. 4, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c26]

Bill 9 — Protecting Alberta's Children Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 319-20 (Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Second Reading — 378-91 (Nov. 19, 2025 aft., adjourned), 493-501 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., adjourned), 549-54 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 676-79 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., adjourned), 815-22 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 855 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 873-80 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Third Reading — 891 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., adjourned on division), 892-900 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025; SA 2025 c24]

Bill 10 — Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Nally)

First Reading — 271 (Nov. 17, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 374-78 (Nov. 19, 2025 aft., adjourned), 514-21 (Nov. 25, 2025 eve., adjourned), 543-49 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 670-76 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 728-29 (Dec. 3, 2025 aft., adjourned), 744-45 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 789-94 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c25]

Bill 11 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (LaGrange)

First Reading — 426 (Nov. 24, 2025 , passed)

Second Reading — 555-64 (Nov. 26, 2025 eve., adjourned), 590-96 (Nov. 27, 2025 aft., adjourned), 637-46 (Dec. 1, 2025 eve., adjourned), 808-15 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 856 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 867-73 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division with amendments)

Third Reading — 913-14 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., adjourned on division), 916-22 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c21]

Bill 12 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 478 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 693-98 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., adjourned), 731-37 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 745-50 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., adjourned), 850-55 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 860-67 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c20]

Bill 13 — Regulated Professions Neutrality Act (Amery)

First Reading — 404 (Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 564-73 (Nov. 26, 2025 eve., adjourned), 629-37 (Dec. 1, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 686-92 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., adjourned), 801-08 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 cR-13.3]

Bill 14 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 763 (Dec. 4, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 794-801 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., adjourned), 844-50 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 856 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 880-87 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division with amendments)

Third Reading — 922-23 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., adjourned on division), 924-31 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c22]

Bill 15 — Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Ellis)

First Reading — 943 (Feb. 24, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 972-83 (Feb. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1141-48 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Bill 16 — Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act (Boitchenko)

First Reading — 963 (Feb. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1065-68 (Mar. 12, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1148-52 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Bill 17 — Fiscal Measures Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Horner)

First Reading — 1039 (Mar. 10, 2026 aft.)

Bill 18 — Safeguards for Last Resort Termination of Life Act (Amery)

First Reading — 1124 (Mar. 18, 2026 aft., passed)

Bill 19 — Appropriation Act, 2026 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 1140 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Bill 201 — Employment Standards (Protecting Workers' Pay) Amendment Act, 2025 (Ganley)

First Reading — 121 (Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 154-65 (Nov. 3, 2025 aft., adjourned), 274-76 (Nov. 17, 2025 aft., defeated on division)

Bill 202 — Conflicts of Interest (Ethical Governance) Amendment Act, 2025 (Kasawski)

First Reading — 248 (Nov. 6, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 276-84 (Nov. 17, 2025 aft., adjourned), 427-31 (Nov. 24, 2025 aft., defeated on division)

Bill 203 — Energy Storage Planning for Investment Act (Al-Guneid)

First Reading — 319 (Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 431-39 (Nov. 24, 2025 aft., adjourned), 608-13 (Dec. 1, 2025 aft., defeated on division)

Bill 204 — Public Interest Disclosure (Publicly Funded Health Entity Whistleblower Protection) Act (Sweet)

First Reading — 534 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 613-20 (Dec. 1, 2025 aft., adjourned), 1014-20 (Mar. 9, 2026 aft., defeated on division)

Bill 205 — Non-Disclosure Agreements Act (Johnson)

First Reading — 1129 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Bill 206 — Accessible Alberta Act (Renaud)

First Reading — 1063 (Mar. 12, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1081-94 (Mar. 16, 2026 aft., adjourned)

Table of Contents

Prayers	1127
Introduction of Guests	1127
Members' Statements	
Premier's Travel to Saudi Arabia	1127
Bill 18	1127
100e anniversaire de la Francophonie albertaine	1128
Ramadan and Eid al-Fitr	1128
Government Record	1128
Government Spending and Accountability	1128
Introduction of Bills	
Bill 205 Non-Disclosure Agreements Act	1129
Bill 19 Appropriation Act, 2026	1140
Tabling Returns and Reports	1129
Oral Question Period	
Investigation of Health Services Procurement	1129
Premier's Acceptance of Gifts and Benefits	1130, 1134
Bill 18	1132
Provincial Intelligence Service	1133
Hospital Emergency Services	1133
Recovery Community Contracts	1134
Crime and Public Safety	1135
Alberta Disability Assistance Program	1136
AISH Client Benefits	1136
Orders of the Day	1138
Committee of Supply	
Committee Reports	1138
Vote on Main Estimates 2026-27	1138
Division	1139
Transmittal of Estimates	1140
Government Motions	1140
Government Bills and Orders	
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 15 Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	1141
Bill 16 Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act	1148

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

For inquiries contact:

Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875

E-mail: AlbertaHansard@assembly.ab.ca