



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Third Session

Alberta Hansard

Monday afternoon, April 3, 2017

Day 14

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature

Third Session

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

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

Party standings:

New Democrat: 55 Wildrose: 22 Progressive Conservative: 8 Alberta Liberal: 1 Alberta Party: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

Executive Council

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

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Coolahan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Cyr	McKitrick
Dang	Taylor
Ellis	Turner
Horne	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

Carson	McPherson
Connolly	Orr
Coolahan	Piquette
Dach	Schneider
Drysdale	Schreiner
Fitzpatrick	Taylor
Gotfried	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

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

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Drever	Nixon
Ellis	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinsteuber	Woollard
Littlewood	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Cooper	Nixon
Dang	Orr
Jabbour	Piquette
Luff	Schreiner
McIver	

Select Special Ombudsman and Public Interest Commissioner Search Committee

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Mr. Malkinson

Ellis	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinsteuber	Woollard
Littlewood	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms McPherson
Deputy Chair: Connolly

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

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

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

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Cyr
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach

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

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Hunter

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

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Monday, April 3, 2017

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Good afternoon.

Let us reflect and pray, each in our own way. Let us remember those who have served our province in earlier years and who have now passed on. As current MLAs it is important that we learn from the experience of those who went before us. Let it offer guidance in order to help establish better public policy for the benefit of all Albertans.

Hon. members, as is our custom, we pay tribute to members and former members of the Assembly who have passed away since we last met. With our admiration and respect there is gratitude to members of the families who shared the burden of public office and public service.

Mr. Leonard Wendelin Mitzel
February 18, 1946, to March 19, 2017

The Speaker: Leonard (Len) Wendelin Mitzel was with us from February 18, 1946, to March 19, 2017. Mr. Len Mitzel served Albertans for many years in many ways. His first foray into public office was as a councillor and then reeve for the county of Forty Mile. Mr. Mitzel then served two terms as the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat from 2004 until 2012. During his second term he served as Deputy Chair of Committees, 2008 to 2011, and parliamentary assistant for Transportation, 2011 to 2012.

Mr. Mitzel remained an active voice for southeastern Alberta, promoting area businesses and tourism, developing water usage strategies, and mentoring participation in local government. Mr. Mitzel's dedication to southeastern Alberta continued to the very end, with his last major contribution to the region coming in this past year with the opening of a short-line railway to help farmers move their products to market. I personally knew Mr. Mitzel and saw in real terms his contribution to the community.

In a moment of silent reflection I ask you to remember Mr. Mitzel as you may have known him.

Hon. members and ladies and gentlemen, we will now be led in the singing of the national anthem by Mr. Robert Clark. I would invite all to participate in the language of their choice.

Hon. Members:

O Canada, our home and native land!
True patriot love in all thy sons command.
Car ton bras sait porter l'épée,
Il sait porter la croix!
Ton histoire est une épopée
Des plus brillants exploits.
God keep our land glorious and free!
O Canada, we stand on guard for thee.
O Canada, we stand on guard for thee.

The Speaker: Thank you. Please be seated.

Introduction of Visitors

The Speaker: Hon. members, with our admiration, respect, and gratitude to the members of the family who shared the burden of public office and public service, today I would like to welcome members of the Mitzel family who are present in the Speaker's

gallery. Please rise as I call your name and remain standing until all have been introduced: Lara Mitzel-Smith, daughter of Mr. Mitzel; Karra Smith, granddaughter of Mr. Mitzel; Dixie Haughton, family friend of Mr. Mitzel; Terry Toth, family friend of Mr. Mitzel; and Laurie Toth, family friend of Mr. Mitzel. Welcome. We're pleased you can be with us today.

Introduction of Guests

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

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this House a school that resides in my riding. I have to say that St. Dominic school is a fair representative of what we have for schoolkids because, I will tell you, the questions they asked me downstairs were incredibly thoughtful. I'm glad to hear that they liked our mock Legislature. I would like to welcome the teachers and the chaperones – if they could stand first, please – Chantel, Benoit, Liz, Cindy, Erica, Trevor, Jessica, and Kyla. Thank you for bringing these children to the House. We really thank you for it. Now, if the rest of the kids can stand, we can acknowledge you through the House and welcome you to this great Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Are there any other school groups, hon. members?
The Minister of Seniors and Housing.

Ms Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my privilege to rise today to introduce to you and through you Betty Henderson, Nelson Modin, and his wife, Hazel Modin. They are proud family members of Alice Modin. Betty is her daughter, and Nelson is her son. In 1985 Alice Modin campaigned for Alberta's first Seniors' Day, which paved the way for the now province-wide Seniors' Week. In honour of her contribution to Alberta the minister's seniors' service awards will now include the Alice Modin award to annually recognize a senior who provides outstanding service to their community. Alice's contributions were felt both locally and across the province, and it is my honour to have her family here today. I would ask them to please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Strathcona-Sherwood Park.

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly two representatives from Strathcona county Economic Development and Tourism, Shane Olson, acting director, and Sean McRitchie, manager of industrial development. Through their department Shane and Sean strive to support a strong, diversified, and resilient economy while balancing social responsibility and environmental stewardship. I would ask my guests to stand and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

1:40

Dr. Swann: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to introduce to you and to the rest of the House the newly elected executive and the interim executive director of the Council of Alberta University Students, or CAUS. CAUS represents over 100,000 undergraduate students from the universities of Alberta, Calgary, Lethbridge, Mount Royal, and MacEwan. They're in Edmonton this week for their annual advocacy week, meeting with

MLAs and their staff to advocate on issues of fairness and transparency in the postsecondary system. I ask them to rise as I say their names and be warmly welcomed by the House: Hailey Babb, Branden Cave, Reed Larsen, Stephanie Nedoshytko, Conner Peta, Parvin Sedighi, Shubir Shaikh, Whitney Hunter, Camilo Gil, and Josh McKeown. Let's give them the warm welcome of the Legislature.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Bow.

Drever: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to introduce to you and through you Shifrah Gadamssetti and Dexter Bruneau. Shifrah is the current president of the Students' Association of Mount Royal University. She graduated from MRU with a degree in nursing and is now a practising RN. She decided to continue her education at MRU and is pursuing a degree in sociology with a minor in women's studies. One of her biggest projects this year is to push for a campus sexual assault policy, which I think is very important. Dexter is the current vice-president external of the Students' Association of Mount Royal University as well as the chair of the Council of Alberta University Students, CAUS. He will be graduating this spring with a degree in criminal justice, honours. One of Dexter's biggest projects this year is the execution of SAMRU's Student Connect event. I ask that my guests please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

Ms McKittrick: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce to you and through you to members of the Assembly Chris and Laura Grant. Both are avid cyclists, as you know I am, and work to promote safe cycling in the community. Together they created Alberta Bike Swap, a safe place to buy, sell, and donate bikes across the province. The next event is in Edmonton on May 13 at Northlands, and I'd ask members to look at the Alberta Bike Swap website to find details. Chris and Laura are positive, empowering community builders who believe in labours of love, who inspire those around them, and who have worked very hard to keep cyclists safe in our communities. I would ask them to stand to receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The Minister of Labour and minister responsible for democratic renewal.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly some of the province's best field hockey players from the Edmonton region: Brien Murphy, Robin Virk and his father, Harsohail Parmar and his parents. They are here to celebrate players who've been selected to join Canada's men's junior developmental squad. I'd also like to recognize Canada's men's field hockey team as they have advanced to the world league semifinals after a top-two finish at world league round 2 in Trinidad and Tobago.

I'd like to add that Field Hockey Alberta is hosting a try-it event in my wonderful constituency of Edmonton-Mill Woods tomorrow for anyone who wants to get out and get a little active in the evening.

I thank everyone for joining us today and now ask them to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Culture and Tourism.

Miranda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly some leaders and coaches in the sport of field hockey in our great province. Field hockey is the second most played sport in the world, played in 112 countries. In Alberta the sport is flourishing, with junior programs, provincial teams, and school programs popping up across the province. Recently Field Hockey Canada announced the men's junior development squad as it begins the journey to the 2020 world junior cup. Today we are joined by Peadar O'Riain, president of the field hockey association of Alberta; Burgundy Biletski, women's indoor national team 2005, 2007, and 2014 and executive director of Field Hockey Alberta; Jagdish Singh Dhaliwal, head coach King's XI hockey club; and Dilpal Singh Seehra, coach of Hawks Hockey Academy in Calgary. I would ask them to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Welcome.

The hon. Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my honour and pleasure to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly also field hockey players from Calgary who have been named to the 2017 junior development squad. First, from Kings XI field hockey club I welcome Avi Dhaliwal, Shazab Shahzad, Parmvir Sidhu, Tanveer Singh Kullar, Harjot Dhaliwal, Jaskarn Dhaliwal. Second, from Hawks Field Hockey Academy I welcome Dildeep Seehra and Tanvir Kang. I hope all members will join me in congratulating them all on this tremendous accomplishment. Joining them is also my constituency manager, Roop Rai. I now ask all my guests to rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this House.

The Speaker: Welcome.

Members' Statements

Vriend Decision Anniversary and LGBTQ Rights

Connolly: Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 19th anniversary of the Supreme Court of Canada's Vriend decision, which marks a crucial moment for human rights and equality in Alberta. Delwin Vriend worked for years as a chemistry instructor. He also happened to be gay. He was fired from his job solely because he was gay. For seven years Mr. Vriend fought for his rights, taking his case all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. The court found that our Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects everyone from workplace discrimination, no matter their sexual orientation. As a result, the court ordered that sexual orientation be read into Alberta's human rights legislation. It was a victory for Delwin Vriend and for us all as it expanded the legal human rights protection of every Albertan.

Mr. Speaker, some in our province denounced the decision. The PCs contemplated using the Constitution's notwithstanding clause so that discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation would be legal. Thankfully, wiser heads prevailed. But not everyone welcomed that. As an MP Jason Kenney spoke out constantly against the Vriend decision. In Parliament he stated the usual excuse that the human rights of LGBTQ-plus Canadians should be lower on the roster than others. He smeared the decision-making of the highest judiciary in the country.

But he went further than simply slamming the equal rights of all. Mr. Kenney said that protecting the human rights of LGBTQ-plus people, quote, opens the window for a provincial, populist party with conservative values. He called for a new party with far-right,

anti-LGBTQ ideology. I wonder where Albertans have seen that before, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud that 19 years later, this government protects the human rights of all Albertans regardless of their identity. I am also ecstatically proud that those social conservative voices of the 1990s are not in government today. Let us celebrate how far we've come as a province and a country, when everyone can fully participate rather than be cast aside.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Highwood.

Okotoks Water Supply

Mr. W. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An urgent issue affecting residents of Okotoks that has been brought up and postponed time and time again due to this government's inefficiency is the challenge of the devastating water shortage in the community. Since 2015 municipal representatives and I have urged this government to collaborate to fix the shortage of water that has been precipitated by the rapid and dramatic growth this community has seen in the past decade. We've sent letters and even brought the critical nature of this issue up in this House last year.

The prebudget water pipeline proposal that was required was sent to the Premier, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the Minister of Transportation. This project has been shovel ready now for several years, and due to the inactivity and denial from this government our community is unable to move forward with this critical infrastructure project, resulting in the inability to attract investors and encourage established businesses, in essence stifling community growth.

This government has been aware that since 2002 the town of Okotoks has taken very aggressive environmental action pertaining to the conservation and the management of their water resources. They also now, due to the town's effort, have been recognized by various agencies and associations. Just recently Okotoks town management received a 2015 FCM sustainable communities award.

1:50

But it seems that these environmental stewards have not been recognized for their efforts and have had barriers presented to them each and every time they've met with this government. This government has been playing games by changing the rules and have not recognized this community for their efforts to comply with this government's wish list.

This government has received sufficient funding from their federal counterparts for exactly these types of water projects, but more accurately there is still about \$60 million that has not been allocated from the federal clean water, waste water fund. This government is obligated to provide Okotoks with the resources they not only deserve but they desperately need. Do the right thing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition.

Government Policies

Mr. Jean: It was another busy week for the Premier, pitting herself as the leading opponent to the most pro oil and gas jurisdiction in Canada. If the Premier is so concerned about Saskatchewan sending letters, here's some free advice she can – can consider. Sorry, Mr. Speaker. This is just so shocking, given she has seen Albertans – actually, she had over 81,000 jobs. I just can't get it out. She should

try some things. Here are some recommendations: stop attacking energy and agriculture; stop the labour review; stop, reverse, and repeal the NDP tax increases; stop shutting down coal; and stop suing Alberta power companies. Now, does the Premier think any of these might be good ideas to stop my stuttering and to stop Alberta shedding jobs?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I do think is a good idea is that as Premier of the province I'm going to promote Alberta. I'm going to stand up for Alberta. I'm going to stand up for why Alberta is a place people should come to, for the fact that we have the lowest taxes in the country, by \$8.7 billion compared to the next closest jurisdiction, and for the fact that Calgary is a great place to grow and start and build a business and that people shouldn't be leaving them. You know what? My minister of economic development is not in Saskatchewan learning lessons from somebody trying to steal jobs from Alberta. That's right.

An Hon. Member: Point of order.

Mr. Jean: Well, it sure would be nice, Mr. Speaker, to see the Premier get as angry about Quebec attacking the pipelines we need as she does about the Saskatchewan budget. It would be helpful, indeed.

Alberta now saw another multinational actually leave Alberta and wave goodbye to our province. ConocoPhillips now sees the United States as a better place to invest than Alberta is. The fact is that under this Premier we've lost thousands of head office jobs in Calgary, and 30 per cent of downtown Calgary is vacant, Mr. Speaker. How can the Premier not understand that her policies have had a direct hand in pushing businesses out of Alberta and into other jurisdictions?

Ms Notley: Well, again, you know, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite seems very, very interested in cheerleading for Alberta's demise, and I really believe that that ought to stop. Now, the fact of the matter is that we've had two excellent homegrown companies expand their investment in the oil sands on behalf of all Albertans. I'm so proud of that, and I'm very happy to be able to work with them as we move forward in building a responsible, sustainable, modern, progressive oil and gas industry that can compete for years to come throughout the world.

Mr. Jean: Mr. Speaker, just wait. You haven't seen anything yet. They're only two years into their mandate, and she should be more worried about other places than just Saskatchewan. Like it or not, the United States is our number one competitor and has no carbon tax, is building lots of pipelines, and is stripping down costly, inefficient regulations for energy companies. Now, we are talking about tens of billions of dollars of investment that is either leaving Alberta or is simply not coming our way and should be. Does the Premier not believe this is a serious problem, or will she just keep taxing and regulating Alberta businesses out of existence?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, the consolidation and reorganization within the oil sands that the member opposite is Chicken Little-ing over right now is actually something that makes the business more efficient and more productive over the long haul. Let me just quote from the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, what they believe about the deal that the member opposite is so worried about: this deal signals a strong, long-term view of the value of Canada's oil and natural gas assets; among our competitors for global oil

supply Canada leads in energy security, regulatory stringency, and environmental protection.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.
Second main question.

Power Purchase Arrangements and the Balancing Pool

Mr. Jean: One way that this Premier likes to try and get rid of a problem is just to pile up debt. We've seen that, Mr. Speaker. There's no better example than the absolute debacle of their boneheaded policies with our electricity grid. Before the NDP the Balancing Pool had a \$700 million surplus. Now because of the NDP and their mismanagement it is set to cost Albertans over \$4 billion. Yes, \$4 billion. That's more than what the NDP plans to scoop up from the carbon tax. How many more billions of dollars of debt will this Premier borrow to pay for her costly and failed electricity experiments?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, as is rather usual with the member opposite, he's taken a number and then grown it by – I don't know – 400 or 500 per cent, whatever he pulled out of the hat at that particular time. In terms of the work that we've done with the Balancing Pool, if we had not acted, average families would be forced to pay charges as high as \$8.40 per month, and we kept those charges to 67 cents per month. That's because our government is focused on ensuring affordability for Albertans, predictability for Albertans, standing up for Albertans, and having their backs when the members opposite go ahead and sign a bad deal that throws Albertans under the bus.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Mr. Jean: Let me explain to the Premier and her cabinet why it's their fault. They raised taxes on power producers without any consultation. NDP mistakes mean that instead of getting big rebates from the Balancing Pool, Albertans are now on the hook for borrowing billions of dollars for electricity losses as a result of the NDP government's decision. This NDP government keeps trying to mislead Albertans that their green experiments won't hurt Albertans. Well, they are wrong. They're clearly wrong. I'll ask again: how many billions of dollars of debt will Albertans have to pay for over the next decade because of NDP negligence?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems the members opposite really cannot restrain themselves from mansplaining to members on the other side, I gotta tell you. Let me just go over there and say to them that the fact of the matter is that a deal was signed, and it was a bad deal. It was a bad deal for Alberta consumers and for Alberta taxpayers. Those folks over there want to stand up to defend that bad deal, and they want to make sure that Albertans pay billions of dollars as a result of that bad deal. What our government did is that we said: "You know what? We were elected by Albertans. We were elected to represent consumers. We were elected to represent investors."

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. Premier.

Mr. Jean: Mr. Speaker, this is a multibillion-dollar screw-up that will cost Albertans big time for years and years. In November the Premier said that she was reasonably close to reaching a deal with Calgary-owned Enmax after trying to rip up their 16-year-old contract. It's been crickets since then, and the Premier wonders why she has a hard time getting any investment to Alberta. Well, will the Premier tell Albertans why her government is still suing Calgary-

owned Enmax and how much this court case is going to cost Albertans suing Enmax to sue other Albertans?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, we were very pleased as part of the work that we did last fall to be able to enter into agreements with three of the four power companies that were impacted by the matter that the member opposite identifies. As well, we're continuing to work to support and protect consumers. That's why we put a cap on electricity prices, and that's why we are moving forward to ensure that Alberta consumers are protected. We will not apologize for that.

The Speaker: Third main question.

Mr. Jean: Let's be clear, Mr. Speaker. A cap equals higher taxes.

AIMCo Governance

Mr. Jean: There are few files as important to Alberta's financial future and security as AIMCo, but under the NDP's watch they are slowly eroding AIMCo's arm's-length independence from this government. Previously individuals appointed to AIMCo's board had to have proven expertise in investment management, finance, accounting and law, or experience as an executive or director in a senior publicly traded company. Why did the Premier repeal these excellent requirements to oversee a fund worth over \$80 billion, \$90 billion?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member opposite ought to probably judge us by our actions. For instance, we've recently appointed to AIMCo Mr. Ken Kroner, who was previously a managing director of a fund that managed more than \$4 trillion in assets – I'm pretty sure that meets the criteria the member opposite is talking about – and Phyllis Clark, formerly the vice-president and CFO of the University of Alberta and currently on the board of the Bank of Canada. These are the kinds of folks that we think will make sure that they can make the right decisions on behalf of the people of Alberta, who we've asked them to work for, with their independent judgement.

2:00

Mr. Jean: It isn't just the fact that the NDP has chosen to get rid of two key sections of AIMCo's regulations; it's about how they actually went about doing it, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the AIMCo CEO told the legislative committee that "these recent changes to the AIMCo regulation actually did come as a surprise to us and, frankly, not a welcome surprise." This isn't conjecture. He is the person ultimately responsible for AIMCo. Will the Premier listen to the valid concerns that have been raised and bring back these rules, which actually protected Albertans and Albertans' money?

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will listen to the concerns, and in fact I'll quote them back to the member opposite. I quote from that person:

I would not sit here and look this group in the eye if [I] were being compromised in terms of our independence in investment decision-making ... it is a line that this government has not crossed. I would be the first to tell you if they [ever] did.

Mr. Jean: Well, here's your opportunity to do so. Newly obtained FOIP documents show just how in over its head the NDP is with AIMCo. They reveal ongoing political interference into AIMCo and political staff ignoring warnings from AIMCo's employees about major mishandling of sensitive files. This is terrible, Mr. Speaker. When the Premier's staff attempt to tell AIMCo employees how to do their jobs, they jeopardize the independence

of this corporation. Will the Premier commit to putting an end to her spin doctors interfering in AIMCo's business? Yes or no?

Ms Notley: Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely appropriate for the government of Alberta to consult with its agencies, boards, and commissions on things that they communicate, and that's exactly what we did and what we will continue to do.

But on the issue of investment integrity let me just say again to the member the following: "I would not sit here and look this group in the eye if we were being compromised in terms of our independence in investment decision-making." That is from the chair of AIMCo answering questions of the members opposite. They just don't like the answers, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The leader of the third party.

Mr. McIver: Thank you. We just heard the NDP textbook: five bad quotes, and they only read the one good one that they can find.

Investment in Alberta and Job Creation

Mr. McIver: Mr. Speaker, our future prosperity is based on confidence. Investors risk their capital when they have confidence of a reasonable chance of return on their investment, called profit, which is not a four-letter word. Investors once flocked to our province to invest in the oil sands, and with this confidence came billions of dollars and thousands of jobs. Well, the multinationals have spoken with their feet by leaving. To the Premier. ConocoPhillips is the most recent of the departed, with their vote of nonconfidence in you and your government. When will you reverse your course on these policies that . . .

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've already identified, I think it's fair to say that CNRL and Cenovus, two excellent Alberta-based companies, have a great deal of confidence in the oil and gas sector, and I'm very proud that they have more confidence than the members opposite, who seem to revel in cheerleading this notion of telling a sad story. But you know what? That's not how you attract investment to Alberta. Thankfully, we're the ones that are doing just that.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. McIver: Thank you. The companies the Premier named earned most of their money when we didn't have a socialist government in Alberta.

I believe that reality escapes all of us, but it does on a regular basis escape this government. To the Premier. You talk about job creation with all your grant programs and subsidies, but why don't you reduce impediments to job creation and let the free market do what it did so very well before you and your ministers were getting in the way of creating jobs and investment in Alberta?

Ms Notley: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that our government is working very carefully, very aggressively, and with a tremendous amount of energy on stimulating the economy, growing the number of jobs, and having Albertans' backs at this difficult time. We are not going to make a bad situation worse. We are going to reverse the previous trends, and what we are going to do is have Albertans' backs. We're going to support their families, we're going to support their pocketbook, and we're going to support job creation. That's why Alberta is the fastest growing economy in the country this year.

Mr. McIver: After killing the economy for two straight years, it's no wonder it's getting up off the mat right now, and no thanks to you, Premier.

This government has been overburdening industry with regulations and taxes and then turning around to offer grants and incentives to undo the damage that their taxes have caused to industry and caused to homeowners. To the Premier: with the crisis of confidence in an NDP Alberta as a place to invest, will you commit to taking a look at the challenges that both businesses and families are facing under your increasing tax burden, increasing regulation, increasing bad policy? Will you actually think about Albertans for once?

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

Ms Notley: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the member opposite must have missed the survey that came out that talked about how small businesses actually have an increase in confidence just right now. So that's good news. The other thing is the Conference Board of Canada suggesting that Alberta will lead the growth throughout the whole country in 2017, and the TD Bank actually said that as a result of the budget that we tabled just a couple of weeks ago, Alberta will grow and lead the rest of the country because we are stimulating the economy. That's what we're doing to grow the economy.

Saskatchewan's Fiscal Policies

Mr. Fildebrandt: When Saskatchewan released its budget, our Premier hastily called a news conference to prophesy of the woes that will befall our eastern neighbours if, God forbid, they ever balance the budget. She warned of the calamity that would befall Gainer the Gopher if the government didn't operate money-losing bus companies anymore. But when the federal government released its budget . . .

Mr. Mason: Point of order.

Mr. Fildebrandt: . . . with \$372 million for Bombardier, \$200 million for Ford, and nothing but equalization rip-offs for Alberta, silence. Let me ask the Premier: what's more important for Alberta, Saskatchewan's budget or the federal budget?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you very much. You know, we had a choice in this province, of course. We were going to support Albertans, we were going to make sure that investments occurred across this province, and we are going to diversify our economy. Now, Saskatchewan has taken the opposite approach. They are cutting back programs and services. They are making it tougher for their citizens. We're not doing that. We've got the backs of Albertans. They're leaving their citizens to drift.

Mr. Fildebrandt: April Fool's Day is over, Mr. Speaker.

Brad Wall has been undoing the legacy of the NDP in his province for a decade, building a Saskatchewan advantage. Since the NDP launched their attack on free enterprise two years ago, our comparative Alberta advantage has declined. But Saskatchewan is only able to woo Alberta businesses because of the less than welcoming business environment created by the NDP. Rather than complain about businesses potentially moving to Saskatchewan, why doesn't this government focus on making sure that businesses want to stay in Alberta?

Mr. Ceci: Thank you very much for the question. You know, this province is focused on supporting Alberta companies and Albertans. In Saskatchewan they're taking a different approach. They're making it far tougher. TD Economics said that our budget is going to have a stimulative effect and impact on Alberta. Theirs is going to have restrictions. They're not stimulating their economy. We're doing those things that will put us in better shape when we come out of this recession, and we are, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Saskatchewan is right to build their own competitive advantage but has exceeded that in offering subsidies that we believe may be in violation of the New West Partnership. The partnership should be respected by all provinces, but the NDP have twice lost in court for violations of internal trade law when they imposed tariffs on out-of-province beers. Now they provide direct subsidies to brewers strikingly similar to the kind they are accusing Saskatchewan of proposing. Does this government's repeated violation of the partnership help to justify what Saskatchewan is doing? [interjections]

2:10

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Ceci: First, with regard to the injunction regarding beer, that's before the courts, so that's not really something that's subject to discussion here. [interjections]

I want to tell you other things Saskatchewan is doing. [interjections]

The Speaker: Please stop the clock. I cannot hear the minister speaking. Stop the clock. [interjections] Hon. members.

Start the clock.
Please proceed.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, the recent budget in Saskatchewan had the impact of raising about a 6 per cent tax increase on construction projects there. If that doesn't stop projects, I don't know what will. You know, they're not growing jobs in Saskatchewan. We're growing jobs in this province. We've come back 20,000 jobs since . . .

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. minister.

Hon. members, spring has sprung. Let's all try and keep it down. Handle your energy a little more constructively.

Gay-straight Alliances in Schools

Cortes-Vargas: The new leader of the Conservatives has stated that his preference is to take away the privacy of students given that he wants to immediately notify parents if their child enrolls in a GSA. Outing them could be devastating when forming a healthy identity. Albertans are worried about this far-right ideology that could negatively define these groups moving forward. To the Minister of Education: how will this government assure LGBTQ-plus students that their hard-fought GSA will continue to be a compassionate and safe space for them?

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you so much for the question. I have made it clear that schools in Alberta must obey the law. The law ensures that students have the right to feel safe and welcome in school and that they have the right to form gay-straight alliances and name them as such. As minister I have been working with school boards, encouraged by the progress we've made. We

know that there's more work to be done, but certainly the vast majority of Albertans are on the side of our children.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me be very clear. GSAs save lives.

Given that LGBTQ-plus students are at higher risk for suicidal ideation and are more likely to experience youth homelessness, to the same minister: what does the evidence show about the impacts of GSAs in schools?

Mr. Eggen: Well, Mr. Speaker, we know that GSAs provide safe spaces for students to talk through experiences and to find support from their peers. We know as well that GSAs provide leadership opportunities and reduce homophobic and transphobic discrimination in schools. Unlike the leader of the Conservative opposition, our government does not out students. We support students in GSAs, and we're going to keep it that way.

Mr. Rodney: Point of order.

The Speaker: I think there was a point of order that was made. Your second supplemental.

Cortes-Vargas: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that in Alberta in over 2,000 schools there are only about 150 GSAs and given that this kind of archaic discussion perpetuates the shame for kids that come out bravely, this is disgraceful. To the same minister: what kind of resources are available to Albertan students looking to form GSAs?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our ministry has already shared several resources with school authorities to provide supports in creating safe and caring learning environments for LGBTQ students. There will be more coming forward in the coming weeks. Students can reach out directly to the staff in our ministry at studentsupport@gov.ab.ca.

Thank you.

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

Alberta Hospital Edmonton

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Wildrose have received another letter from a psychiatrist at Alberta Hospital Edmonton rebutting the arguments that there will be 37 new mental health beds to compensate for the closures at the hospital. According to the front-line workers 12 of those beds are reopening after renovations, and the 15 transitional beds are not an adequate level of care for those currently in specialized beds. In total, 20 beds are being closed down, with no new beds suitable for those vulnerable patients. Will the Health minister listen to the front-line workers and reverse this decision?

The Speaker: The Minister of Health.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have to update the member. He's acting with outdated information. The letter he received, I believe, was dated March 22. I did meet with the front-line physicians, including the president of the Medical Association at the site on March 24. On the 31st we also had subsequent conversations. We're going to keep working with them in making sure that they're working with Alberta Health Services as opposed

to proposing deep, \$9 billion cuts and operational cuts on the other side of the House. We know what would happen with health care under the members opposite.

Mr. Smith: The minister previously stated that she'd provide transitional beds in the community and at the Royal Alex. The front-line workers dispute that, saying: to propose that transitional placements in the community provide the same level of care as the ALC unit and are therefore interchangeable is a gross misjudgment and can lead to tragic outcomes. Given that the psychiatrists have extended an invitation to meet with the minister and to date have received no response up until now, can the minister tell us if she is willing to reverse the call that she has made?

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

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I tried to help the member catch up in the first answer. We did meet on the 24th at the facility itself. This isn't how AHS is going to align their resources, but I've made it very clear that as long as there's an NDP government in Alberta, there will be Alberta Hospital Edmonton.

We know what's going to happen if the members opposite get their hands on health care. They're proposing deep, deep cuts. We saw what happened under others who had a deep ideology of cuts. Deep cuts, brutal cuts: we know that's all that the members opposite are proposing. We're standing up for front-line health care. I'm happy to engage with those health care providers, and I've done so. Time to catch up.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the minister maintains that she wants to treat staff at Alberta hospitals with respect and since she's responsible for the staff at AHS and given that the psychiatrists at the hospital state that a sickening culture of staff intimidation at AHS management requires that those of us who chose to advocate for our vulnerable patients remain anonymous and since the minister has stated that health professionals have every right and responsibility to advocate for their patients, when will this minister match her rhetoric with actions to promote a collaborative work environment dedicated to first-class patient care?

Ms Hoffman: So anonymous, Mr. Speaker, that we sat down and had a face-to-face meeting. I have to say that the member opposite is very wrong with his assertions that he's making today. We are proud to support health care in all parts of our province, including Alberta Hospital Edmonton. Guess what? We're putting our money where our mouth is not only in our own ridings but in the members opposite's ridings as well. Which facilities do they want us to cut? Important investments that we're making in the Strathmore hospital, the Brooks hospital, Ponoka? The list goes on. Enough is enough, you guys. Stop talking out of both sides of your mouth. [interjections]

The Speaker: Hon. members, I'm not able to determine who particularly it was, but we're all hon. members. I heard someone say a couple of times: tell the truth. [interjections] Excuse me. I want to caution all of you that if there is anybody saying that, I'm expecting as hon. members that you will no longer say that.

The Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Pulse Crops and Soil Health

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Growing pulse crops is good for soil health. Peas, lentils, beans, and chickpeas are not only

highly nutritious but are also a profitable crop for farmers who grow them. Many consumers in the U.S. and Canada are unfamiliar with the great taste, nutrition, and versatility of pulses. Pulse Canada has been working with the media to generate attention for pulses and increase demand. To the minister of agriculture: what are you doing to support Alberta pulse crops' market development?

2:20

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

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the hon. member for the question. Just to update him and the House, I was very recently on a trade mission to India. We were able to promote the good crops that pulses are. At the same time we were able to advocate for an issue they had around fumigation. I'd like the member to know and the House to know that the federal government has now negotiated a three-month deal on that operation, so we don't have to worry about the fumigation issue going forward. But I continue promoting pulses as the good crops that they are for all Albertans and for the world.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that farmers can benefit agronomically as well as economically from bringing lentils into their crop rotation and given that the biggest winner in the practice is the environment because legume crops like lentils can fix nitrogen and given that this can reduce nitrogen fertilizer application and further reduce farmers' carbon footprint, to the minister: how are you encouraging farmers to rotate lentils into their crops?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the member for the question. He's absolutely right. The more pulses can grow, the more we can get nitrogen into the soil. I'm happy to work with Alberta Canola on their plan of continuing to grow that crop. It's a fact that Canada is the second-largest producer of pulses in the world. Alberta is one of the world's largest producers of yellow and green peas. That's a market that continues to grow, as our market continues to grow. We're very happy to promote that for our producers and for the health of all Albertans.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that farmers want to grow healthy and high-yielding crops and given that it is increasingly important for farmers to know more and more about their soil so that they continue to grow them and given that what's grown in the soil has received decades of research but what's actually in the soil and how to improve soil health has much yet to be discovered, to the minister: how are you working to help farmers better understand soil biological function so they can have the knowledge and information to improve it?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the member for the question. I've had the opportunity to talk to many farmers across the province. One young farmer in particular really stuck out at a Hutterite colony. His interest and knowledge of soil science was magnificent. I think there at the farmer level they're very interested in the health of their soil as it would contribute to the health of their crops. We continue to work with department people and producers

across the province on continuing that healthy soil so they can continue with healthy crops.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Education Ministry Online Student Resources

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Department of Education provides is access to online resources for students, which is extremely important. Over the past couple of weeks we've seen several instances where content linked to the Alberta Education website is clearly inappropriate for students, containing graphic and sexual content. Yes, kids can find anything on the Internet, but Alberta Education shouldn't play a part by condoning inappropriate content. Does this minister recognize that this is a problem, and will he apologize to parents?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. Yes, I believe that the member is talking about an incident that took place a few weeks ago, and at the very moment that we found this link, which was several steps removed, we had the people take it down. It's very important that we are working with our schools and our school board and our ministry together. Online is a very important way by which we communicate information, and we have to make sure that the integrity is intact.

Thank you.

Mrs. Aheer: I agree about the integrity. There have actually been more links since.

When it comes to our kids, resources that Alberta Education approves matter. Given that the NDP government pulled down the link from the Facebook page with the content that was not appropriate for students, with articles about sexual positions and other explicit material, and given that there are still links to the material that no parent would say is appropriate for kids, especially elementary school-age children, through the Alberta Education website, will the minister tell parents whose fault this is, why no one is monitoring this, and who is going to be held accountable?

The Speaker: The Minister of Education.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, as I said, the incident that was initially brought up we dealt with immediately. I believe it was a link to a link, and then it was an open-forum community sort of thing. Certainly, we have worked to address this, and if the hon. member has any other specific issues, she should make sure that she brings it to our attention because we can deal with it.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you. Providing supports to all students is imperative, but giving students access to explicit content is wrong. The minister knows it, and – believe me – parents know it. Given the mandate for the education system to promote safe and caring spaces and given that we have seen that no changes have been made to ensure that Alberta Education monitors the site so that it does contain links with appropriate content, will the minister please tell Albertans when this will be fixed, and if it won't be fixed, why not?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Eggen: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, as I had outlined in my first two replies, we dealt with this in an expeditious manner, and we will. If I can get information from the individual member, I would be happy to pursue that as well. You know, we work hard to make sure that we provide a safe and caring environment for all of our students, including having gay-straight alliances in our schools and not talking about outing students in those same very vulnerable situations. So I think we've got some pretty solid ground to stand on, and we're proud of the work that we do in education.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Highwood.

Postsecondary Institutions' Capital Funding

Mr. W. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I address this question to the Minister of Advanced Education. A few weeks ago, during discussions regarding supplementary budget, I inquired as to the financing of a power plant upgrade at a public institution and why for this capital project the funds were coming from the environment ministry. For the record can you elaborate as to why the environment ministry is funding capital projects for public institutions and not from Infrastructure as per their mandate?

The Speaker: The Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the member opposite is referring to upgrades in energy efficiency measures undertaken at Mount Royal University, efficiency measures that we're proud to make investments in as the government of Alberta. Of course, the members opposite want to bury their heads in the sand when it comes to dealing with climate change. They refuse to do anything about it. Our government is taking action, and our public institutions are leading the way, showing Albertans how to deal with improving energy efficiency in dealing with climate change.

Mr. W. Anderson: Oh, boy. Given that the funds are coming from environment line item Climate Change and Emissions Management Fund and since this project is merely an upgrade and not some nebulous green project, again, why is the environment ministry funding capital projects for public institutions?

The Speaker: The Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, the money is going to improving energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions at our universities. I find it odd that the members opposite are working themselves into a swivet over investing money in green infrastructure and energy efficiency. That just shows the people of Alberta that they are opposed to taking action on climate change, they are opposed to energy efficiency measures, and that, given the chance, they would destroy everything this government is doing.

Mr. W. Anderson: I won't say anything about the truth. Given that it seems that Environment is now responsible for funding public institutions' capital projects and not Infrastructure, as per its mandate, is the carbon tax slush fund simply meant to provide money to backstop this government's mismanagement of their capital projects, and can this or any minister explain to the taxpayers of Alberta why this is so and come clean about the wealth transfer tax grab?

Mr. Schmidt: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, whether or not you believe that the climate is changing due to human impacts on the planet . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Quiet.

Mr. Schmidt: . . . I think we should all agree that investing in energy efficiency is good for everybody, Mr. Speaker. Those energy efficiency measures will save the taxpayers of Alberta millions of dollars over the next few years. The member opposite should hang his head in shame the next time he lectures us on being financially responsible.

The Speaker: Please, do we have representatives of universities here today? Welcome.

The hon. Member for Calgary-West.

Finance Minister's Attendance at Heritage Fund Committee Meetings

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the March 8 meeting of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund the chair, at the request of the members, said that he would send the minister a direct invitation to attend the next meeting, and given that the committee chair and the Finance minister can co-ordinate schedules to determine a day that works for both the committee and the minister, to the committee chair: will you commit today to schedule the next committee meeting on a date that allows the minister to be present?

2:30

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's being scheduled right now, so we will try and do that. There's a standing . . .

An Hon. Member: Yes or no?

Mr. Coolahan: It's possible. It's possible.

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

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Chair. Given that at the March 8 meeting of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee members were so confused about conflicting messages from Treasury Board and AIMCo that they requested that the minister attend their next meeting and given that we have just heard that the committee chair may co-ordinate an acceptable meeting date with the minister in good faith, to the Minister of Finance: will you commit to attending the next meeting of the Standing Committee on Alberta's Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

Mr. Ceci: You know, Mr. Speaker, I want to just clarify. There is no confusion at all. I just want to say that the standing committee heard from Mr. Uebelein, who said: "I do want to reinforce that at present our independence in investment decision-making, as I think I reassure you at every quarterly meeting, has not been encumbered in any way." There's no confusion between administration at Treasury Board and AIMCo.

The Speaker: Hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Smoky . . . [interjections] I'm trying to make another point to another member.

The volume is getting excessive at times, hon. member. I'd ask that you contain it.

Second supplemental.

Mr. Ellis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that whether the minister will commit to attending a meeting is really a yes or no answer and

given that this is my third try for an answer to a very direct and important question for all Albertans, Minister of Finance, will you or will you not attend the next heritage trust fund committee meeting?

Mr. Ceci: You know, Mr. Speaker, all Albertans get it, that there is no confusion. The only ones who are confused are that side of the House. I've stood up and said that Mr. Uebelein believes . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Thank you.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you. I've stood up several times and said that Mr. Uebelein is not concerned about any independence being taken away from them. The government of Alberta supports AIMCo at every turn, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

The Speaker: Member for Calgary-Hays, keep your volume down.

Mr. McIver: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Health Services for Migrant Workers and Children

Loyola: Mr. Speaker, this government has shown a strong commitment to protecting the rights of all Albertans regardless of where they come from. However, residents in my constituency of Edmonton-Ellerslie have raised concerns for the health and wellness of Canadian-born children of migrant undocumented parents. Given that access to health care is a fundamental human right, to the Minister of Health: what coverage is available for these Canadian-born children?

The Speaker: The Minister of Health.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the very important question. As of January 2016 our government extended full Alberta health insurance coverage to include Canadian-born children of migrant workers. We understand Alberta residency guidelines, and we want to make sure that these young Albertans, who were born in the province, are properly insured and that their parents don't have to worry about their health care. It's important to us that we make their lives better.

The Speaker: First supplemental.

Loyola: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the minister has confirmed that these children are covered by Alberta health care, what steps can be taken to ensure that migrant undocumented workers are aware of this coverage?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and to the member for his advocacy on this matter and his engagement with those who share those very concerns. Recognizing that language and cultural barriers can be a significant issue, we continue to develop information in multiple languages and support translation services throughout the Alberta health care system. Some people call these important services in the public service bureaucrats. We call them important service providers, and we're going to make sure that we continue to provide supports for Alberta families who speak a variety of languages because it's important to us that they have access to the services that they deserve.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Loyola: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that refugee and migrant families are some of the most disadvantaged people in our province, with a wide range of concerns, what other steps are being taken to ensure that they are connected to comprehensive community health supports?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, some of the largest populations of migrants and newcomers are in Edmonton and Calgary. In Edmonton we have the East Edmonton health centre, which works with these populations to make sure that they get comprehensive supports, including social services and ongoing health management as well as education related to health care. In Calgary we have the Mosaic refugee health clinic, which is a significant resource for particularly low-income, high-risk families who are new to Canada. We're working to expand these services throughout Alberta in ways that are accessible, including supporting 211, which is a partnership with Alberta Health Services as well as the Canadian Mental Health Association.

The Speaker: The Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake.

Resource Industries in Northeastern Alberta

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you know, Alberta's economy has been suffering from an economic downturn, and this is especially true of communities in northeastern Alberta who are heavily reliant on the natural resource sector. In other communities the NDP economic diversification plan has resulted in the entire shutdown of the coal industry, meaning thousands of jobs being cut. Albertans in my riding and northeastern Alberta are concerned that a similar fate might happen to them. To the Minister of Economic Development and Trade: what is your plan to make sure that this doesn't happen to the Bonnyville-Cold Lake constituency?

The Speaker: The Minister of Finance.

Mr. Ceci: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This government is working respectfully with coal communities. I know this one was asked about in terms of a specific one, but I can tell you that the process we're using is to work with local officials and the federal government to transition these plants and keep them working. We're keeping those working. We're going to assist those coal communities. We've made some forays into the current ones that are there and will continue to work with them. There's nothing different in how we're going to work with the one that he's talking about than with the ones we're already working with.

Mr. Cyr: That's distressing to hear.

Given that certain agricultural crops such as hemp, lentils, and pulse crops have been developed in northeastern Alberta and given that the Alberta Biomaterials Development Centre can produce one tonne of hemp straw per hour, which is insufficient for Alberta's current hemp fibre industry, to the minister of economic development: what are you doing to attract private, large-scale processing capacity for hemp feedstock and other crops within northeastern Alberta?

The Speaker: The Minister of Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. Carlier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member for the question. Hemp is fast becoming a very important crop for Alberta. We have approximately 20,000 acres or so in production now. There is room to grow in that not only as food, which many of us enjoy, but also for the stocks themselves for fibre. It's a plant that's

been grown for thousands of years and has been very successful in many parts of the world. I think that now it's right for Alberta to take advantage of that market world-wide.

The Speaker: Second supplemental.

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that rental vacancy rates in Cold Lake have skyrocketed to an overall vacancy rate of 26.2 per cent, which is a stark comparison to the national vacancy rate of 3.7 per cent, and given that several new plants and expansions to existing oil and gas plants have been announced by several different companies, which assuredly means housing will be needed, to the Minister of Energy: do you have a plan to encourage oil companies to work together with community leaders to hire locals and to ensure that nonlocal workers will be placed in the communities they serve instead of forcing them into . . .

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

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We continue to work with all communities in our oil and gas industry, but where they are housed is the choice of where the project is and what company it is. As we go forward, we will always work with our companies to make life better for Albertans and make life better for industry.

Energy Exploration Incentives

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, when the federal government released their budget, I know that many Albertans were hoping that we'd see some help from Ottawa with our struggling economy or, at the very least, nothing to hurt us further. I and many other Albertans, especially in our vital energy industry, were therefore alarmed to discover that the federal government was ending the Canadian exploration expense, an important tool for junior energy companies to raise capital. To the Energy minister: were you consulted on this change, and if so, did you try to do anything to stop it?

The Speaker: The Minister of Energy.

2:40

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The day we heard about that, I was actually in Calgary speaking to EPAC. I did express some dismay about that change, but I also asked them to work with us and help us support their thoughts about that tax to the federal government, and we are doing that work right now.

Mr. Fraser: Given that the Canadian exploration expense has been replaced with the Canadian development expense, which spreads the tax incentives out over many years as opposed to providing an up-front benefit, and given that junior energy companies don't have access to the large capital reserves available to larger players and rely on the Canadian exploration expense to fund exploration of new assets, to the same minister: does your government have any estimates on how much damage this change will cause to our economy and what it will cost small and medium-sized energy companies?

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned, I have reached out to groups such as the companies that are represented by EPAC, and I have asked them to help me assess what the impact is of that tax. As I know more about what that impact is,

I will be working with them and their members to express that to the federal government.

Mr. Fraser: Given that the majority of energy juniors operating in Alberta are started and operated by Albertans and given that the growth of these junior energy companies is a vital part of the economic recovery in this province and given that the removal of the Canadian exploration expense will seriously limit the ability of companies to expand and succeed, Minister, I'm glad to hear that you're standing up for these companies. How much more are you going to help them out? Because they are struggling.

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We absolutely know that those junior companies are critical to the whole oil and gas industry. They are the ones that do the early exploration, and they bring a lot of growth and value to our province. As I mentioned, it's continuing work. I'll have more to report in the days to come.

The Speaker: Hon. members, in 30 seconds we'll continue with Members' Statements.

Members' Statements

(continued)

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Grande Prairie-Wapiti Constituency

Mr. Drysdale: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to share with the House some of the great things in my constituency of Grande Prairie-Wapiti. There are many successful Alberta-based businesses thriving in the Grande Prairie area, run by and employing Albertans. There are two microbreweries, the Grain Bin Brewing Company and the GP Brewing Company, who are using locally sourced barley and local spring water in their production.

The Evergreen centre for resource excellence was originally developed in 2009 as a collaborative effort between industry and government. They continue to focus on solving environmental issues in an economically sustainable way. The Evergreen centre provides an educational and training facility for environmental best-management practices.

The Grande Prairie Regional College is celebrating their 50th anniversary this year. GPRC is invested in indigenous education and has signed a protocol agreement to build on the college's commitment to indigenous students and communities in northwestern Alberta.

The National Bee Diagnostic Centre is the result of a partnership with GPRC research and innovation, Alberta Agriculture, and Agri-Food Canada. The diagnostic centre is the first comprehensive lab in Canada to provide a full array of diagnostic services for honeybee pests, pathogens, and parasites.

Weyerhaeuser has again been named the 2017 world's most ethical company by the Ethisphere Institute, a global leader in defining and advancing the standards of ethical business practices.

The Norbord mill in Grande Prairie recently celebrated 20 years of success. Norbord Inc. is the leading global manufacturer of wood-based panels and is the world's largest producer of oriented strandboard, and it employs almost 200 people in Grande Prairie alone.

That, Mr. Speaker, is just the tip of the iceberg, but there are lots of great things happening in Grande Prairie-Wapiti.

Thank you.

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

Postsecondary Education Funding

Drever: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I was elected to serve as the MLA for Calgary-Bow, I was a student at Mount Royal University working towards a bachelor of arts in sociology. Having the opportunity to attend postsecondary exposed me to a whole new world of critical thinking. Through this critical thinking I found my voice in activism.

During my time in university there was a lot of discussion and anxiety among students around increasingly unaffordable tuition fees and massive cuts that the previous government made. Those cuts resulted in the loss of nursing enrolment of one-third, an engineering program, a disability transfer program, and a performing arts program. It meant larger classroom sizes and higher instructional fees. This burden on students made postsecondary less accessible.

The loss of accessibility and affordability of university programs resonated with many students at MRU, and something had to be done. Shortly after this news surfaced, many students and faculty came together in solidarity to rally against these deep cuts. Over 300 people marched to former Premier Redford's constituency office, which was conveniently across the street from campus. When we arrived at her office, we discovered that she was not there to talk to us. It was like our voice didn't matter, and that felt discouraging.

I fundamentally believe that everyone benefits from a society that has equitable access to affordable education. Students exercised their voice and elected a government on that principle. It is why we have extended our tuition freeze for a third year, introduced new awards for indigenous students, doubled the amount of available funds for the Alberta low-income grant, made apprentices eligible for student aid, and made it easier for all students to access student aid.

I am so proud of the role that our government is playing in making the lives of Albertans better. It is good to know that students and faculty will no longer have to face these deep cuts.

Thank you very much.

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

Red Deer Courthouse

Mrs. Schreiner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Central Alberta has seen incredible growth in recent years. Since the Red Deer courthouse was built, in the early '80s, the city's population has almost doubled. As a result, space in the current courthouse is limited. Red Deer pressed the previous government for several years to recognize that our region is in dire need of a new courthouse, but the provincial government was silent until now.

Thankfully, with Budget 2017 our government did more than just recognize the need. While we are still finalizing the total cost, we are committed to investing \$97 million over the next four years for a new Red Deer justice centre. Mr. Speaker, this new justice centre is desperately needed. It will increase the number of courtrooms from seven to 12, but it will also go beyond providing more courtrooms. The new Red Deer justice centre will also be a place where people can go for justice outside as well as inside court. That's because there will also be a resolution services wing, which will help Albertans resolve disputes faster. It'll provide more access to a variety of services like education, assessment, dispute resolution, mediation, and other alternatives to court.

Mr. Speaker, Red Deer's new justice centre is just one of several measures by our government to address pressures in Alberta's justice system. We're hiring more Crown prosecutors and court staff, we're appointing judges and working with Ottawa to do the same, we've introduced legislation into the House that, if passed, will increase access to the legal system for survivors of sexual and domestic violence, and we've increased legal aid funding so people who cannot afford a lawyer can still have one. Together these and other measures are helping to ensure that Albertans have access to a fair and innovative justice system.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be part of a government that takes concrete – literally concrete – action on issues that will make life better for Albertans.

Thank you.

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

2:50 Autism Spectrum Disorder

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak about world autism day, which took place yesterday across the country. Autism spectrum disorder is the name of a group of developmental disorders which includes a wide range of symptoms, skills, and levels of disability. Yesterday groups from all over Alberta gathered to raise awareness for those affected and their families, who provide them with much-needed love and support these very able individuals.

One group in my riding, called Rednecks with a Cause, threw a fantastic, sold-out dinner dance and auction, which raised monies which will directly benefit families of the community and provide support and help to identify individuals affected. I'm so proud of my Redneck community. To all of the volunteers who put this on, thank you. To all of the generous donors who attended, thank you. I definitely agree with the organizers of this that this was not a benchmark for success but a true phenomenon which touches people of all backgrounds.

I hope that more people will take time to learn how someone with autism thinks and experiences their surroundings. These are people with different thought processes. Let's change the discussion from pity to joy, from tolerance to acceptance. Let's embrace neurodiversity and get to know some of these truly amazing individuals. There have been some truly amazing people with autism – for instance, Mozart and Einstein were believed to be on the spectrum – and the world is a better place to have these unique individuals.

I thank Rednecks with a Cause for their hard work and their kindness and for helping people in my community of Bonnyville-Cold Lake who are living with the autism spectrum disorder.

Thank you.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: The Minister of Justice and Solicitor General.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As required by the Statutes Repeal Act, I rise to table the requisite number of copies of the unproclaimed legislation that is more than five years old. Legislation on this list will automatically be repealed on December 31, 2017, unless proclaimed before that date or the Legislative Assembly adopts a resolution that it not be repealed.

Thank you.

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

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll table the appropriate number of copies of a request from a constituent of Edmonton-

Glenora for a plan to save the provincial royal museum based on the study of significance, that I'm presenting here, from the historic resource management program and that it be protected from demolition.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you.

The Member for Edmonton-South West.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and, with your indulgence, do three tablings today. First, I would like to table the requisite number of copies of the survey results, that I put forward, showing that 27,000 Albertans support ending the time change.

Mr. Speaker, second, I would like to table 950 pages of online feedback I have received in support of having one time year-round. I'll hold off on those ones.

Finally, the third doc that I would like to table, Mr. Speaker: I have the requisite number of copies of 644 pages of e-mails that I have received in support of Bill 203 and ending the time change.

Thank you.

The Speaker: I can see that we're going to have to recruit more pages.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Hawkwood.

Connolly: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise today and table five copies of a member's statement given by Jason Kenney, where he smeared the decision-making power of the Supreme Court of Canada regarding the Vriend decision.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I rise to table five copies of the report by Paul Fraser, QC, Acting Ethics Commissioner, into allegations involving the hon. Alison Redford, dated March 29, 2017, pursuant to section 25(12) of the Conflicts of Interest Act.

I'm sorry. Strathmore-Brooks.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite five copies of a letter I wrote to the Government House Leader referencing things that he said in regard to the Public Affairs Bureau being a partisan government body of the previous government. I wrote a letter to the minister that I'm tabling today on the sixth day of fantastic PAB tablings.

Tablings to the Clerk

The Clerk: I wish to advise the Assembly that the following documents were deposited with the office of the Clerk: on behalf of the Hon. Mr. S. Anderson, Minister of Municipal Affairs, responses to questions raised by Mr. Stier, hon. Member for Livingstone-Macleod, and Mr. Clark, hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow, on March 8, 2017, 2016-17 supplementary supply estimates debate; also, responses to questions raised by Mr. Gotfried, hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, on March 9, 2017, 2016-17 supplementary supply estimates debate.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I think we had two points of order today. The first one, I believe, was by the Government House Leader.

Point of Order Rotation of Questions

Mr. Mason: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't need to take very much time with respect to this matter. During question period today, when it was the MLA for Calgary-Elbow's turn to ask a

question, the minister or the Member – I’m confused about titles today – for Strathmore-Brooks stood up. Now, I know that the trading of questions has been historically permitted in the Assembly, but I would ask that House leaders be notified of those kinds of changes in advance.

The Speaker: The Opposition House Leader.

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s a pleasure to rise. I didn’t catch the citation from the Government House Leader, so I’m not entirely sure if it’s a point of order, but I’m happy to speak to it. There certainly was a trade that took place earlier today. While we did take the time to inform the Speaker’s office, in the future I will endeavour to ensure that the Government House Leader is informed as well.

The Speaker: I’m sure there’s no snacking in the House, is there? No.

There was communication to our office, but thank you. I think the onus is on members to let the Government House Leader know.

The second is a point of order by the Member for Calgary-Hays, I believe. Is that correct?

Point of Order

Allegations against a Member

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I cite from the standing orders, 23(h), (i), (j), and (l). Now, I don’t have the Blues in front of me, so I’ll paraphrase as best I can, but (h) is making allegations of another member, (i) is “imputes false or unavowed motives to another Member,” (j) is using “language of a nature likely to create disorder,” and (l) is, of course, “introduces any matter in debate that offends the practices and precedents of the Assembly.”

Now, if I heard it correctly, Mr. Speaker, I think an hon. member accused me in the one question of being not in favour of GSAs and wanting to out gay kids. For those watching, I certainly was in this Legislature and voted in favour of Bill 10, which was introduced by our government before the last election. Also, I certainly do not have the opinion attributed to me of wanting to out gay kids. It’s not been my position, and I don’t expect it will ever be my position. So for that reason I hope that you will hold the point of order and ask the member to withdraw the remarks.

The Speaker: The Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don’t have the Blues, and I didn’t hear that particular reference. What I did hear was the hon. member referring to the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and his advocacy in favour of informing parents when a student requests to join a gay-straight alliance. That was characterized as akin to outing the students.

3:00

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is the view of many people who are experts in this field and others that this particular proposition on the part of the new leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, Mr. Kenney, is extraordinarily damaging and will undo the good that GSAs do. I want to just indicate that gay-straight alliances are student-led clubs that aim to make the school community a safer place for all students regardless of their sexual orientation. Their members include lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or questioning, LGBTQ, youth and their straight allies.

I just want to quote from this author from the University of British Columbia.

“We know that LGBTQ students are at higher risk for suicide, in part because they are more often targeted for bullying and discrimination,” says [the author of the study]. “But heterosexual students can also be the target of homophobic bullying. When policies and supportive programs like GSAs are in place long enough to change the environment of the school, it’s better for students’ mental health, no matter what their orientation.”

The Speaker: Government House Leader, to the procedural question, not the substance of debate.

Mr. Mason: Well, Mr. Speaker, I’m not sure what the hon. member is referring to. As I said, I didn’t hear the reference to him. I heard references to his new leader clearly taking a position that’s very, very harmful and undermines the efforts to protect gay and lesbian students in our schools. If the reference was to the hon. member and his position, I take him at his word that he has been supportive of this bill in the past even though his new leader is committed to repealing it.

I don’t believe there’s a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The House leader of the third party.

Mr. Rodney: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It’s good to hear that the hon. Government House Leader indeed understands that if it was in reference to our hon. caucus leader, then (h), (i), and (j) would apply.

Now, a seldom utilized standing order is (l), to which our hon. caucus leader has referred, and since it is not often utilized, I’ll simply repeat it.

23 A Member will be called to order by the Speaker if, in the Speaker’s opinion, that Member . . .

(l) introduces any matter in debate that offends the practices and precedents of the Assembly.

One of the practices and precedents of this Assembly, of course, as you know very, very well, Mr. Speaker, is that those who are outside of this House and, therefore, cannot defend themselves should not be referred to. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Mr. Rodney: Now, there have been a number of misquotations utilized both . . . [interjections] Excuse me?

The Speaker: Please.

Mr. Rodney: Thank you.

. . . in this Chamber and on social media, so I shall read a short statement that refers directly, Mr. Speaker, to this allegation.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I drew this to the attention of the Government House Leader as well. It’s not the substance of the discussion. I think the point is what was said and whether it was aimed, as I understand the Member for Calgary-Hays, at a particular member. So please stick to that subject matter and not stuff outside the House.

Mr. Rodney: Yes. That’s exactly what this is: a very few sentences that will set the record straight.

The Speaker: I hope they are, because you know what? I’m going to can it real fast if it’s not.

Mr. Rodney: I wouldn’t waste your time. I promise you that.

“Some are falsely claiming that I want to force schools to ‘out’ children to their parents. This simply is not true.”

The Speaker: Hon. member, I'm going to rule your comment out of order. Please be seated.

I do have a copy of the Blues. "The new leader of the Conservatives has stated that his preference is to take away the privacy of students." This was the particular statement that hon. members had referenced. The exchange did not impute motives in connection with a specific member; it may have, perhaps, to someone outside this House.

Clearly, it may not be a point of order. However, to the hon. member, I think you had a good suspicion of what that particular comment might have caused.

Cortes-Vargas: It offended me, too, Mr. Speaker. It's hurtful, and it offended me.

The Speaker: Please don't exchange dialogue with me, hon. member.

I would caution all of you that these kinds of comments are not constructive to good public policy and democracy. There is a freedom of speech option that exists in this House. It's more than an option; it's a rule. It's not without conditions attached to it. Therefore, while this may not officially be a point of order, I want to caution you yet again about the comments that you make here and the uproar that it sometimes causes in this Assembly.

Privilege

Obstructing a Member in Performance of Duty

The Speaker: Hon. members, I want to rule on a point of privilege. [interjections] Hon. members, are we ready to go?

I'm prepared to rule on the question of privilege that was raised by the third party House leader on March 21, 2017, as set out on pages 420 and 421 of the *Alberta Hansard* for that day. I note that the hon. member raised this matter immediately following the vote on Government Motion 16. Given that the purported question of privilege relates to the passage of this motion, I find that the member raised the matter at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, the notice requirement for the purpose of Standing Order 15 has been met, in particular Standing Order 15(6), which specifically provides for this situation.

Government Motion 16 provides for concurrence in a report from the Ethics Commissioner concerning recommended sanctions for a breach of the Conflicts of Interest Act involving the Member for Calgary-Hays. As I noted on March 15, 2017, when ruling on a point of order as to whether this was sub judice, this motion is the next step in a process set out in section 28(3) of that act. As I indicated in my ruling, the Assembly has delegated the investigation of matters concerning conflicts of interest to the Ethics Commissioner. This is a part of the Assembly's inherent privileges relating to its internal proceedings and the conduct and discipline of members.

The third party House leader is essentially arguing that the Assembly's motion is violating one of the member's privileges, namely freedom of speech. However, I would say that the essence of the member's argument pertains to the findings of the Ethics Commissioner rather than the sanctions that she recommended. In other words, I would say that the argument is that the finding that the Member for Calgary-Hays was in breach of the act for asking a question during question period violates his freedom of speech.

On this point I agree with the Deputy Government House Leader's argument that rights of members are subject to the procedures of the Assembly, as noted on pages 13 and 14 of *Maingot's Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, second edition.

While it will be seen that the Member enjoys all the immunity necessary to perform his [particular] parliamentary work, this privilege or right, such as freedom of speech, is nevertheless subject to the practices and procedures of the House.

A similar statement can be found in section 77 of *Beauchesne's*, sixth edition, which reads as follows:

Freedom of speech does not mean that Members have an unlimited or unrestrained right to speak on every issue. The rules of the House impose limits on the participation of Members and it is the duty of the Speaker to restrain those who abuse the rules.

I cannot imagine how the passage of a motion that deals with a matter relating to the internal proceedings of this Assembly and discipline of its members would constitute a prima facie question of privilege. There have been rulings in this Assembly on similar matters where members have raised questions of privilege relating to decisions that the Assembly has taken pursuant to its own rules.

3:10

For instance, the most recent ruling on this point occurred on December 1, 2011, and I would refer members to page 1590 of *Alberta Hansard*, where the Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood argued that a government motion concerning evening sittings violated his privileges. Speaker Kowalski found that there was no prima facie question of privilege and noted that he could not imagine how sittings of the Assembly or the standing orders violated members' privileges.

A similar argument was raised in 1996 concerning a government motion establishing subcommittees of supply. Again, the Speaker concluded that there was no prima facie question of privilege. I'd like to quote from Speaker Schumacher's ruling on February 26, 1996, at page 224 of *Alberta Hansard*, where he stated:

In this instance, if the Chair were to find that a prima facie question of privilege existed or that a contempt had been committed, the Chair would in effect have to find that the Standing Orders violated the privileges of the members. To make such a finding could cast doubt upon the House's ability to control its own proceedings, which the Chair is not about to do.

This Assembly has made a decision on a motion following a debate that has been conducted according to its own rules, in which all members were able to participate. For the reasons stated earlier, I find that there is no prima facie question of privilege. This concludes the matter.

The Member for Calgary-Hays.

Member's Apology

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to respond to the requirement of Government Motion 16, which accepts the January 4, 2017, report of the Ethics Commissioner and upholds both her ruling and her proposed sanctions for words I spoke in this House on November 22, 2016. I have no choice but to accept that Government Motion 16 has passed, and I am required to apologize to the Assembly. I must say that if I thought at any point, at the time that I said it, that it was wrong, I certainly would not have said those words.

Mr. Speaker, subsequently I retained independent counsel to find out what indeed I had done wrong and have sought to have this matter adjudicated to the Court of Queen's Bench. At a preliminary hearing held recently in Calgary, a judge in that court found my complaint to be such that the judge ordered a hearing on the matter, which is scheduled for January of 2018. I can only guess that if my complaint had not been worthy of a hearing, I wouldn't be getting one, and I would have accepted that judgment, knowing that I had indeed said something offside in this House.

But the judge did not throw my complaint out, and we await a decision on whether my privilege as a Member of this Legislative Assembly and by extension the privilege of every Member of this Legislative Assembly to speak freely on the floor of this House is subordinate to the Conflicts of Interest Act, an interesting question indeed, one that not only impacts members of this Assembly but elected members of Assemblies and parliaments across Canada and the Commonwealth. I regret that it has come to this, where a sitting government would attempt to limit the privilege of an opposition member to speak freely in the Assembly.

As my colleague the Member for Calgary-Lougheed pointed out, *Beauchesne's* section 75 states: "The privilege of freedom of speech is both the least questioned and the most fundamental right of the Member of Parliament on the floor of the House and in committee." It appears, Mr. Speaker, that this may not be the case in Calgary any longer, and that really is an affront to this democratic institution and, in my opinion, to democracy itself. The fact that I'm being censored for raising an issue of importance not only to my constituents but to all Albertans is deeply concerning and all because the government could not handle answering tough questions on their own policies.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad. It is sad that the Premier can no longer do her job and have any involvement in upcoming labour negotiations with the public sector because her husband . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, I do hope that you keep your conversation related to the point of privilege matter.

Mr. McIver: It is sad indeed, Mr. Speaker. It is sad that the Premier can no longer do her job and have any involvement . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member.

Mr. McIver: Would you like me to start again, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: No. I would like you to deal with the matter of privilege and speak to the motion.

Mr. McIver: I believe that I'm required to do this, Mr. Speaker, and I'm fulfilling the requirements.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad. It is sad that the Premier can no longer do her job and have any involvement in upcoming labour negotiations with the public sector because her husband earns his living as a union executive. It is sad that the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General will have to resign her position because her husband is a police officer with the Calgary Police Service, because given the Ethics Commissioner's ruling how could she not be in conflict by making decisions that directly impact the Calgary Police Service, the one that employs her husband?

If the occupations and ways in which our spouses earn their living bears directly on what we as members can say in this House, it surely comes to . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, do you have any closing arguments with respect to the action that has been approved by this Assembly?

Mr. McIver: I am delivering them right now, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: No. You're using it as an opportunity, hon. member, to speak to other members of this Assembly and not to the substance of the matter before us today. If that's what you choose to continue to do, I am fearful that I'm going to need to rule you out of order for speaking in reference to other members. Speak to the matter of the point of order, not to the other members of this Legislature on matters that you believe might have something to do with this.

Do you have any other comments you'd like to make on the motion as approved by the Assembly other than those comments with respect to other members of the Assembly?

Mr. McIver: I will continue but only with your permission, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: If you have words with respect to the motion approved by the Assembly, then absolutely, but if you are continuing to make references to other individuals of this House and their family members, I would . . . [interjections]

Hon. member, could you abide by my request and speak to the motion. If you have something that you'd like to say with respect to the motion approved by the Assembly with respect to your actions, please proceed. I would ask that you stick to that subject matter, though, please.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All of my words have been about the ruling, and all of my words from now on will continue to be about the ruling.

If the occupations and ways in which our spouses earn their living bears directly on what we as members can say in this House, it surely comes to bear on the work ministers of the Crown do as well. They manage large portfolios and wield tremendous power. How can Albertans trust that they are not using it to further their interests and, by extension, their own interests if it has been decided that my wife's very small business precludes me from asking questions on a topic related to that industry? If it sounds ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that's because it is, but sadly that's where we find ourselves today.

What a shame it is for the government to seek to limit my ability to do my job as the representative for Calgary-Hays and a member of the Progressive Conservative Party, and in so doing, they also move to limit the ability of each member of the Assembly to do her or his job. The precedent they seek to set will also limit the ability of each and every elected representative in the Commonwealth to do their jobs. How, Mr. Speaker, does this serve the public interest? How are these government members doing right by Albertans?

Beyond this, Mr. Speaker, I'm also sorry that the government has seen fit in this case to appoint itself judge, jury, and executioner on a matter that is indeed before the courts. As my colleague from Calgary-Lougheed also pointed out in his remarks, it is not our job to evaluate the scope of section 3 of the Conflicts of Interest Act, especially not when the very question is before the courts. The idea that this government would rather score a win today than wait for the judge's decision speaks to how much the political discourse in the province has devolved since the last election.

To be clear, partisanship has its place, but the extent to which this government has blurred the line between their role as government and their role as NDP MLAs is a real disappointment. In fact, if the previous government, Mr. Speaker, had even tried to pull this stunt, the NDP opposition would have been all over us for censorship and abuse of power, and they would have been right in that case.

Because I take my job as the MLA for Calgary-Hays and Progressive Conservative member very seriously, I'm standing in this House today to meet my obligation, as I am required to do, but it's also the government that owes an apology to all Albertans for attempting to subvert the efforts of opposition members to hold them accountable for their actions and policies. They owe an apology to the judiciary in our province for presuming to do the job of an independent and impartial court and to every member of assemblies and parliaments in the Commonwealth for attempting to set a precedent that could limit the most sacred of parliamentary privileges, that of freedom of speech, a precedent that could be used by other governments to limit opposition's ability to be effective.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I now make my official apology to this House. I am sorry for the words that I said.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

3:20

Orders of the Day

Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

Bill 203

Alberta Standard Time Act

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-South West.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and move second reading of Bill 203, the Alberta Standard Time Act.

Since 1972 Albertans have been changing their clocks twice a year in accordance with the Daylight Saving Time Act. But Alberta is not the Alberta that existed 45 years ago, and Albertans have told me that they want one time. While the practice of changing their clocks may come easily to some, to many others it really does not. Let me be clear: these Albertans experience adverse effects due to this time change.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about supporting Albertans and making their lives better. I've heard from tens of thousands of Albertans who have strong opinions regarding the practice of changing their clocks. Many of my colleagues in this House echo that daylight saving time is a topic of real concern for their constituents. These concerns are present and real. Just a few short weeks ago Albertans across the province were feeling the effects of losing an hour. This bill will address those concerns and establish a consistent, year-round time for Albertans that will provide stability for families, parents, employers, and working Albertans.

This bill is an example of the real and practical changes that I believe can help Albertans, because with this bill I'm working to make life better for all Albertans and to ensure that their concerns, from individuals to businesses, are reflected by not only addressing daylight saving time but by also crafting a bill based on what Albertans have told me. The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill is about addressing Albertans' concerns, and it's about making a difference that every single Albertan will feel.

Under the current Daylight Saving Time Act Albertans are paying through increases in road accidents, workplace injuries, destabilizing the family's routine, and through our agriculture partners, who see decreases in production. To address these concerns, Bill 203 will repeal the Daylight Saving Time Act and establish a year-round Alberta standard time, Coordinated Universal Time minus six hours. It creates a made-in-Alberta time zone, and as mentioned, this will provide stability for families, communities, and businesses.

Both prior to and since the bill's introduction I've received much positive feedback. I certainly continue to welcome any and all input on this bill as we continue to debate it today in the House. My goal is to address the concerns of Albertans regarding daylight saving time through a bill that's reflective of the needs and desires of the population. We've engaged well over 30,000 people in my office and through our survey, Mr. Speaker, and I tabled those documents for you today. It's been wonderful to hear the perspectives on how this bill can help impact individuals' lives. I've spoken to constituents directly. I've spoken to them in my office, in town halls. In fact, I've been stopped on the street by people who simply must tell me that daylight saving time must go. The staff in my office have received and responded to well over a thousand e-mails

and phone calls. In fact, we received over 700 phone calls in one day regarding this bill, and we're still hearing from hundreds of Albertans every week.

This is an issue that Albertans are passionate about. The consultations I have done have been extremely positive, and we continue to hear voices and perspectives. The message is clear. This is a much-needed change. It's something that will impact our families. Seventy-three per cent of Albertans agree that it's time for one time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that's been raised before. There have been two petitions tabled in the Legislature over the last few years. Ruby Kassian from Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville tabled a petition in 2015 and was one of the very strong voices on abolishing daylight saving time. We also heard from another petition last year. This is something that we hear not only from the cities, not only from the rural areas; this is something that we are hearing across the province.

It's something that will make life better for industries whose livelihood is dependent on things like animals, who don't read a clock but are regulated only by the setting and rising of the sun. It's something that will make life better for families and parents, who struggle to maintain a schedule with their children following the twice-yearly shift. It's something that will make life better for shift workers like nurses and postal workers, who will no longer have to add another hour to their already strenuous shifts, and it will make life better for seniors, who need to follow very strict schedules for their medications and their personal health, Mr. Speaker. These are only some of the voices that we are most familiar with.

There are impacts on many whom we may have never considered and for whom this change or ceasing of change will make life better. It will make life better for Albertans and caregivers of Albertans who are battling Alzheimer's. We heard through consultation that this disease is one that doesn't just involve memory loss but also deep bouts of anxiety, anxiety that can be triggered and magnified by the setting sun through a syndrome known as sundowning. For these patients their anxiety worsens in the fall and accelerates dramatically as the clocks fall back.

Now, as one of the respondents who contacted us stated, caregivers know this change is coming, and it adds to an already extremely stressful situation, Mr. Speaker, for both themselves and for their patients and their patients' families. This human perspective concerning the effects of the loss of evening light resonated with us, and I realized the positive impact that this bill could have on the lives of so many others. As a caregiver reminded me, abolishing daylight saving time will not cure Alzheimer's, but it will certainly make life easier for the sufferers and their caregivers. All members of this Legislature, I hope, can agree that improving the things that make a difference in the lives of every single individual should be at the forefront of this Assembly.

It's going to make life better, Mr. Speaker, for working Albertans. We actually were reached out to by assistant business manager Scott Crichton of IBEW local 424. In a written statement he said:

IBEW Local 424 supports MLA Thomas Dang's private member's bill on time change. It will be good for our workers, many of whom work in isolated conditions, and will no longer have the hassle of re-setting their clocks. This bill is a positive step forward for the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, during our consultation we were also made aware of the impacts that daylight saving time has on our health care system. We heard from one of the managers of medical equipment at a local hospital about the impact that DST has on the work being done to care for Albertans. Many of the life-support devices, including defibrillators and dialysis machines, have integrated

clocks in their systems that require manual resetting and changing to accommodate the time change. Now, this is very costly in human power, but more than that, it can take weeks to locate every single piece of equipment and make the necessary changes throughout an entire hospital. This can result in errors being made on patient charting records and legal documents, that are so important to ensure that we have a continuum of care for our patients. All of this incorrect data happens simply because of DST.

What this means is that we have an opportunity today, Mr. Speaker. We have an opportunity in this Assembly to make a difference in the lives of Albertans and improve patient care by voting in favour of this bill. It's something that I am proud to be able to vote on today.

Mr. Speaker, in considering this bill, I conducted a survey from February 15 to March 4 of this year with nearly 26,000 respondents, with 82 per cent indicating that they wanted to do away with DST. The tabling of this bill is in direct response to what Albertans told us. The crafting of this bill comes directly from what I heard from Albertans. We asked Albertans what life after daylight saving time should be like. We asked them what they wanted to see moving forward. We not only asked people if they felt that it was time to end this change, but I also asked them: when did they value their daylight hours most? The results were overwhelmingly clear. When asked whether they preferred more light in the morning or the evening, two-thirds of Albertans chose the evening. Almost 60 per cent of Albertans chose the evening as well for the wintertime. So Albertans value their evening hours in the sun.

I'm proud that Alberta standard time and the Alberta Standard Time Act are going to reflect that. Alberta standard time is a time zone that Albertans are already familiar with. It's the time that we have right now, Mr. Speaker. It's the time that we have for the majority of the year already, and it's a time that resonates with Albertans. I'm proud that I chose a time that works for us, and it's a time that I believe reflects the will of the people we were elected to represent. This bill will improve the lives of Albertans by creating a consistent, year-round time for all of Alberta. What I heard is that it's time we had one time.

I look forward to hearing the debate from all members of this Assembly, and I really do hope that we are able to move forward on this important legislation. Thank you.

3:30

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

Mr. Cyr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak about Bill 203, the Alberta Standard Time Act. This bill is certainly evoking some interesting debate on whether or not we should spring forward and fall back.

A little bit of history could add some context to this debate. In 1898 George Hudson, frustrated with the duties of normal work hours and the lack of sunlight hours in his summer evenings, created a time system which rolls the clock forward one hour in the summer months. The idea is that instead of having an hour of sun before everyone gets up, the sun sets later so that in summer people can enjoy evening sunlight. The clock then reverts from DST back to standard time in the winter by rolling it back one hour to what is known as standard time. In Alberta and most of Canada on the second Sunday of every March we set our clocks forward one hour, and then on the first Sunday of November we go back.

This is a debate that has long been waged within Alberta. Daylight saving time took two referendums to originally put in place. The first took place in the 1967 Alberta general election in a province-wide plebiscite, which was defeated by a slim margin, with 51.25 per cent voting against it. The second referendum took

place in the 1971 general election, when Alberta's voters also voted for a province-wide plebiscite, but this time it passed with a wide margin of 61.37 per cent of the vote.

This debate will affect everyone, and I have been surprised by the number of people who have stopped me on the street just to give me their thoughts on daylight saving time. I've heard from many for and a few against, but one thing is clear. Albertans need to have their say. Some like the advantages of early winter mornings and late summer evenings under the current system. Others hate the time change, and there's a debate over whether we should stay on daylight saving or standard time if we stop changing the clocks. History can teach us some very good lessons if we're willing to listen and learn from the past. Decisions of this magnitude must be taken to the people. We must listen to all stakeholders.

Recently the Edmonton Oilers and the Calgary Flames management officials all came out against Alberta standard time. Bob Nicholson, vice-chairman and CEO of the Oilers Entertainment Group, recently gave an interview in Calgary on this bill. I'd like to read some of his quotes to the House.

Quote: I've had some discussions with the Calgary Flames, and they are in agreement with us. We are very concerned with the possible shift away from daylight saving time. There are a few key things. One is that our fans enjoy 7 p.m. games. It's great for our fans to allow families to get to the game, and doubleheaders are a big part of hockey now with television contracts. They're working well. The audience likes it, and for us they would be like 9 o'clock and 9:30 games. They'd get over after midnight. We just can't do that to our fans. And it's not just the fans in the arena; it's the television audience. Television is tough enough without adding that to it. There are a lot of things that you have to look at when it comes to switching schedules for everyone. We're going to find out the proper way to have a discussion with the government to make sure we understand their points of view, but I want to discuss our point of view, which is why it's better to get up twice a year and change the clocks. Unquote.

Mr. Speaker, this is only the start of the list of stakeholders becoming concerned about what exactly time change means to them. What concerns me more than the hockey teams' expressed concerns is that we haven't heard from a number of industries either way. It tells me we need more time. I believe that more conversations need to take place, and as legislators we need to think about whether this is a discussion that we should make unilaterally. This was brought into Alberta in its form with two plebiscites, and this is something that may need to happen again.

I know that I'm not the only one that has some concern about overturning a referendum by people without another referendum. I look forward to hearing what the other members have to say on this debate, and I'll listen closely, very closely, on how the bill debate unfolds. But I want the House to consider whether this should go to committee for further study and ultimately be decided in a referendum since that is how it was brought in.

I commend the Member for Edmonton-South West for bringing in this bill. I do believe that it brings passion and a lot of discussion, and I think that this is something that the House can always use.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville.

Mrs. Littlewood: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my absolute pleasure to stand and speak about this bill given that it is something that has been an active topic of conversation in my constituency since the day I was elected. Previously there was a signature-gathering petition that was undertaken by Ruby Kassian, who the member referenced, where she got almost 3,000 signatures in the

area of Vegreville. Given that Vegreville is a town of 6,000, that is quite an overwhelming response from the people around there in support of it.

I think, as the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake mentioned, it is partly about starting a conversation in the wider public sphere. He is absolutely right. It's something that has been enacted for 45 years, and over that time the province and the people have gone through incredible changes. Innovations and technology that have changed the way that we conduct our lives have made a world where we are integrated with each other unlike ever before. One of the things that we see in talking with our agricultural sector is how our supply chain managed industries, dairy and poultry, are affected by this. If someone is working in this industry, they know how sensitive livestock are to changes. I had the opportunity of conducting a town hall with the Member for Edmonton-South West, and that was something that we heard. A gentleman who had a dairy operation was saying that it takes a month for him to slowly change the routine of his animals to make sure that the productivity of them in terms of milk production was not substantively affected.

What we are talking about is a bill that would make life better for Albertans from across the province. I know that my colleague from Edmonton-South West also spoke at length on how these changes are practical. They're practical and beneficial, something that would help families and communities and our Alberta businesses.

I just want to reiterate that many Albertans struggle through these yearly time changes. Working in health care, where I used to work, in long-term care, there were seniors that took medication four, sometimes five times a day, so if you're talking about moving a medication by an hour, that is actually quite substantial for that person.

I'm familiar with a drug that I had to administer to people that lived in long-term care homes. If someone had osteoporosis, they would be put onto calcium, and once a week they took a medication an hour before breakfast, so I had to make sure that I was in this person's room and administering this medication that would take the calcium that they are prescribed every day and actually bond it to their bones. One of the things that people that take this medication will tell you is that they actually feel a pain in their chest after they take this medication because the first place that your bones take the calcium out of your system and apply it is in your sternum. So an hour's change of medication in a seasonal change twice a year is something that people are quite affected by.

3:40

My constituents have absolutely expressed a lot of concerns with this. They're concerned that when we see changes to the time, there are increases in car accidents, that when we see a change in time, there is an increase to heart attacks, and there is research to show corollary evidence of this.

This is something that I think probably all members of this Assembly have actually heard from their constituents on. I think it's something that, because it is a nonpartisan issue, is an opportunity for us to engage on this and create change in a bipartisan way. Having a year-round time would be a practical change for this province. It's quite timely. I know that I had many constituents reach out to my office that were hoping for this bill to actually get passed before this year's time change that we just had. Unfortunately, we were not able to circumvent that. However, I think that, going forward, we can look at how to best implement it for the province.

The member has gone through extensive consultation, and I've had my own discussions with many people from all municipalities and all counties: Vegreville, Chipman, Mundare, Lamont, Fort Saskatchewan, Andrew, Tofield, Bruderheim, the counties of

Minburn, Lamont, Beaver, and Strathcona. Every single municipality that I represent has come or sent me e-mails and phone calls and talked to me in the community about this, wanting the change, to have one single time zone.

Of course, I think it would be prudent to continue to listen to Albertans' feedback on this. I think it is absolutely prudent to discuss this more as we have this under our advice in the House. I know that this is something where we have heard from tens of thousands of people. I know that we saw stacks of that feedback tabled by the Member for Edmonton-South West just earlier today. The message is loud and clear, that Albertans want to see an end to daylight saving. Whether that means that we stay on the time that it is now or that we fall back and then stay there, people want to have one time year-round.

It's something that would help support our agriculture industry, as I stated earlier, and it's something that teachers, with their students, have also spoken to us about, that they notice a change in their students when they have to deal with a very fatigued child in their class for a week after. This is something that has also been discussed in quite reputable magazines. *Forbes* on March 11, 2017, discussed that there was a study done by Jennifer Welsh and Sarah Kramer of *Business Insider*, and they estimate that it costs \$2 billion just to change the clocks. *Fortune* magazine from March 12, 2016, had a study that they referred to from SleepBetter that estimates the cost to the United States being \$434 million in lost productivity. I think it's very interesting to discuss this from all angles. I know that it has not been discussed as a money bill, but it has incredible implications, when it comes to the costs, to actually implement this change.

I think the jury is still out. I think we still need to discuss which time zone people want to go with, and I find it very interesting that people have very personal interests which time zone they want to go to. If they have more ties or more integration with Saskatchewan, they definitely want to have a time closer to that, and when they have ties or land or other property or family in B.C., they want to go to a time that's closer to B.C. time. Given the issues that have been raised because of discussing these issues, such as one of our most important Canadian stakeholders, our hockey here in Canada, I think that it behooves us to make sure that we continue to discuss this more.

With that, I will just say that I am incredibly supportive of this bill, and I know that the majority of my constituents are also supportive of this bill. I hope to hear more conversation on the topic as we go forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise on Bill 203. It's not too often we have bills that are both interesting and have agreement across party lines, and I think that we may be in one of those circumstances. I know that not all members will be agreed upon it, but this is a genuinely nonideological and nonpartisan issue, that will either unite us or disunite us depending on what hockey teams we go for and our own, personal daily routines.

We would be creating an Alberta standard time or, effectively, a permanent daylight saving time, and if you'll excuse the indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to dub it Dang-light saving time.

I want to commend the Member for Edmonton-South West for bringing this bill forward. It has sparked an incredible amount of debate across the province. It is, admittedly, perhaps not the most important issue we have before us, but it is still important, and it certainly has grabbed the attention of a lot of people. I've had a lot

of constituents come up to me. Normally they're either supportive or angry about one thing or another, but a lot of people have come up to give me their personal two cents about this.

This morning on my Facebook page between 10:30 and 11 I just asked constituents to share their thoughts with me about what they think about this, and I'll read a few. I have, let's say, cut out some of the less productive comments that have appeared. I just wanted to share a smattering of them. I do mean this. These are the nicest ones I found. I don't mean these as digs at government members. I genuinely support this bill.

Carmen Stopanski says, "Get rid of it! It may be the one and only thing the dippers suggest that I agree with."

"This might be the only [time] the NDP have got [it] right. Please vote for this and get rid of Daylight Savings time. The more we can be like Brad Wall and Saskatchewan, the better." Now, I know that's not the intention of the Member for Edmonton-South West. It's not his intention to be more like Brad Wall, but we appreciate the sentiment.

Dustin McCombe says:

Leave it the way it is. I don't think people fully understand the way it works. All they want is their convenience. Saskatchewan isn't really on Central time. Power bills both at home, and [in] the cities . . . go up in the winter. It won't be light out until mid morning. That [won't] save energy at all. It'll wreak havoc [upon the] people who go to BC in the winter to work, or play with the 2 hour time difference. Dumbest idea ever.

That's obviously not a supportive constituent.

Bobby SP says, "Consider voting in favour of daylight savings time. So, we can have the same time year round. I don't see any value in switching times . . . it's a hindrance. One issue I agree with the NDP [on]."

Lou Williams says:

Brilliant idea. I live in both Calgary and Foam Lake [Saskatchewan], and have always liked the [idea of] no time change in [Saskatchewan]. Vote for it, it will be [the] only chance to support something the NDP [does bring] forward before they lose the next election!

I am trying to be nice, Mr. Speaker. I mean this genuinely.

Brock Warkentin – I think he might be from the Grande Prairie area – says, "Loving how the time is right now, leave it and never touch it again."

Lois Eagles says:

Finally ONE thing the NDP is doing right! Get rid of [the] time change and stick with the same time as [Saskatchewan].

As a parent – I am SO sick of the time change agony for kids! [As] an employee – driving an hour to work after [the] time change [sucks].

I'll leave it there. These are among the more polite responses I've received for parliamentary consumption, Mr. Speaker.

3:50

Now, while I'm broadly supportive of the bill, my main concern, that I've had expressed to me, is from Canucks fans who are very concerned about having to stay up very late on weeknights watching Canucks games. Obviously, we're going to have to hear from that very important stakeholder group, as we move forward, about how we can address concerns of our Canucks fans. Nonetheless, I think it is still broadly the right way to go.

I broadly support this. I would say that it would be advantageous to put this bill to a committee for proper study. While I broadly support it, I don't think that myself or anybody except for perhaps the Member for Edmonton-South West considers themselves an expert on the topic of daylight savings time and springing forward and falling back. I'd like to hear from expert witnesses about the best path forward for this. Is this truly the way we want to go?

Again, this is something I will vote for in second reading. I broadly support it, but this is exactly the kind of bill that we should have some expert witness on to determine if it is, in fact, the right way. I can be convinced either way.

I want to again commend the Member for Edmonton-South West for bringing this forward. I think it's a great way to go. Dang for PM.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I just wanted you to be aware that infants, when they're hungry, don't care whether it's one time or the other.

Calgary-Shaw.

Mr. Sucha: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm really excited to stand up and speak about this bill that we have up here today, Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act. Now, I'm going to reflect first on a story about when I did like the time change, which was when I was 19, and I was a student in Ottawa. I was at the bar, and 2 o'clock came, and then we rolled back an hour, and I got to stay out there longer. Then I sadly realized that I had to work an 11 a.m. shift – and that was not good either – the next day. I only really liked that for a few hours.

Then fast-forward to two years later, when I had a new baby in my arms, and it was very wonky about when it wanted to be fed after we changed the time zone. I changed my tune very, very quickly there, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank the Member for Strathmore-Brooks for some of the comments that he made about having experts, people from within the industry speaking about this.

I'm going to reflect back to speak about what I know, which is being a manager in the service industry. Now, it's always funny to look back, because I refer to my father, who still calls businesses before he goes out because back when we implemented the time change, a lot of businesses were actually closed on Sundays. That's not the case anymore. Businesses are open all the time. They're open on New Year's Day now. Even businesses are open on Christmas. You can go to Shoppers Drug Mart and get a bag of potato chips on Christmas Day. So the relevance of this really changes remarkably.

I managed a restaurant, and we were open on Sundays. We did a Sunday brunch service. I recall the challenges that we used to face both when we rolled back the time and then when we sprung forward. Actually, I want to thank my colleagues from the restaurant industry. I spent some of my time over constituency week reaching out to them and asking them about the implications that have been happening because I've been away from the industry for about two years now. Actually, credit some of them that they did notice that it did create a lot of challenges. What I actually sought out is – I spoke to one of my colleagues from Milestones at Market Mall.

If I can throw this in there: if you want a really good eggs Benedict that's made with fresh hollandaise sauce daily, go to Milestones at Market Mall. Apparently, they had a really good manager there at one point, too.

With that being said, I took a look at about three years worth of data from them. They kindly allowed me to look at their logbook notes, and I want to make sure that I don't divulge too many trade secrets from those. With that being said, I looked at both October and November, when we rolled back, to see if there were any implications. Actually, there was no change, really, to their revenue sales because since they added the extra hour, people were coming in a bit more sporadically, but revenue-wise there wasn't much change.

However, productivitywise they dealt with some challenges because people were sort of off-kilter when it came to their time.

However, when I looked at the March season, when they lost the hour, I was actually quite surprised to see that there was an impact. Depending on the year, it was a decline in sales compared to the previous week and the following week of anywhere between \$300 to \$1,000 in net revenue. I reflect that as being only one business. I would suggest that that may have occurred because their people were sort of off-kilter with their time, so they were skipping a meal, or they weren't going out for dinner.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Realistically, it had an implication for our business, and I can only envision what implications it has for other businesses. I recall, having worked at a different branch restaurant, seeing a decline in our intake of guests during that time, not to mention that when we lost the hour, we would always deal with issues of staff showing up late. In fact, in the logbook notes I noticed that that was an issue. We also dealt with people who were quite grumpy, so our comps were actually higher on that day. So when I reflect back, it actually had a negative impact on our business operations. Now, I can't speak in relation to all the other retail sectors that are out there, but I can speak to how it impacted the restaurant industry, and it was quite negative for us.

With that being said, because I can only speak to this one field, I firmly believe that we do need to have further discussion with a lot of other businesses. I think it's actually quite prudent that we parallel what's happening in Saskatchewan. If you look at it IT-wise – now, I'm not going to encourage a business I've invested in to come to Alberta. However, I think that when we parallel what they see in Saskatchewan, if you look at adopting your IT software, there wouldn't be many challenges that you'd have. It would actually be lower cost.

A lot of businesses here in Alberta do work with eastern seaboard businesses, so the closer we can be to the time zones you see in Ontario or New York, the better because sometimes you have a lot of employees that end up having to go into downtown Calgary early in the morning because they have to be doing a lot of work in conference calls, especially because we can Skype now and go live via video conferencing. They do a lot of work with these partners, so being closer to them because they are business partners and trade partners would be very prudent as well.

Now, I reflect back to when this started getting lively, when the Member for Edmonton-South West originally proposed this, back in December. I remember visiting a Silvera seniors' complex in Shawnessy, and the number of seniors that came to me to talk about how we should eliminate daylight savings time and eliminate the time change was remarkable. I had a senior tell me that she threw away her clock because she didn't know how to change it. I had quite a few of the nursing aides who talked about the challenges they had with regulating medications and the fact that it really threw them off-kilter, and it was a big challenge for many of the people working within that sector. You know, that's speaking in relation to what the Member for Edmonton-South West spoke about, the challenges that we see within health care.

You know, when I have interacted with some of the people within the farming community in the last little while, they don't really see the relevance either. I've heard comments around: the cow doesn't know what time it is, so it only really changes what's going to go on with us.

At the end of the day, it was something we implemented a little while back, and maybe it made sense at that time, but when I start

hearing from constituents, it's quite overwhelming where they sit on this side of the spectrum.

Now, I've heard the comments in relation to what we heard with some of the hockey teams here. At first, when I heard it from the Edmonton Oilers, I started dismissing it because: the Oilers. However, they did reference the Calgary Flames, so I started listening a bit more. With that being said, you know, that's one of the voices that was being heard.

I do commend the Member for Edmonton-South East – sorry; South West. My apologies. I live sort of in the east end of Calgary, so the east is a lot nicer. Either way, I commend him for the outreach that he's done to really try to get a lot of perspectives at the table here. I think, you know, the more we can open up this dialogue and discussion, the better to really inform ourselves.

4:00

This will have implications on our industry. Being the first province to do this and to eliminate our time change could have a lot of ramifications down the line. I think a lot of other provinces right now are watching very closely. I would not be surprised if some of the U.S. states that we do a lot of work with are watching this quite closely, and if we were to be the first to move forward with this, they would follow suit. So if we do it, we need to make sure that we get it right.

Now, with that being said, one of the things that I made sure I did leading up to this was reach out to constituents through our newsletters, and I asked them to provide me with feedback. I do that with many different issues every single month to really get some of the comments that are coming from constituents in my riding. I was overwhelmed with how many people reached out to us. I have not had a single issue that I have received more feedback on than this one. I think it really speaks volumes to the fact that this is extraordinarily important to Albertans, that they take this quite seriously, and I think they're going to take quite a bit of pride in this once we've moved through this bill.

With that being said, you know, I reflect back to being a parent myself and the challenges that I have getting my kids synced up to the right time and the challenges I have getting them off to bed. It's a quality of life thing. While it may seem like it's something small, even the little things sometimes make a big difference in people's lives.

You know, I appreciate the member for bringing this bill forward to really try to make life better for all Albertans. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Speaker: I'll recognize the hon. Member for Airdrie, followed by Calgary-Mountain View.

Mrs. Pitt: Wonderful. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise today to speak to Bill 203. I'd like to thank the hon. member for bringing this bill forward. This has created a flurry of activity in my office. It's such a great conversation piece to have with constituents of mine. Our local media have appreciated the discussion as well. So we've had a good time with this. The people of Airdrie are certainly interested in Bill 203 and the intent and purpose and the outcome of what this is supposed to bring. In fact, I could actually honestly say that at this point I've had one correspondence with a constituent that doesn't think this is a good idea. One. It's sort of like it hit the nail on the head bang on. I would probably have a big problem in my constituency of Airdrie should I vote against this bill.

The discussion is great. The reasons here, you know, I think we've all heard before. I've even heard the comment that the cows don't care what time it is. But you know what? This is actually truly important, I think, to a lot of people. When you turn on the news on

the day that the time has changed, whichever way it's changed, we see an increase in the number of motor vehicle accidents. The emergency rooms will report higher numbers as well for sure. I think there's a safety component that is being addressed by this piece of legislation, which I hope will be proclaimed before the fallback time. That would be really great because we can just get this thing over and done with and be good. I know that, certainly, the people of Airdrie want to see that as well. And that's actually what I've heard a lot from the feedback, too: "Yes. Let's vote for this. Let's get it done, and let's move on."

So I'm relaying the message from the constituents of Airdrie to this Assembly, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this piece of legislation. Thank you very much.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View, followed by Edmonton-McClung.

Dr. Swann: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the member for raising this issue, that seems to have captured a lot of attention in Alberta, though not in my constituency. Calgary-Mountain View seems to be fairly quiet about this issue. I assume that, like many, they are enjoying the long evenings that come with daylight saving time and time with children and time with family activities afterwards.

The bill proposes to shift and be consistent with Saskatchewan Central Time year-round, ending the practice of putting clocks forward by one hour in the spring and turning them back an hour in the fall. This would preserve the province's long summer evenings but would result in much later sunrises and darker mornings in the winter and would put us out of sync with the west coast by two hours instead of one hour. It stipulates that Alberta standard time will be the only time used or observed in Alberta.

We actually had a resolution before our spring policy convention with the Alberta Liberal Party, and it was narrowly defeated, to say in brief. What I may say is that because of the mixed response and the, really, lack of interest in my constituency about changing the daylight saving time, we will probably oppose the bill and suggest that we push this to committee for a full discussion there and more consultation with Albertans.

There are values, I gather, that daylight saving time actually consumes more energy in Alberta, more electricity, more fossil fuels, and that, to me, should suggest that we may want to change it. But on the other hand, there is more daylight time, and people are more active, so they're healthier and doing more things outdoors, and there's good family time and stress relief time. So I'm kind of torn myself. I think I could probably live with either. I've lived with daylight saving time for many years, and I could probably live without it, but it's not a big enough issue in my constituency to get too concerned about.

There is some evidence that heart attacks and strokes and car accidents in some ways go along with daylight saving time, and there are these pros and cons. But if we switched, I guess, the other reflection we've had in our caucus is that we would want it synchronized, as it is today, with many of the northwest United States, which are also on this, even the southwest United States: Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico, Montana, Idaho, and Colorado.

It's a mixed bag. I guess what I would say from this side is that without a referral or a hoist, I don't think we could support it as it is. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to speak to the proposed Bill 203, the daylight saving time bill. I do agree that there should be a full airing of expert views in a forum

that satisfies Albertans with respect to proposed amendments to daylight saving time that Bill 203 contemplates.

I know that in my constituency I've asked individuals about this almost every time that I come into contact with them, and they overwhelmingly, particularly the younger people with families, are really supportive of this change and really not liking changing their clocks twice a year and finding it quite disruptive.

On the other side of the fence, I've had two individuals with whom I've had contact with for decades, long-time friends and associates, who found it fit to actually text me saying: now, this is personal. They were really quite upset about it. On either side of the fence people have passion on this issue, but the overwhelming majority that I've run into in my constituency are definitely supportive of Bill 203.

I think I'm in support of measures which would make sure that all Albertans are happy with the legislation that we end up finally supporting in terms of investigating all avenues of concern with respect to it. That may be from industry. I think agriculture has generally expressed themselves in favour, but there may be airline industries, restaurants, or other industries which have schedules that are affected by the daylight saving time changes, that they would like to express that themselves.

4:10

I think it's incumbent on us that we do hear all those views while there's an opportunity to do so, before the legislation is finally passed. Notwithstanding the huge outpouring of responses that we had from Albertans on the surveys and also the good attendance at meetings that were held here in the Federal building, one of which I attended, I still think that many individuals consider that an airing of expert opinion might be worth while to ensure that there are no sour grapes at the end of the day.

I agree with the Member for Airdrie that the overwhelming response from Albertans is to go ahead and do this and get the change made and move on, but I think in a final analysis we should make sure that no voices have been unheard and that we consider with respect those that do oppose it for one reason or another. I think the opportunity for those voices to be heard in a forum that may go deeper than an online survey would be something to consider.

With those remarks, I'll let it be known that I'm kind of agnostic personally on the matter, but I think the overwhelming majority of people in the province have expressed themselves quite clearly that they are tired of changing their clocks twice a year.

I know that I'm probably one of the people in this House who is in a minority as far as having experienced the implementation of daylight saving time in 1972. I do remember enjoying the longer summer hours after that was implemented. I do remember enjoying, I guess, being able to shovel the sidewalks in the morning with my brother in the darkness because it didn't seem quite as early as we continued to keep our sidewalks clear on a corner lot that I lived on. If you wanted your porridge, you got the sidewalks shovelled. If you didn't get them done, you're going hungry until they get done. We shovelled away in the darkness, but we certainly enjoyed the long summer evenings. I know that when our family finally got a boat and we took it out water-skiing, my brothers and sisters and I certainly enjoyed the calm waters in the late hours and the glass on the lake to learn and hone our water-skiing skills those long summer evenings. Campers especially, I think, in Alberta enjoy those long summer evenings. So while I may have told you earlier that I'm agnostic on the idea, there certainly are some benefits to the daylight saving time or the Central Time that this bill proposes to potentially adopt that appeal very much to me.

It actually kind of surprised me when I heard from constituents in conversation that without hesitation, especially those that had

family members and children, they would tell me right now: let's not bother changing the clocks anymore. I was more than surprised at how disruptive it was to them and how quickly they cast their vote in favour of not changing the clocks. I must say that my kids have long since left the house. They're in their thirties now and producing grandchildren, so I haven't had my house disrupted by clock changes in a long time. That, I guess, I needed to be reminded of. Those are the individuals that I've spoken to who have really gone on to say most quickly that they really would like us to do away with the process of changing the clocks every fall and every spring.

I'm not really overly concerned about the difference in time between us and British Columbia. In the winter it will be a couple of hours, but I think that's not an overly strong objection. That's my personal view on it. However, the thing I'm most looking forward to personally is the long summer evenings, which I think we've come to value and enjoy and appreciate. If it is decided that we'll adopt the Central Time, Saskatchewan time, and call it Alberta standard time, then I'll continue to enjoy those summer evenings.

One thing I know that I was concerned about was that we would end up calling it Central Time or Saskatchewan time, and I'm happy to see that the proposal is to call it Alberta standard time. It is an Alberta time zone that we're contemplating here. I know we'll kind of lose the historical Mountain Standard Time designation that we had, but in order to be clear that we're adopting a time zone that's different from Mountain Standard Time, which is a time zone that runs sort of vertically north-south into the States, we'll be adopting Alberta standard time, which has a year-long, nonchanging designation. That designation will be published in all kinds of schedules globally and identified specifically as a time zone that Albertans will follow year-round without changing.

Therefore, we will become known as one of those jurisdictions in North America and globally which have decided to adjust their thinking with respect to daylight saving time and changing their clocks twice a year and probably will become, as others have mentioned in this House, a leader in adopting these changes. I certainly can see the debate branching out beyond our borders and into other western economic jurisdictions and perhaps even Europe when they hear from their public how unpopular the practice of changing their clocks twice a year is. We once again will be seen as a very forward-thinking jurisdiction. Even people from, I'm sure, jurisdictions like Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills seem to agree with those from Airdrie that changing the clocks twice a year is an unnecessary burden and a practice they would prefer to do away with.

Now, with those remarks, I'll listen to others with interest as they add to this debate and, hopefully, decide that we'll allow all Albertans to express themselves fully and completely, and when the decision is finally made, we'll be able to put the issue to bed with everybody being happy campers.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Mason: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm happy to rise. I intend to move a motion which will refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future because I think there are a number of interests at play here. Not all of them are, you know, going in the same direction, and it's important that we make sure that all points of view are heard and that the impact or potential impact of these changes be fully canvassed with everyone so that we are fully informed on this matter. I think there's been some really good debate on this, and I know that out there people are quite seized by the issue in many respects and very, very, very interested in it.

Obviously, everyone has an opinion on the matter. I know that the sponsor of the bill undertook extensive consultation before bringing it forward, and I expect that we've all been hearing from our constituents about it. There have been a number of concerns expressed as well by different organizations, for example both NHL teams here in the province, so I think that that consultation is a good thing. It's been very good so far, but I believe also that it should continue.

For that reason, Madam Speaker, I would like to move the following amendment, that the motion for second reading of Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 203, Alberta Standard Time Act, be not now read a second time but that the subject matter of the bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future in accordance with Standing Order 74.2 and that the committee report the bill back to the Assembly on or before October 4, 2017.

Madam Speaker, I have the requisite number of copies of this amendment, which has been approved by Parliamentary Counsel, and I would ask that the extremely efficient pages could now distribute it.

Thank you very much.

4:20

The Deputy Speaker: This referral amendment is debatable. Are there any hon. members wishing to speak to the amendment? The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mr. Cooper: Thank you. It's my pleasure to rise, Madam Speaker, and speak to the amendment. I might just like to point out a very brief couple of items. I know that you will know that I have spent some time in this House encouraging the government to refer pieces of legislation to committee. In fact, I have done it north of 25 times. I will find out the exact number because I know that members are riveted to know how many times it's actually happened. I will rise and speak in support of such a motion. I think that any time we can make the best use of making good decisions, not just fast decisions but good decisions – I do find it a little interesting that the Government House Leader has spoken at length about not referring pieces of legislation to standing committees and the need for the business of the House to proceed. I look forward to using some of his quotes from this afternoon in the very, very near future with respect to consultation and the importance of getting it right. Without the benefit of the Blues I wouldn't want to misquote him, but I do look forward to that.

You know, in the name of how things happen around this place, I think that it's interesting that a member of cabinet might come back to actively participate and encourage private members to perhaps go in one direction or another. I know that in the past he may have been a little excited about these sorts of things, but one thing I will say is that the Government House Leader is a good, good parliamentarian. He has taught me a lot, so I look forward to continuing to learn how to do these sorts of things, about having a change of heart, when I, too, am in government.

It's great to be able to support the motion. In all seriousness, I think that getting it right is very important. I perhaps look forward to moving a motion at committee, and maybe we'll make this Daylight saving time. There are lots of options available to us at committee, and I know that the best opportunity for the best idea to win takes place at committee and not necessarily here in the confines of the House.

I look forward to supporting the amendment. I encourage all members of the Assembly to do the same, and hopefully we can move expeditiously.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-South West.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to rise today and thank all members who spoke both to the main motion and who've spoken to this referral amendment. I do believe my team did amazing work and pulled long hours to ensure that we did have as thorough a consultation as I possibly could. We heard from tens of thousands of people through my office and through the survey, and that's why we did have, after the bill was tabled, an ongoing consultation form that we put back up on our website. I do believe in hearing from Albertans and that legislation is a living, growing process and that we should keep moving forward on this.

While I do believe that my team and I put in a great deal of work that I think does reflect Albertans and does reflect their will, if this is the will of the Assembly, if this is what the House requires so that we are able to move forward with this legislation – I'm encouraged to see that there's a due date for this referral. If this is what the House wills, then I'd be happy to work with the committee, with Alberta's Economic Future Committee, and ensure that this legislation is thoroughly consulted on, thoroughly fleshed out, and is the best possible legislation it can be.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to the amendment?

You can't speak to the amendment again.

Mr. Mason: Not to close?

The Deputy Speaker: No.

Mr. Mason: Oh, really.

The Deputy Speaker: Seeing no other members wishing to speak to the amendment, I will call the question.

[Motion on amendment carried]

Bill 204
Protection of Property Rights Statutes
Amendment Act, 2017

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Livingstone-Macleod.

Mr. Stier: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to rise this afternoon. For the official part of this little presentation I'm pleased to move second reading of Bill 204, the Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017.

[The Speaker in the chair]

Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. Thank you for being here this afternoon. Finally, we get to a topic that's near and dear to my heart and has been for several years. It is something that we actually brought forward for first reading in Bill 210 this fall, but that kind of disappeared with the change of session and so on and so forth. So we have brought that bill back, in essence, but we've also added in something that's vitally important in 204, and that is squatters' rights.

Let me just start, then, by saying that, you know, over the years since our party came into being, there were a number of things that took place that generated that. One of those was actually back in the 2008 and 2009 era, when the government of the day launched a series of bills that became quite controversial. This all stemmed from many years prior, when the same government had been feeling a lot of pressure from the environment side and the oil and gas side

to make some changes. They wanted to therefore look at also land-use planning as being the crux of the situation, so they brought in a series of bills that would more or less give the government of the day power to make some decisions without necessarily having all of the different rights and concerns of landowners first in mind, it seemed.

They brought out bills 19, 24, 36, and 50 in those days. Bill 50 was eventually repealed, which was to do with the electricity power line grid. Bill 19 was the land assembly act, which actually was able to come along and set aside lands without a lot of rights as well when the government might need land for roads and so on and so forth. That one was done. Then Bill 24, which is still kind of on the books as a pore space one: that one is still kind of hanging around for carbon capture and storage. But the most controversial one was Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, in short ALSA. ALSA had several sections in it that gave an awful lot of people around the rural area and the business world an awful lot of concern.

Really, what this all was about was that the government wanted to change how land-use planning was being done. They set about, around the '07-08 era, the new land-use policy document, which became the land-use framework. It set aside a whole new set of endeavours to control how land-use planning was done. They went ahead and they decided to cut the province of Alberta into seven regions. They were going to do regional plans, so it was a change to the regional planning model.

4:30

Regional planning had been done years and years before, but it didn't work out too well in those days. Over the period of time in the '80s and '90s we had municipalities working with themselves individually, as they almost are in many respects today, without a regional plan. So they decided to put in regional planning. That became a problem. People were having arguments, urban and rural, so eventually the government decided to run back to the regional planning model. Now, as we've seen in the past year and a half here in this Assembly, we have gone back to where municipalities are having to do their municipal development plans, their intermunicipal development plans, land-use bylaws and that to conform to these regional plans.

Within the context of Bill 36, though, which was the legislation that put the regional plans into legislation and gave them the power to do what they were doing, were several clauses that were quite controversial and that raised the ire of a lot of people out in the business world and the rural landowner world. Those clauses more or less said in many respects that the cabinet of the day, in creating these regional plans, could dictate to the local governments and municipalities how to plan. That caused a sense of angst with the municipalities because it kind of cut down on their autonomy, so the municipalities weren't too pleased with it. Moreover, the landowners were a little concerned about several clauses that were in there.

There were also clauses, at the same time, in the responsible energy act that gave them some problems. Basically, I'd just like to read out a few of these clauses to draw your attention to them. I only have a few minutes in this second reading process to address a lot of this. Section 11 talks about the ability of the government to amend or rescind existing rights, including development rights, resource extraction rights, mining rights, water licences, grazing leases, et cetera. Those are called statutory consents. Those are extremely important documents that people struggle to get through for their own business needs or to run the affairs of their farm properties or feedlots or dairy farms or what have you. Statutory consents are really important in oil and gas, of course, because that includes oil and gas leases. There are different kinds of things in

forestry where we get statutory consents. So this act actually allowed the government to come along and amend or rescind those things.

Further, in some of the other clauses in the act they also eliminated the rights of the courts, the ability to make a claim against the government when some of the government decisions were handed down from the cabinet like that. They also limited the ability for the landowner or the business owner to seek compensation. So we're trying to clean that up.

I realize I've only got three and a half minutes now, Mr. Speaker, so I'm going to move along. We're looking at the responsible energy act, too. As I mentioned, the responsible energy act had at one time come along, in the first year, I believe, of when I was elected. They took out a lot of the red tape that was in the previous act that governed this, the Energy Resources Conservation Act, which allowed for notice to the landowner and the ability to have the right to speak at a hearing regarding oil and gas type operations on the property. What we're doing with this is that we're going to take some of the old, previous, proper notification rules that were in the Energy Resources Conservation Act and put that back into place. That would have been section 26 of that previous act. And we're amending the responsible energy act to include proper notification and those kinds of opportunities for landowners to go and have those hearings.

Further, and most importantly, I think, in addition to all of those things, we have now decided to go ahead and add into Bill 204 the issue of adverse possession. Many people, I believe, in this House were involved in a committee meeting earlier these past few months regarding property rights and adverse possession. This is a situation, Mr. Speaker, where – and I'll just read the legislation quickly.

When, during a period of 10 years (1), a person has been in exclusive, continuous, open or visible and notorious (2) actual possession or occupation of land of which he is not the registered owner and which is not Crown land (3) or municipal land (4), that person may apply to the courts to recover a judgment declaring that he is entitled to the exclusive right to use the land or that he is . . . in the exclusive possession of the land.

In other words, what this is basically saying is that he can apply and actually seek and gain title of the land if he and the original owner have not had some sort of an agreement or any interaction for a period of 10 years. This has been one of the most archaic rules that's been around in Canada. There are only two provinces, ours and Nova Scotia, I understand, that still have this rule in effect. There have been, unfortunately, some unfortunate situations, particularly in the south part of the country just lately, where land has actually had to change hands because of this old rule.

The motion that was made by our party during the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship regarding this was:

Be it resolved that the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship recommend that the government introduce legislation abolishing the common-law doctrine of adverse possession in Alberta and all statutory references supporting adverse possession in Alberta legislation.

That actually passed during that committee meeting. We thought it a great opportunity to bring it into this bill. It's a very important property right. It is a key piece of this legislation, and I would ask all members to have a look. Feel free to contact me if you need more information during the upcoming debates on this bill. It is extremely important to all Albertans. I know that the governing party in the past had supported this kind of stuff.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Thank you.

Any members who wish to speak to Bill 204? The Member for Little Bow.

Mr. Schneider: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to give my enthusiastic support to Bill 204, Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017. What this bill really does is that it paves the way to fix some of the more troublesome aspects of bills that were brought forth by previous governments that, I would say, had a direct and negative impact on property rights in Alberta.

Property rights, of course, refers to the rights of the landowner. I think you'll find that this particular point will be made several times throughout my speech. These rights are those basic rights to financial security and prosperity. They're the very foundation that landowners rely on. Landowners want to know when they make an investment to purchase land that that investment is protected and its value will not be adversely affected by others, including government at any level, without just compensation.

I cannot stress enough to everyone today that these landowners are the primary group most impacted by energy projects in Alberta. Remember that it is these projects, be they pipelines, well sites, or transmission lines, that primarily occur on private land. Now, sometimes they can happen on Crown land, but very rarely do energy companies actually own the land that the project occurs on. This is a very important distinction to make because as it turns out in Alberta, landowners have very little say when it comes to energy projects on their land or access to their land for the project. The fact is that the energy company can come and will get a right-of-entry order under the Surface Rights Act and force their way onto the land. What this bill does is try to fix this process that allows access and how land is accessed and appealed when possible damages and disagreements pop up.

We are really here today because in 2009 and 2010 the government of the day passed laws that attacked property rights and the rule of law. At that time the government saw rights and courts as obstacles to their planning and policy goals. Whether this was simply the bureaucracy run amok or not, the politicians of the day went along with it every step of the way. They brought in legislation that severely curtailed the property rights of Albertans through Bills 19, 24, 36, and 50. In addition, Bill 2 in 2012, the energy development act, lacked the adequate notification, hearing, and appeal rights for landowners. On top of that, they failed to address the issue of the law of adverse possession, known more commonly as squatters' rights. This made Alberta one of only two provinces not to repeal this outdated practice.

Now, fortunately, some of the more outrageous bills have been fixed or repealed. Bill 19, The Land Assembly Project Area Act, for instance, gave cabinet the power to freeze a person's land for an extended period of time without compensation. For instance, a farmer or landowner could not develop his own property or in any way change the land to suit his own needs, to suit his livelihood without the consent of the government. This basically devalued the land's worth. Thankfully, however, the bill was repealed in 2015 before it was ever used.

4:40

Now, Bill 50, the Electric Statutes Amendment Act, 2009, was used to force through a few energy projects, including Fort McMurray east and west. These are projects that we are still hearing landowners' complaints on today. These projects forced these builds through largely privately held land, and while some objections did manage to modify the proposed route, there was little recourse under existing law for landowners other than to make the best deal for compensation that they possibly could. Noncompliance, as mentioned earlier, was not an option, and right-of-entry orders

were always a big stick that energy companies could wield. This particular bill, Bill 50, was also repealed, but the current projects were grandfathered in, and damage to property rights was done.

Mr. Speaker, that's not to say that these are the only ill-conceived pieces of legislation that tended to curtail property rights in Alberta. Not at all. There are still several others that simply need to be addressed. That is what Bill 204 seeks to address. As my colleague from Livingstone-Macleod stated when he introduced his bill: "[Bill 204] is a culmination of many years of advocacy, dating back to 2009, when the Alberta Land Stewardship Act was introduced."

As we know, that particular piece of legislation limited property rights without notice or adequate compensation. Bill 204 proposes to correct this by amending the Alberta Land Stewardship Act and the Responsible Energy Development Act to ensure Albertans will once more have the right to a fair hearing if their rights are affected and have the right of recourse to the courts where their lands or vested interests are affected by a regional plan.

Furthermore, this bill finally deals with squatters' rights, or adverse possession if you'd rather, by repealing Section 74 of the Land Titles Act and amending the act accordingly. Let me talk about adverse possession for a moment. Can you imagine losing your hard-earned titled land without recourse or compensation simply because someone else happened to occupy it for 10 years? Imagine that, a law that permits untitled occupants of land of 10 years or longer to take possession of that same land without a valid agreement with the original owner. It is simply unacceptable, and as several Albertan landowners have discovered to their dismay, this is the law of the land.

Now, it is important to remember that this isn't just a rural issue. Several of the precedents over adverse possession have occurred within an urban setting. This could just as easily be an issue over a poorly surveyed fence line or a garage that could conceivably be partly owned by your neighbour just because of an unfortunate oversight. Hopefully, with the help of every member of this Assembly we can make right a wrong in this province. While this will do little to correct past decisions, it will prevent this unjust law from penalizing future Alberta landowners. This really shouldn't be a hard sell in this House. After all, it was just months ago that the Wildrose motion on adverse possession was passed unanimously by all parties in committee. Property rights, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan issue. On that I think we can all agree.

Now, I've looked back in *Hansard* and read numerous quotes from government members when they were in opposition. In fact, the now Minister of Infrastructure once remarked, "I find it ironic in a way that it's the New Democrat opposition that is standing up and has stood up from the beginning for the rights of property owners in this province."

A statement like that leaves me little doubt that he will be one of the staunchest advocates for what this bill is trying to accomplish. In fact, I have an entire document that the New Democratic Party published – it's called *Your Land, Your Rights* – that extols the premise that together we can change these laws that trample on important rights of citizens. This is powerful stuff, Mr. Speaker. I'd be happy to table this document if you'd like. But it is certainly nice to know that we have a bill here that seems to me is exactly what the New Democratic Party in Alberta fought so very hard to fix when they were in opposition. This should make for a very fulsome exchange of ideas as this bill progresses along.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend my colleague from the constituency of Livingstone-Macleod for his tireless work on this topic. I've been involved in many conversations with him, and

he has long championed this fight, as have several of my other peers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, Bill 204, speaks to fundamental rights that all Albertans deserve, and it is my sincere hope that all members of this House feel the same. Thank you.

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

Mr. Strankman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It truly is a pleasure and an honour to stand in regard to defending property rights. As many know, it has been part of my activist role, previous to attaining status in this Chamber, to defend property rights, not necessarily in regard to land but in regard to the ownership of the fruits of your own labour, and I think that relates to the NDP government, the NDP vision of the use of their own hands and their own achievement of wealth and attaining that by using their own labour.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a liberty here and relate an approximately 500-word column related to that that I created and presented in my community. It relates only to one portion of what the Member for Livingstone-Macleod talks about in his bill. [An electronic device sounded] Well, I guess I'm cut off.

It's entitled *Eliminating Squatters' Rights*, Bill 204. As I said, it relates to one portion of this bill.

Your rights to own property are not protected in the way most Albertans believe they should be. In recent years, we've seen flawed legislation come into effect that does not protect Albertans' rights to own property and that gives government sweeping powers to negatively affect landowners who get in the way of its centralized land-use plans.

In Alberta, a lesser known negative still exists known as adverse possession, or squatters' rights. In Alberta property law, squatters' rights allow individuals with no legal or moral right the ability to claim possession of another individual's property. This can be achieved simply by an individual who does not have title or ownership occupying or using a portion of land for a legally specified number of years. They can then claim legal use to that portion of property.

Currently, only Alberta and Nova Scotia have a law like this on the books. In 2014, the Alberta Property Rights Advocate recommended scrapping this law and just last February, a Wildrose motion on abolishing squatters' rights received all-party support from a Legislature committee. There is a strong will to get this done for Alberta landowners.

Recently, Wildrose Livingstone-Macleod MLA Pat Stier introduced the Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017, an enhanced Bill to protect property rights that would remove squatters' rights from Alberta law.

"It's high time we caught up to the rest of the country and abolished squatters' rights in this province," [the Member for Livingstone-Macleod] said. "This is the big issue that so many hardworking landowners have been waiting patiently to see fixed. It's time for the NDP to put its money where its mouth is and get this done for Alberta landowners."

Bill 204 would accomplish other good things for landowners like amending Bill 36, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act (ALSA), which has been categorized by legal experts as "draconian." The ministerial powers that exist within ALSA are so sweeping and all-powerful they've been dubbed the "Henry VIII clauses."

Under section 19.1 of ALSA, landowners impacted by regional planning saw their rights to seek legal remedy through the courts eliminated completely. If Bill 204 passes, this will no longer be the case.

If I could just ad lib, Mr. Speaker, my hat is off to the Member for Livingstone-Macleod.

4:50

Bill 204 will also protect the rights of statutory consents (such as forestry permits, intensive livestock operation licenses, oil and gas leases, and grazing leases) to recover financial or property losses through the courts should they be negatively impacted by regional planning decisions. The Bill also proposes amending the Responsible Energy Development Act to incorporate the rights from section 26 of the Energy Resources Conservation Act so that owners of private land will be properly notified of access requests, learn and challenge the facts supporting an energy resource application and be fully involved with the hearing.

[This government] used to support property rights and oppose Bill 36, but since they've been in power, we've been slow to see any effort to fix these issues in Alberta property law.

As the Wildrose Shadow Minister for Property and Surface Rights, I'm proud to support [my compatriot member's] Bill 204, and I urge [this government] to do right by landowners and support the Bill too.

Wildrose will continue to fight for property rights to ensure the future protection of Albertans' ability to create, maintain and accumulate their own earned wealth.

Mr. Speaker, it's primary to a free and democratic society for people to understand that property rights are not necessarily only about access to what some would know as the dirt. In this case we are talking primarily about access to physical property, where people operate their farms and ranches, forestry operations, and other such operations or explore for oil and such. Under our Westminster system we have a tiered system of physical property ownership such that the mineral rights underneath the ground are owned by the Crown, and they sell the rights to those energy resources to other companies. Then the access to those mineral rights is needed by the surface landowners, and this creates issues. The Member for Livingstone-Macleod knows full well and respects and understands that there are requirements needed for proper consultation and legal remedies in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber we've also talked about renewable resources and the access for those entities who are seeking facilities to develop renewable resources, whether they be by wind or solar. To date we do not have proper regulatory legislation for the development of those facilities, and the minister of environment has stated that those contracts would be held between the landowner and the developer for that property. There is a whole tier of issues that are about to be developed there and are happening in my constituency and other constituencies throughout the province that are going to cause great concern as we go forward without the government's proper regulatory issuance of legislation in that regard.

The primary subject, I guess, of our discussion today, though, is Bill 204, and I view that as the most important part of our discussion. I look forward to having the support of all members in the Chamber in the development and the passing of the private member's Bill 204.

With that, in closing, I'd like to say that with my activism in the past of defending property rights – and some people take it in a flippant manner. I do not because I had an opportunity to confer at one stage with the Prime Minister in this regard, and I was able to tell him, Mr. Speaker, that I was the only man in this Chamber who was able to go to jail before I came into the Legislature, many actually going to jail after or with their involvement with the Chamber. I'm proud to be able to say that, so I thank you.

The Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak to Bill 204? The Member for Wetaskiwin-Camrose.

Mr. Hinkley: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question first? If I speak now and we run out of time, will I be able to speak again in second reading?

The Speaker: You will have five minutes left.

Mr. Hinkley: At another time?

The Speaker: At another time.

Mr. Hinkley: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to rise and speak to Bill 204, the Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017. I am proud to be part of a government and a caucus that has always stood up for landowners in Alberta and will continue to do so. We believe in property rights, including due process, proper notification, and fair compensation. We have made a commitment to address these issues, and that's what we are doing. It's important to Albertans, and it's important to our government. Our government has already begun working with stakeholders to make positive change on these important issues and is working to make Albertans' lives better by ensuring that the public has access to appropriate protections and avenues for resolution where issues arise involving private property. Bill 204 aims to address these important concerns.

I think the spirit of the bill is an important one. I would like to thank the Member for Livingstone-Macleod for bringing that forward. However, I am left with several questions about how it is currently drafted. In fact, Mr. Speaker, Bill 204 creates more questions than it addresses, so I am interested in hearing more from the member and my colleagues here in the House about these issues.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, protecting landowners' rights is of great importance to our government and has long been an issue championed by members of our caucus. One of the key changes that Bill 204 proposes to create is to provide additional rights to compensation for any statutory consents that are affected, amended, or rescinded by a regional plan made under the Alberta Land Stewardship Act. In fact, Bill 204 would add a clause to the Alberta Land Stewardship Act which states:

Notwithstanding section 13, if a regional plan affects, amends or rescinds a statutory consent or the terms or conditions of a statutory consent, the holder of the statutory consent may bring a claim against the Crown ...

I want to repeat that part: "may bring a claim against the Crown." ... for any losses the holder may suffer as a result of any effect on or amendment or rescission of the statutory consent under a regional plan.

Again, I understand the intent of the member in putting forward this amendment, and we support that intent. However, I worry that this bill looks at the issue from only one perspective and misses some other important perspectives. Looking at an issue from all sides is what we do in this government and what we should do in this House as well.

As I understand it, Bill 204 also creates private compensation mandates for public goods such as water and Crown lands. Private compensation for public goods: I just have some questions about that. It's not that I'm opposing what is being said, but I do need some clarification. I think we can all agree that property rights are complex, and finding the balance between public good, private property owners' rights, and responsible development is key to addressing these issues.

There are currently over 86,000 active Crown mineral agreements in Alberta, and many of these may be potentially impacted by regional plans. If Bill 204 becomes law as it is currently drafted and if regional plans directly affect, amend, or rescind Crown mineral agreements, this could leave the government

and Alberta taxpayers potentially liable for compensation. So I think we really need to look at that.

I want to provide one example here. Bill 204 proposes to change subsection 19.1(1)(a) of the ALSA to redefine “compensable taking” to mean “the diminution or abrogation of a property right, title or interest” – who wrote this a long time ago? – “directly resulting from a regional plan or an amendment to a regional plan.” This would create a new clause of action that is not currently recognized in the law. The potential implications to government in terms of compensation would be broad-reaching. This would broaden the scope of those who could be entitled to compensation. For example, with my understanding of the proposed changes, a mining firm whose coal extraction rights are impacted by a regional plan may qualify for compensation more easily following this amendment even if that firm would not have been entitled to compensation at common law.

The Speaker: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt you, but the time limit for consideration of this business item at this time is concluded.

5:00 Motions Other than Government Motions

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

Electricity Rates

502. Dr. Swann moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to amend the regulated rate option regulation, Alta. reg. 262/2005, by replacing the regulated rate option with a new default rate for electricity that is to be calculated using a weighted average of the wholesale price of electricity.

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and move Motion 502. Since becoming an MLA, one of my most frequent concerns, as raised by my constituents, is the high cost and volatility of electricity bills. The system did not seem to be delivering on the promise of low energy costs and reduced price volatility that was made when the market was deregulated. This NDP government is planning a series of measures in an attempt to deal with this. However, like other policies, I find they are ideologically based and are failing to take into consideration some of the price and volatility issues that Albertans are concerned about.

Albertans need a practical solution based on evidence, so I've decided to research this issue in depth. Motion 502 is the culmination of substantial consultation over two years with stakeholders in Alberta's electricity energy market. In particular, I'd like to thank Nick Jansen, an academic researcher, and Rob Spragins, who previously served as Alberta's Utilities Consumer Advocate. Both were instrumental in researching, drafting, and encouraging me to bring this motion forward today. I'd also like to thank my constituents and other Albertans who over the years took the time to write to me about these concerns.

Before going further into the rationale for the motion, perhaps it would be helpful to review the history of the deregulated energy market and the regulated rate option, the RRO. Since 2001 Albertans have been able to choose to receive their electricity either from a retailer that is regulated by the Alberta Utilities Commission, the AUC, or from a competitive retailer, in which case they would sign a contract for a set price for electricity such as a fixed price for a defined time period.

The regulated rate option was established to provide a default option for consumers who decide not to choose a competitive retail product. The regulated rate option does not ensure a single low rate.

Rather, rates change from month to month, depending on the price of power. In 2006 the regulated rate option was changed to encourage customers to switch from the regulated rate option to a competitive retail product and to foster the development of the competitive retail energy market. Section 11 of the regulated rate option regulation determines this rate based on the weighted average of forward contracts to a 120-day period prior to the month of consumption. This is called forward pricing.

The problem with using this method, as experience has clearly shown, is that it actually leads to higher electricity costs for consumers. In addition, now that the competitive market has been in operation for 11 years, it's time to revise this policy to something more in line with current market conditions. Something needs to be done in order to ensure that the default option for electricity is affordable, protects consumers, encourages industry participation, and reinforces proper market functioning.

My motion to change the regulated rate option calculation to use the weighted average monthly pool prices instead of the forward market for four months is aimed at doing just that. Motion 502 reads as follows:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to amend the regulated rate option regulation, Alta. reg. 262/2005, by replacing the regulated rate option with a new default rate for electricity that is to be calculated using a weighted average of the wholesale price of electricity.

Not unlike the electricity market itself, I understand how this motion may seem complicated at first glance. It was to me. But what it essentially seeks to do is to replace the current formula for calculating the regulated rate option with a new one that is based on the actual price of power.

There are numerous benefits to using the weighted average pool price. First of all, it's consistent with the original intent of the deregulated electricity market. Our electricity market was founded on the notion that markets provide consumers with choice and that truly competitive markets will result in lower prices than the regulated markets.

Under my proposed changes consumers would continue to have choice through competitive markets. Unlike attempts to reregulate the market, it preserves the integrity of the competitive retail market and may even make it more competitive. It also allows the equitable allocation of risk and reward to the stakeholders: the investors, the retailers, and the consumers. All can win. Furthermore, it achieves a significant reduction in the complexity and the cost associated with the regulatory approval of regulated rate option rates by the Alberta Utilities Commission.

Customers would also receive savings by receiving the flow-through weighted average wholesale rate. These savings will help to offset the increases in the cost of electricity distribution and transmission service, the power purchase agreement liability, and the high cost of living in Alberta. They could potentially be used for expenditures on energy efficiency upgrades, energy services, and helping to grow future-ready industries, clean tech.

Strategically it is also a good time to implement a change in the regulated rate option due to the current low level of pool prices relative to historic levels. These low pricing levels are expected to continue for the next three to four years, primarily because of the overcapacity of our generating supply. Any of the negative impacts of this proposal on vulnerable consumers could be readily offset through subsidies and rebates, as we've heard the government is prepared to do.

In addition to providing choice, strengthening the retail market, and passing on savings to consumers, the weighted average of monthly pool prices offers the most effective price signal possible. This means that the price paid by consumers will be the actual cost

of power. Consumers may not understand that there is a significant cost premium built into the current regulated rate option which advances the price over four months. This new method of regulated rate option calculation will establish a price reference point by standardizing the default cost across Alberta. It would also facilitate comparability of nonenergy costs such as the distribution, administration, and return margins amongst different regulated retailers throughout Alberta. Consumers could then use this information to conduct a proper cost-benefit analysis of competitive retail options.

While I support the government's efforts to create a market for renewables and diversify our province's electricity generation very much, simply putting a price cap on the regulated rate option is not the answer. In fact, it could potentially cause serious problems down the line and discourage new investment. Consumers should always have a price reference based on the actual cost of electricity in order to make the most efficient and effective energy consumption and investment choices. If energy costs are deemed to be too high, the government has the option to utilize rebates and subsidies for those that need it, not across the board to all Albertans. It should never mask the price signal that would encourage people to do the right thing as far as finding energy efficiency and using less. Otherwise, we may end up in a situation like Ontario.

The price cap will not reduce the cost of electricity for consumers; it merely defers payment to a later date and to our future generations. If we don't pay our way now, somebody is going to have to pay it later. Also, it will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the viability of a competitive retail market by eliminating the incentive for consumers to sign the fixed-price contracts. It also has the potential to distort the price signal, which may cause consumers to make poor decisions regarding their energy purchases and investment.

More importantly, a price cap will actually increase the cost of power to regulated rate option customers. If the market price of energy exceeds 6.8 cents a kilowatt hour, the cap, retailers will be purchasing supply at a higher price and selling it at a lower price. The difference will still need to be paid by consumers. This difference would likely be put in a deferral account and repaid over a period of time. Regulated rate option retailers will incur a financing charge, which will result in an increase to the cost of the regulated rate option. Consumers will be under the false illusion that total energy costs are lower as a result of the price cap when, in fact, they will be higher due to the cost of financing the deferral account, another extra expense in electricity.

Another possible issue associated with a price cap is the possibility of unintended consequences. The regulated rate option price is extremely complicated and is probably only understood by a handful of people in Alberta. Because of the variability of pool prices and forward prices, there is a risk that the deferral account could run out of control, which could significantly increase the cost of the regulated rate option to consumers. If the government plans on using a price cap, it would make sense for it to adopt my proposal to change the regulated rate calculation as this would significantly reduce the deferral account risk and would help to achieve the government's ultimate goal, which is to protect consumers.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will take my seat and listen intently to what will undoubtedly be a shockingly current debate which will electrify the Assembly with positive and negative charges.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Energy.

5:10

Ms McCuaig-Boyd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That'll be a tough one to follow. I'm honoured to rise and speak to Motion 502. I can't support it, but I'll give you the reasons why.

Changing the regulated rate option to a pool price flow mechanism, as the motion suggests, will not help electricity consumers. In fact, this change will expose Albertans to greater price swings than the ones they've already experienced under the existing system. We are working to make life more affordable for Albertan families. We need to keep electricity prices in check, but this motion would do the opposite. It would expose Albertans to even wilder electricity price swings than what we've already seen in the past, and we won't let that happen to Albertan families.

Now, I appreciate what the Member for Calgary-Mountain View is trying to do. Our electricity system is broken. It doesn't work for investors, it doesn't work for consumers, and we need to fix it. Price spikes are built into the energy market that we inherited from the previous government, and ratepayers have the scars to prove it. During the first half of this decade prices swung wildly, well above the price cap that we are implementing. They were over 7 cents most of the time, over 10 cents, over 12 cents, and sometimes over 15 cents. That system took Albertans on a roller coaster of electricity prices, and it wasn't a pleasant ride, and the government at the controls didn't want to let us off.

I think we're all open to finding ways to fix the broken system we inherited and to end that roller-coaster ride, but, Mr. Speaker, this motion won't help. We have done the analysis. There is no guarantee that following pool prices will result in lower costs. In fact, it would worsen the price volatility that was purposely built into the energy system we inherited. Our government will not expose consumers to great price volatility.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we're doing the work necessary to get the electricity retail system and the broader generation system right to benefit consumers and investors, work like transitioning our electricity market system to a proven structure, one that is more attractive to investors and will provide Albertans with more stable, predictable electricity prices. As we do this work, we are protecting consumers and making life more affordable for Albertans.

For example, we are implementing a four-year price cap on electricity rates under the RRO, or regulated rate option. Beginning June 1, electricity consumers who are on the RRO can be assured that their electricity rates will not rise above 6.8 cents per kilowatt hour. This cap will protect Alberta families and entrepreneurs should electricity rates spike without warning, which we've become too accustomed to seeing in past years. This will make energy bills more predictable.

Albertans will no longer be subjected to the volatility of a broken system, a system where electricity rates have been a roller-coaster ride, constantly rising and falling from month to month. Albertans deserve more certainty in pricing and a more stable electricity system. That's why we're making changes, changes that will protect the pocketbooks of families and make life better for Albertans.

While we make the necessary reforms, our government will be looking at ways we can transition the RRO so that it offers greater stability and predictability to consumers. There are a number of options to consider, and we will work with experts to find the best fit for Albertans. In the meantime the price cap will keep electricity rates reasonable and protect Albertans from the unaffordable spikes of the past.

Mr. Speaker, we have done our homework. Amending the RRO in the way put forward by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View is not in the best interests of electricity consumers. It does not address the issue of price volatility. In fact, consumers would be exposed to prices that are even more volatile than the current RRO prices. They would not get more certainty with their monthly electricity bill; they would get less. This action will not protect

electricity consumers, it will not make life better for Albertans, and for these reasons I cannot support the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. MacIntyre: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and speak to Motion 502. Just a little bit of a mention about the RRO to begin with. The RRO is offered to residential and small-business customers who consume less than 250,000 kilowatt hours a year. It is the rate that customers receive who have not chosen to enter into a contract with an electricity retail supplier.

This option was originally set up to ensure that consumers who had not selected a retail supplier would continue to receive electricity service. So if you are an RRO customer, you may choose to do nothing and remain on the RRO in the province. That rate will fluctuate monthly. Power fluctuates monthly as a blend of short-term purchases at the market price and long-term hedges, that are used to determine the RRO. Now, the consumer who does stay with an RRO can expect the amount that they pay per kilowatt hour to change every month. There are, however, numerous other options available to an electricity consumer – for example, a fixed price per kilowatt hour or even a flow-through market price – if they so choose. Those options are available to consumers. The RRO was intended to be a default rate for people who did not make such a choice.

The RRO for electricity fluctuates each month to reflect the changes in the wholesale electricity market using a process that was approved by the Alberta Utilities Commission. By far the biggest influence on the monthly rate is supply and demand. The rate also includes an electric energy charge, which is a fixed charge for costs related to the supply of electricity, and an administrative charge for billing, customer care, and administration.

It is the AUC's responsibility to review the RRO provider's energy charges to make sure that they are being passed along accurately to consumers. The AUC does not regulate the rates or the service of competitive retailers. Retailer charges include the energy commodity charges, calculated by multiplying the amount of electricity used in the billing period by the applicable rate per kilowatt hour, and nonenergy rates. Nonenergy rates are charges that recover the retailer's costs of billing consumers for electricity and providing customer service.

That's just a little background on the RRO and how it works.

Some of the things we need to take a look at here are that the prolonged low rates that we're currently experiencing cannot – cannot – be expected to stay low. When they rise – and they will rise due to this government's 30 by 2030 policy on coal phase-out – we're now going to be exposing customers to volatility on their bills. That cannot be avoided. The wholesale price is calculated hourly. If anything, this makes billing equally complicated for each hour of every day the actual pool price is a weighted average. Power distributors take energy from the Power Pool and pay the declared hourly pool price for the energy they buy.

This option that the hon. member is putting forward will not actually remove any of the complexities that are associated with calculating the appropriate rates. The AUC will still have to determine the related management and administrative costs that the hon. member cited as needing to be added to the bill. Wholesale prices, of course, will be calculated hourly.

Now, it's not that I'm opposed to discussing changes to the default rate. Not at all. The hon. member is correct in pointing out the very recent benefits to customers that elected to be on the more volatile flow-through rate, but at the same time I understand why the previous government introduced the RRO: to provide

consumers with a hedge and less volatility. That's been a priority. As I see this motion before us, I'm not sure that that really will address that and accomplish what the hon. member thinks it will.

Some of the other issues that I have with the motion are that it appears to me that the member failed to use industry-accepted terms and language. In my opinion, by politicizing that language within this motion at the expense of accuracy, it makes the motion problematic.

We're left with a motion which has been brought forward with the best of intentions – I understand that – but frankly in its current form I think it needs help. It's convoluted, and as a result I cannot support it. I did read the hon. member's brief, that he provided to us, and I thank the hon. member for that brief. It was very thorough. But as I was reading through the brief, line by line by line, one thing I noticed was that the brief didn't really match the motion. They didn't seem to me to be necessarily congruent through and through. That was problematic. So although the brief sounds like the hon. member wants to change the default rate to the flow-through rate, it never explicitly states that.

5:20

At the end of the day, I cannot support the motion that's before us right now. I don't believe it will accomplish what was the hon. member's intent. I believe that as we go forward, this is not going to protect consumers from volatility, so I cannot support the motion as it is written right now.

Thank you.

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

Dr. Turner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the Member for Calgary-Mountain View for presenting this motion, and also thank you to my other colleagues who have spoken to this. Their presentations have actually pointed to the importance of this measure. I think it's vital that this Legislature actually spend some time considering all of these things.

From my perspective, the work that was done last fall – and many of us discussed this at the time – on Bill 34 has actually probably pre-empted much of what's in this motion. The Electric Utilities Amendment Act, 2016, allows the Balancing Pool to borrow money from the province to manage its funding obligations. This change supports electricity costs remaining low and stable. The Balancing Pool at the present time gives consumers a credit of \$1.95 on their monthly bills. Without Bill 34, the Balancing Pool would have had to apply a charge as large as \$8.40 starting last January 1 and continuing until the end of 2020. By passing Bill 34, we've actually protected consumers from volatility, which I think is one of the main concerns of the Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

The old system, I will call it: I think it was a disastrous system, in which this was one of the few electricity markets in North America – I believe there was only one other jurisdiction that had a similar one. This is the thing that we needed to change into what's called a capacity market, which is what the rest of North America uses. In a capacity market we're actually going to be able to prevent those ups and downs. In the old system there were times when the spot market for electricity was very, very high, and there were times when the regulated rate option was actually up to 15 cents. Now, as has been said, the regulated rate option is much lower, but even if it goes higher, as some of the members have suggested, we've put a cap on that, and that cap is going to prevent consumers from being damaged. I mean, people are going to be able to predict what their electricity costs are.

They're also going to be encouraged through our other legislation to actually do some energy efficiency. I know that the opposition

sometimes decries whether or not replacing fluorescent bulbs with LED light bulbs would be a good idea. I can tell you that I have done that in my constituency office already, and the people of Alberta are actually benefiting because my power bill to light my constituency office is a small fraction of what it was before those LED lights were installed. So we're already making some advances on that.

This sort of encouragement, I can tell you – it was a constituency week last week. I did four town halls last week. I actually ran out of the cards that I have to give to people about efficiencyalberta.ca. I would encourage all members here, if they've not registered their homes or their other properties, to go on that site and register so that we can get started on getting things like LED lights put in, programmable thermostats, the use of weatherstripping, appropriate furnaces, and other things. My constituents are very, very interested in reducing their carbon footprint, if you wish, or their greenhouse gas emission rate, and combined with Bill 34 and with the energy efficiency activities, we can actually help these constituents along.

Changing the regulated rate option to a price flow mechanism could expose consumers to wild price swings if prices were to spike in a particular month of high demand or during large generation outages. This has happened in the past, folks. We need to remember that history. There's no guarantee that following pool prices will result in lower costs in the future. Our government has stated that it's not going to expose consumers to this great volatility.

Instead, we're doing the right thing necessary to get the electricity retail system and the broader generation system right. We've announced a four-year, 6.8 cents per kilowatt hour cap on the RRO. This cap will protect consumers should electricity rates spike without warning. The price cap is just one of the many steps we're taking to create an electricity system that is more reliable, stable, affordable. I repeat "affordable," and that's a key thing. I mean, we could talk about that we should be paying as we go, but in fact if your electricity bills are so high that you can't afford to pay your rent or your food bills, I really wonder.

It's also attractive to investors. We know that the capacity market has attracted a lot of interest among a whole range of investors. That along with the renewables auction is going to be bringing stability to this province.

In summary, colleagues, I think that while the intent behind the motion is laudable, it is actually redundant. We should basically work together as a whole to make sure that the combination of Bill 34 as well as the energy efficiency measures and the renewables act can bring stability and affordability to the province.

The Speaker: Speaking to Motion 502, the hon. Member for Calgary-Klein.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to thank the hon. member for bringing forward this motion. I do believe his intentions are honourable as well, and I also believe that it acknowledges the fact that, as my other colleague said, the old system needed some changes and that we are doing that.

Unfortunately, though, I don't think his motion accomplishes exactly what it sets out to do. In fact, it actually may have the opposite impact. In fact, as we've heard already, it might actually lead to more volatility in the price for consumers as it will fluctuate a great deal more than it would under a cap like we have put forward, which is 6.8 cents per kilowatt hour.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and as we've heard a lot of people say as well, the generation, sale, and delivery of electricity: it is very complex, and so is the RRO very complex. There's a delicate balance between keeping consumer prices low and encouraging investment in electricity generation. This motion does not factor in

this last piece. I think that's what's being omitted here, investment and generation. The statistics provided by the hon. member who put forward this motion ignore the fact that these businesses need to earn a return, and it ignores that the profit has to be built into the price that the consumer will pay.

While I appreciate that on the surface reducing the forward market to 30 days from 120 days would provide more accuracy on the actual price of electricity, it would actually likely be more expensive because when you do it over 120 days, it actually has time, on a weighted average, to level out to a more affordable rate for consumers.

5:30

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I mean, this government is moving towards greater stability and affordability of electricity for consumers, and it's creating a new competitive generation market through the capacity market for all the province's generators and other businesses who now want to get into generation. Unfortunately, this motion impedes what this government is trying to do and rather successfully, actually.

Renewable energy is anticipated to attract at least \$10.5 billion in investment over the next 13 years or so. So we don't want to detract from this type of investment in the province, the type of investment that will create jobs and clean energy. You know, in spite of the opposition's fearmongering with Ontario references, the fact of the matter is that there is a lot of interest in renewable energy in this province right now.

I don't want to jeopardize this interest in renewable energy by supporting this motion. I do appreciate it being brought forward, but I will not be supporting it.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Are there any other members who wish to speak to Motion 502?

Seeing and hearing none, I will allow the Member for Calgary-Mountain View to close debate.

Dr. Swann: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, thank you to all members for giving their views on this, a complex issue, to be sure. While I disagree fundamentally with the government on this and their unwillingness to allow some market mechanisms, some clear price signals – by all means, rebate and support people who can't afford particular price spikes. I think they're in fact undermining the very basis by which this is trying to provide not more stability – there will be some volatility – but lower prices overall. That's what the graph showed over the last 10 years. Albertans actually spent up to a billion dollars more over 10 years than they would have if they were on this altered regulated rate option.

There's been quite a bit of reaction since I proposed this back in January. There are concerns that this change will do little to protect consumers from volatility. This is where the motion works well with the other potential solutions. It ensures that consumers are paying the actual price of power, which is what new investors want to see. Consumers will still have the option to choose other retail products that can better manage price volatility. However, the Retail Market Review Committee report of 2012 which surveyed Alberta consumers found that the majority of Albertans were comfortable with price volatility as long as they got the lowest price. This regulated rate option would provide them with the lowest price by about \$10 to \$15 a month. That's why the main objective in my motion is to reduce the overall cost to consumers.

Using the weighted average wholesale price of electricity will result in lower overall prices and significant savings over the long term. Any of the negative impacts on energy producers, retailers, or

vulnerable consumers can be offset through subsidies or rebates to those who need them. We don't need to be giving everybody in Alberta a free ride on electricity, only those who really need it, which I thought would have appealed to this government.

Others have said that the amount of savings would be insignificant. That's unfair to consumers. The implication is that savings of between \$600 and \$800 over the next four to five years is trivial. I'm sorry; the evidence speaks otherwise. The motion proposes a simple change that would be implemented over four to six months and would immediately start to generate savings for consumers.

Some have also called into question the potential for future price savings. Historic evidence indicates that there is a strong likelihood that there will be a positive differential between forward and pool prices. The Alberta Market Surveillance Administrator examined the historic relationship between the last forward price for a given month and the average price for that month between 2008 and 2016 and concluded, quote, forward prices still remain above pool prices in most months.

It's also been mentioned that customers already have an option by choosing a flow-through contract. This is true. However, these contracts constitute a relatively small portion of competitive retail contracts, which are primarily fixed-price contracts. The Market Surveillance Administrator retail statistics indicate that as of September 2016 46 per cent of residential customers had switched to competitive contracts, but most, 54 per cent, remained on the default, regulated rate option. So despite the availability of a flow-through product from competitive retailers, consumers have not chosen it. In fact, the majority of Albertans still are on the regulated rate option default product. My proposal would eliminate the flow-through contract option. However, it could potentially increase the demand for fixed-price contracts, and competitive retailers could see an increase in fixed-price contracts that would offset lost revenue and profits from the flow-through regulated rate option.

One of the key issues will be the impact of my proposal on the forward market. The forward market is used by some sellers of

energy to hedge the price of electricity. A significant volume of forward contracts is related to the regulated rate option. Changing the regulated rate option calculation to the weighted average pool price might jeopardize the integrity of the forward market, causing it to lose its effectiveness as a mechanism for price hedging. However, energy buyers and sellers don't require the forward market for hedging, which can still be accomplished through negotiation.

Finally, the current regulated rate option regulation forces retailers to purchase contracts in the forward market. A long-standing concern has been that sellers can game the market and arbitrarily push up prices. My proposal would eliminate that.

In conclusion, Motion 502 is an evidence-based solution that strikes the right balance between protecting consumers and improving the functioning of our electricity market. For these reasons and many more, I will be voting in favour of this motion.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

[Motion Other than Government Motion 502 lost]

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

Mr. Westhead: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've made some great progress this afternoon. Seeing the time, I move that we call it 6 o'clock and adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow.

The Speaker: The legislative policy committees will convene this evening and tomorrow morning for consideration of the main estimates. This evening Families and Communities will consider the estimates for Justice and Solicitor General in the Parkland Room, and Alberta's Economic Future will consider the estimates for Executive Council in the Rocky Mountain Room. Tomorrow morning Resource Stewardship will consider the estimates for Environment and Parks in the Rocky Mountain Room.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 5:38 p.m.]

Table of Contents

Prayers	481
In Memoriam	
Mr. Leonard Wendelin Mitzel	481
Introduction of Visitors	481
Introduction of Guests	481
Members' Statements	
Vriend Decision Anniversary and LGBTQ Rights	482
Okotoks Water Supply.....	483
Grande Prairie-Wapiti Constituency.....	491
Postsecondary Education Funding.....	491
Red Deer Courthouse	491
Autism Spectrum Disorder	492
Oral Question Period	
Government Policies	483
Power Purchase Arrangements and the Balancing Pool	484
AIMCo Governance	484
Investment in Alberta and Job Creation.....	485
Saskatchewan's Fiscal Policies.....	485
Gay-straight Alliances in Schools.....	486
Alberta Hospital Edmonton	486
Pulse Crops and Soil Health	487
Education Ministry Online Student Resources	488
Postsecondary Institutions' Capital Funding	488
Finance Minister's Attendance at Heritage Fund Committee Meetings	489
Health Services for Migrant Workers and Children	489
Resource Industries in Northeastern Alberta	490
Energy Exploration Incentives	490
Tabling Returns and Reports	492
Tablings to the Clerk	492
Member's Apology.....	494
Orders of the Day	496
Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 203 Alberta Standard Time Act.....	496
Bill 204 Protection of Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2017.....	503
Motions Other than Government Motions	
Electricity Rates	507

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

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875