



Province of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Alberta Hansard

Monday evening, November 26, 2018

Day 53

The Honourable Robert E. Wanner, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature

Fourth Session

Wanner, Hon. Robert E., Medicine Hat (NDP), Speaker

Jabbour, Deborah C., Peace River (NDP), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees

Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP), Deputy Chair of Committees

Aheer, Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Rocky View (UCP),

Deputy Leader of the Official Opposition

Anderson, Hon. Shaye, Leduc-Beaumont (NDP)

Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (UCP)

Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP)

Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)

Bilous, Hon. Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)

Carlier, Hon. Oneil, Whitecourt-St. Anne (NDP)

Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (NDP)

Ceci, Hon. Joe, Calgary-Fort (NDP)

Clark, Greg, Calgary-Elbow (AP),

Alberta Party Opposition House Leader

Connolly, Michael R.D., Calgary-Hawkwood (NDP)

Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (NDP)

Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP)

Cortes-Vargas, Estefania, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (NDP),

Government Whip

Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake (UCP)

Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)

Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South West (NDP)

Dreeshen, Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)

Drever, Deborah, Calgary-Bow (NDP)

Drysdale, Wayne, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)

Eggen, Hon. David, Edmonton-Calder (NDP)

Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP)

Feehan, Hon. Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP),

Deputy Government House Leader

Fildebrandt, Derek Gerhard, Strathmore-Brooks (FCP)

Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP)

Fraser, Rick, Calgary-South East (AP)

Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., Calgary-Buffalo (NDP),

Deputy Government House Leader

Gill, Prab, Calgary-Greenway (Ind)

Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)

Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Conklin (UCP)

Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)

Gray, Hon. Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)

Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)

Hinkley, Bruce, Wetaskiwin-Camrose (NDP)

Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)

Horne, Trevor A.R., Spruce Grove-St. Albert (NDP)

Hunter, Grant R., Cardston-Taber-Warner (UCP),

Official Opposition Deputy Whip

Jansen, Hon. Sandra, Calgary-North West (NDP)

Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)

Kenney, Hon. Jason, PC, Calgary-Lougheed (UCP),

Leader of the Official Opposition

Kleinsteuber, Jamie, Calgary-Northern Hills (NDP)

Larivee, Hon. Danielle, Lesser Slave Lake (NDP),

Deputy Government House Leader

Littlewood, Jessica, Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (NDP)

Loewen, Todd, Grande Prairie-Smoky (UCP)

Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)

Luff, Robyn, Calgary-East (Ind)

Malkinson, Hon. Brian, Calgary-Currie (NDP)

Mason, Hon. Brian, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),

Government House Leader

McCuaig-Boyd, Hon. Margaret,

Dunvegan-Central Peace-Notley (NDP)

McIver, Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),

Official Opposition Whip

McKitrick, Annie, Sherwood Park (NDP)

McLean, Stephanie V., Calgary-Varsity (NDP)

McPherson, Karen M., Calgary-Mackay-Nose Hill (AP)

Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (NDP)

Miranda, Hon. Ricardo, Calgary-Cross (NDP)

Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)

Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (UCP),

Official Opposition House Leader

Notley, Hon. Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),

Premier

Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)

Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)

Payne, Brandy, Calgary-Acadia (NDP)

Phillips, Hon. Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)

Piquette, Colin, Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater (NDP)

Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (UCP),

Official Opposition Deputy House Leader

Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)

Rosendahl, Eric, West Yellowhead (NDP)

Sabir, Hon. Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)

Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)

Schneider, David A., Little Bow (UCP)

Schreiner, Kim, Red Deer-North (NDP)

Shepherd, David, Edmonton-Centre (NDP)

Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)

Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)

Starke, Dr. Richard, Vermilion-Lloydminster (PC)

Stier, Pat, Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)

Strankman, Rick, Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)

Sucha, Graham, Calgary-Shaw (NDP)

Swann, Dr. David, Calgary-Mountain View (AL)

Taylor, Wes, Battle River-Wainwright (UCP)

Turner, Dr. A. Robert, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)

van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (UCP)

Westhead, Cameron, Banff-Cochrane (NDP),

Deputy Government Whip

Woollard, Denise, Edmonton-Mill Creek (NDP)

Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)

Party standings:

New Democratic: 53 United Conservative: 26 Alberta Party: 3 Alberta Liberal: 1 Freedom Conservative: 1 Independent: 2 Progressive Conservative: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, Law Clerk and Executive
Director of House Services, and Acting
Clerk, Procedure

Stephanie LeBlanc, Senior Parliamentary
Counsel

Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel

Philip Massolin, Manager of Research and
Committee Services

Nancy Robert, Research Officer

Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of

Alberta Hansard

Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms

Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Tom Bell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

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

Parliamentary Secretaries

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

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Coolahan
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Schreiner

Cyr	Horne
Dang	McPherson
Drever	Turner
Ellis	

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

Carson	Horne
Connolly	Littlewood
Coolahan	McPherson
Dach	Piquette
Dreeshen	Schneider
Fitzpatrick	Starke
Gotfried	

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goehring
Deputy Chair: Mr. Smith

Drever	Orr
Fraser	Renaud
Goodridge	Shepherd
Hinkley	Swann
Luff	Woollard
McKitrick	Yao
Miller	

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Shepherd
Deputy Chair: Ms Payne

Aheer	McKitrick
Cooper	Pitt
Horne	van Dijken
Kleinstauber	Woollard
Littlewood	

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Wanner
Deputy Chair: Cortes-Vargas

Babcock	Nixon
Cooper	Piquette
Dang	Pitt
Drever	Westhead
McIver	

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms Kazim
Deputy Chair: Connolly

Anderson, W.	McKitrick
Babcock	Rosendahl
Drever	Stier
Drysdale	Strankman
Gill	Sucha
Hinkley	Taylor
Kleinstauber	

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Fitzpatrick
Deputy Chair: Ms Babcock

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

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Cyr
Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach

Barnes	Miller
Carson	Nielsen
Clark	Panda
Gotfried	Payne
Hunter	Renaud
Kazim	Turner
Littlewood	

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Loyola
Deputy Chair: Mr. Drysdale

Babcock	Loewen
Clark	Nielsen
Dang	Panda
Fildebrandt	Payne
Hanson	Rosendahl
Kazim	Schreiner
Kleinstauber	

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Monday, November 26, 2018

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: Good evening. Please be seated.

Government Motions

Committee Membership Changes

35. Ms Larivee moved:
Be it resolved that the membership of the Assembly's committees be replaced as follows:
- A. on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts that Ms Payne replace Mr. Malkinson and Ms Kazim replace Ms Luff;
 - B. on the Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship that Ms Payne replace Mr. Malkinson;
 - C. on the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices that Ms Payne replace Mr. Malkinson, Ms Payne replace Mr. Malkinson as deputy chair, and Mr. Cooper replace Mr. Gill;
 - D. on the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that MLA Drever replace Ms Luff;
 - E. on the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future that Mr. Dreeshen replace Mr. Taylor;
 - F. on the Standing Committee on Families and Communities that Ms Goodridge replace Mr. Ellis;
 - G. on the Standing Committee on Private Bills that Mr. Gill replace Mr. Orr.

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

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to request one-minute bells for votes related to Government Motion 35.

[Unanimous consent denied]

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

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Madam Speaker. On behalf of the Government House Leader I move Government Motion 35.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

The hon. Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre.

Mr. Nixon: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Standing Order 49(2) I move that the question be now put.

The Acting Speaker: Hon. members, for clarity of the House before we move on, the motion for the previous question under 49(2) serves to curtail the debate. After it is moved and carried, no further amendments may be made to the main motion as has been moved. The motion may be debated by every member who has spoken to the main question. If this motion is carried, then the vote is immediately called on the original question without any further debate, as in Standing Order 49(3).

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

Ms Luff: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask that the House vote this down right now, please. According to this motion that is now before the House, I have been removed from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. I was hoping to be able to move an

amendment to allow myself to not be removed from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts because it is against best practice in parliamentary procedure. According to the Canadian Audit and Accountability Foundation: the Public Accounts Committee should be free from government interference; it should be committed to working in a crosspartisan fashion; member turnover and substitution are discouraged whenever possible; and the Public Accounts Committee finds consensus and unity on its decisions.

The fact that the Official Opposition and the government are working together right now to not allow me to move an amendment to speak to the fact that they're choosing to take me off this committee against my wishes – I asked specifically not to be removed from this committee – and the fact that the government and the Official Opposition are working together right now to prevent me the opportunity to speak and to provide an amendment is absolutely abominable, Madam Speaker. This is a tragedy. I stand on this side as an independent because I feel that the democratic processes of this House do not work as they are intended to work, and this is absolutely an example of that. So I would ask very much that you allow amendments and debate on this motion to continue, please.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Mr. Clark: I sure do, Madam Speaker. It is truly a remarkable day when two parties – the government party, that is, if anybody was to tune in for Oral Question Period, to be in pitched opposition to the Official Opposition – somehow find it in their hearts to come together when it is time for committee reassignment when it serves their own political interests. Like the Member for Calgary-East, I have a couple of amendments I'd like to put to this. I suspect the Member for Strathmore-Brooks may have as well.

It is entirely remarkable that the government and the Official Opposition, the NDP and the UCP: here they are hand in hand working together finally. Maybe that's the purpose of being a centrist. Maybe that's what it is. Maybe, finally, we've actually united these two parties. We've found something that they can actually agree on.

What they did: very clearly, when the hon. Deputy Government House Leader moved the motion, the Official Opposition House Leader sprang to his feet, just like that, lickety-split. In fact, he got up even before she moved the motion because very clearly they had colluded, and they had a plan, this nefarious little plan in the backrooms of this building, the kind of thing that Albertans absolutely hate and reject.

Now, democracy isn't always convenient, it isn't always simple, it isn't always straightforward, but, you know, democracy means that officially recognized parties of this Assembly, of which the Alberta Party caucus is one, would be on all of the major committees. I remind the government side that when their members the now Premier and the now Government House Leader were but two members of the Assembly sitting in this very spot, perhaps at one of these very desks, those two members were on every single committee, including Legislative Offices and including Members' Services, the two committees that govern how we run the Legislative Assembly.

But they've decided to exclude the Alberta Party caucus, an officially recognized third party, from those two committees. They've decided to exclude the Member for Calgary-East from any committees at all, which is completely unheard of, when the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, the Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster as single-member caucuses are part of a committee, when independent members in the past have always been assigned

at least to one committee. That is unconscionable, that they would seek to exclude those members from those committees especially. Back when the NDP was a small party – Madam Speaker, I think that if they continue behaving this way, they may find themselves once again being a very small party represented by only a couple of members of the Assembly – they found themselves in a completely different position, where they were put on every single committee.

I wonder, if we actually were able to ask each one of the backbench members of the government party how they felt about this, if they actually, really felt that this is the right thing to do, not just excluding us from the committees that we are legitimately entitled to be a part of but this procedural trickery that's being used in collusion between the NDP and the UCP late at night, when no one seems to be watching, to just get their way, to steamroll and use the power of the Legislative Assembly and get together and roll over us smaller parties.

Well, it's not why I went into elected office. In fact, maybe in some ways it is, because I went into elected office to fight against this sort of thing, to fight against this sort of entitlement, using your muscle, this kind of bully tactics to get your way.

Mr. Yao: Shame.

Mr. Clark: It is shameful. It's ironic to hear that from a member of the UCP backbench because you're part of it. You're part of this. My arguments are so compelling that we've got UCP backbenchers heckling their own motion.

It's bizarre. I mean, we're through the looking glass on this, and while it may be a technical and procedural motion and while this may not be the topic of choice at the Red Deer Tim Hortons on the drive back to Calgary at the end of the week, this does matter. This really does matter. What happens in this House matters. How we conduct ourselves, how the business of the Legislative Assembly is conducted actually matters. It matters to the real lives of everyday Albertans. We're sitting here debating a procedural motion to exclude even the possibility of us presenting amendments, which I'm not so naive as to think would perhaps be accepted by the government although we've presented this request to the government, would like very much, I think, to be on these committees, because that's what was done when the two government members, back in 2008, were the lone voice of the NDP in the wilderness, by the way, as a two-member caucus, were an official party at the time. The Alberta Party now as a three-member caucus is an official party. They were on these committees that we seek to amend ourselves onto, but they're not going to even allow us the chance to debate that, as to why we should be on those committees.

I'm very angry with this, and I think if Albertans tuning in today were to see what's going on, they would be angry with this as well. This is not, I think, what they thought they were going to get when they elected a new government to sweep out a 44-year dynasty, but surprisingly, three and a half years in, they're starting to behave exactly the same way.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

7:40

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

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

Seeing none, are there any members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Strathmore-Brooks.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is perhaps the most petty and vindictive motion I have ever seen come before this Legislature, and in the three and a half years I have been here, I have seen a lot of petty and vindictive. This is the most heavy-

handed and extreme antidemocratic attempt by any member of this Legislature that I have ever seen in the entire time I've watched Alberta's Legislature in action, including before I was elected.

Now, the government motion before us here was originally vindictive enough to take the Member for Calgary-Greenway and the Member for Calgary-East off of committees. Now, I remember in my time on the Public Accounts Committee the Member for Calgary-East. However restricted by party discipline she was, she was, within the confines of that, perhaps one of the more thoughtful and well-studied people on that committee. Government members were not allowed to ask their own questions. They were written and scripted, but I could tell that she at least did her homework, which is more than I could say for many. Regardless of whatever political differences are there, she has experience on that committee and, I think, brings value.

But that's not what this is about. This motion to take the members for Calgary-Greenway and Calgary-East off these committees and move them around as the big parties see fit isn't about what's going to make the most functional and collaborative and intelligent committees of this Legislature possible. It's about power and vindictiveness.

Now, I expected to come in here this evening and debate Government Motion 35 to take them off these committees. The Member for Calgary-East would move a motion that would get defeated by the government, the Member for Calgary-Elbow would move a motion, likely, that would get defeated by the government, and I myself would make a motion that would get defeated by the government. That's what opposition is, and when you're smaller opposition parties, it's particularly futile sometimes, but it is our duty as the opposition to hold the government to account. Even if we expect we're going to lose votes, we have to make our point.

For the first time I've ever seen, the government and the Official Opposition are colluding to not even allow an amendment to a government motion. Now, can you imagine for one second if the NDP had brought forward a similar motion to not allow any amendments to Bill 6? When the NDP brought forward legislation that myself and many on the opposition and, I think, quietly, some members of the government, although they couldn't say so, felt was an attack on rural Alberta and farmers, the Official Opposition Wildrose at the time and the Progressive Conservative third party at the time put forward amendments. We knew that every single one would be shot down, but it was our duty as the opposition to oppose the government but to propose ways to make what they were proposing better. That is our job, and the government would have never dared to say that the opposition can't bring forward an amendment to what they're doing.

But – lo and behold – what happens when democracy becomes two foxes and a hen voting on what to have for dinner? This is collusion. This is making bipartisanship a negative, pejorative word. Bipartisanship is really when the two big parties gang up to screw the people together, when they work together to monopolize the political system, when they work together to make sure that there are no other voices. In fact, no one is even allowed to speak. What they are attempting to do is to make sure that – from my estimation and research, it's by far the busiest this distant corner of the Legislature has ever been, with one three-member caucus, three recognized single-member caucuses, and two independents – no one over here is allowed to make an amendment to a motion from the government.

Shame on the day when the Tories are bedfellows with the NDP in shutting down debate in this Legislature. I know that all of my colleagues on both sides of this House will remember the outrage from the NDP, when they were a small caucus sitting in the nosebleeds on this side of the Legislature before the last election,

when the old Tories invoked closure on debate. They were outraged. Now, that type of outrage tends to dissipate when one goes into government. Sometimes it becomes inconvenient. But there hasn't even been an election since members on this side of the House were outraged when the government imposed closure on several bills: on the carbon tax, if I'm not mistaken, and on the Bill 6 attack on our farmers. The NDP government imposed closure on debate.

But at least even closure wasn't saying: no debate. It wasn't saying: no amendments. We remember the rightful indignation of the Wildrose and Progressive Conservative caucuses a mere two years ago – two years ago – when we were debating Bill 6. We were outraged that the NDP invoked closure on debate because it was the wrong thing to do. But even the NDP wouldn't have had the gall to say: there can't be amendments proposed to our own legislation. They at least had the guts at the time to argue against those amendments and vote them down. That was a little more brave than saying that there can't even be amendments. But the most shameful thing here is that the Official Opposition is colluding to shut down debate in this Legislature. Can you imagine the small, little, brave two- and four-member NDP caucus doing this? Can you imagine the grassroots democratic legacy of the Wildrose doing this? Working hand in hand with the NDP to shut down debate or even propositions of changes to the government's plan in this place: that is shameful.

Now, I have great respect for the Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo. He's going to be very angry at me for mentioning this at all, but he's a good guy. He came in just as we were going on here and was unaware that this motion was actually moved by the Official Opposition House Leader, and as the Member for Calgary-Elbow was making a very, I think, good argument against this motion, he said, "Shame." It was a shameful motion, and I agree. And I don't mean to embarrass him, I don't mean to get him in trouble, but it was a moment of honesty, and he couldn't have known. He just assumed that this came from the NDP because this is something that's beyond what the NDP have ever done. This is beyond closure. I genuinely do not want to get him in trouble. He's a good guy. [interjections] I don't care what you guys say about him; he's a good guy. But he said, "Shame" before knowing that – I had to whisper in his ear, "Psst, this is a motion from your party." And that should say something here.

To every private member on the government side of the House, these are your cabinet ministers and your whip telling you what happens to you if you step out of line. This is telling you that if you step out of line and do something brave and speak up like the Member for Calgary-East has, this is what's going to happen to you. Members of the Official Opposition, you know in your hearts you are against this. You know this is what you stood for. Especially those of you who stood in the Wildrose with me, you know that this is the old, antidemocratic, Tory establishment way of doing things. You know in your heart that it's wrong. But I know that you're in a very tough spot, that there is extreme party discipline and whips here and that there are consequences if you break from it. But I know what's in your hearts. I know what's in your hearts, and you know this is wrong.

Vote for the government's motion to change these committees if you want. If you want to stack them with your members, okay. Fine. That's for your party. But at least vote against this particular motion, which will bar anyone in this Legislature from bringing forward an amendment to the government motion or even debating the motion itself. You know in your hearts that this is wrong. So I beseech you, private members of the government – I know who I'm talking to. I know this is not going to happen. But I'm telling you, private members of the government, that this is strengthening the party whip's crack on you.

Members of the Official Opposition, look in your hearts. You know this is against everything you stood for when you got elected. You know this is against democracy and free votes from MLAs. If you voted to oppose the government's closure of the Bill 6 debates, then surely you will vote against an even more draconian measure which will end debate, which is closure on this motion, and not even allow for an amendment to the government's motion.

7:50

If you're going to vote for the motion overall, fine – that's for your party; do it – but search your hearts and vote against this motion to invoke closure and not even allow for debate and amendments on a bill. I ask you. I know that in your hearts you know it's the wrong thing. Please have the courage of your convictions to throw the party whip aside for an evening and just see what happens.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any members wishing to speak under 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner.

Mr. Hunter: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Look, I just have a couple of questions for you. First of all, maybe just in terms of clarity, the Member for Strathmore-Brooks said that Calgary-East and Calgary-Greenway will not be on any committees, so I, not knowing if that was true or not, went out and checked. I don't know if the member realizes, but Calgary-East is on Families and Communities, and Calgary-Greenway would be on the Private Bills Committee. That's just a point of clarity which is important to know. I think that it's important for members to be able to be on committees here so that they have the ability to express themselves, whether they're on the government side, the Official Opposition, or as a private member or a third party. I think it is important to have that. It's important to have that clarity, Member, so that you know that there's just not a complete shutout.

Now, one of the other things that I wanted to just clarify as well here is that there was a hue and cry made by the Member for Calgary-Elbow that somehow working with the members opposite, the NDP, was absolutely unconscionable. I heard the same thing from the Member for Strathmore-Brooks. What is interesting about that, Madam Speaker, is that I know that on multiple occasions both of these members have worked many times with the government on amendments. I guess I'm just trying to figure out whether or not they have just stood up to pontificate or whether or not this is an actual concern that is legitimate. If you're going to cast stones, just make sure that you're not living in a glass house.

I ask the member if he would be willing to answer these questions because they are genuine questions that I have. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Fildebrandt: I want to thank the Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner for his questions. They're actually well-taken, fair questions. I think I'm somewhat clarifying on behalf of the Member for Calgary-Elbow. I think he may have slightly misspoken in saying that the Member for Calgary-East wouldn't be on any committees. That's not the case. She is to be on one of the policy committees, which, we all know, get so much done in this place. Both the members for Calgary-Greenway and Calgary-East have been assigned to those committees but are, against their wishes, being taken off Members' Services and Public Accounts. When I say that the Member for Calgary-East is being taken off Public Accounts, I'm not saying that she's being removed from all committees. She is being left on a committee.

Now, to the member's questions and points about working with the NDP, I'm willing to work with any member of this Legislature on policy issues. Amendments I have put forward: the vast majority of them were unsuccessful. Some of them have been successful. I think one was successful. My least favourite of them was successful, but it was successful. The Minister of Health looks very indignant at this. But I'm willing to work with any member of this Legislature – I don't care if they're from the Rhinoceros Party – on improving legislation. What I am not willing to do is work with any member of this Legislature in shutting down debate. I'm not willing to work with any member of this Legislature on invoking closure on debate. I'm not willing to work with any member of this Legislature in saying that no member will be allowed to bring forward an amendment to a motion or an amendment to legislation. That is beyond the pale.

I have sincere policy disagreements on a lot of issues with the members across and significant disagreements with maybe some members of the opposition, but we probably see more eye to eye on the bulk of things. I will work with people where there's any common ground. But one thing that is unconscionable, regardless of our ideologies or party affiliation or even personalities, is any attempt to invoke closure on debate.

As the Member for Cardston-Taber-Warner will know – and I remember – he was very right when he denounced the NDP passionately for closure on Bill 6. Now, this motion is even more extreme. This is invoking closure on this motion, to say that we may not even debate the main part of the motion. This is a motion to shut down debate on the motion, to say that we're not allowed to have a single word of debate on the motion itself and that no member – government or opposition, the third party, single-member caucuses, or independents – can bring forward amendments. That is even more extreme than the motions for closure brought forward by the government on Bill 6, on the carbon tax, and on a number of other issues where they wanted to stop debate.

I know that in his heart he knows this is right. I have great respect for him, and I ask that he stand up to do the right thing here.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak?

Seeing none, we will vote on the first question.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on the previous question carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 7:56 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Goehring	Payne
Anderson, S.	Hoffman	Phillips
Bilous	Horne	Piquette
Carlier	Hunter	Renaud
Carson	Jansen	Rosendahl
Ceci	Kazim	Sabir
Connolly	Kleinsteuber	Schmidt
Coolahan	Larivee	Schreiner
Cortes-Vargas	Loyola	Shepherd
Dach	McCuaig-Boyd	Smith
Dreeshen	McKitrick	Stier
Drever	Miller	Sucha
Drysdale	Miranda	Westhead
Eggen	Nielsen	Yao
Fitzpatrick	Nixon	

Against the motion:

Clark	Fildebrandt	Luff
Totals:	For – 44	Against – 3

[Motion on previous question on Government Motion 35 carried]

The Acting Speaker: Hon. members, I will now put the next question forward.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Point of order.

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

Mr. Fildebrandt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The fundamental role of the Speaker is to ensure and protect the right of every member of this Legislature to speak. That is the ancient duty and privilege of the Speaker of any Legislative Assembly or parliament in our Westminster tradition. It is your duty to ensure that every member here gets to speak and gets to be heard and speak for their constituents. I cannot recall any precedents in the history of Alberta where on a government bill or motion it has been illegal to debate or propose amendments. There has never been a government motion or piece of legislation where it was illegal for members of the Legislature to debate or move amendments. It is a violation of privilege of the members of this Legislature that they are not allowed to speak to a government motion. It is a violation of privilege of every member of this Legislature that they are barred from presenting amendments. So I would ask that you rule in favour . . .

The Acting Speaker: Hon. member, do you have a standing order that you would like to reference in regard to your point of order to me?

Mr. Fildebrandt: You've got to give me a minute. I wasn't expecting you to side with me.

The Acting Speaker: You still have to provide a reference to a standing order.

We will move on.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 35 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 8:15 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Goehring	Payne
Anderson, S.	Hoffman	Phillips
Bilous	Horne	Piquette
Carlier	Hunter	Renaud
Carson	Jansen	Rosendahl
Ceci	Kazim	Sabir
Connolly	Kleinsteuber	Schmidt
Coolahan	Larivee	Schreiner
Cortes-Vargas	Loyola	Shepherd
Dach	McCuaig-Boyd	Smith
Dreeshen	McKitrick	Stier
Drever	Miller	Sucha
Drysdale	Miranda	Westhead
Eggen	Nielsen	Yao
Fitzpatrick	Nixon	

Against the motion:

Clark	Fildebrandt	Luff
-------	-------------	------

Totals: For – 44 Against – 3

[Government Motion 35 carried]

**Government Bills and Orders
Committee of the Whole**

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

The Deputy Chair: I would like to call the committee to order.

Bill 23

An Act to Renew Local Democracy in Alberta

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered in respect of this bill? The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. S. Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do have an amendment to . . .

Mr. Cooper: What? It's your bill.

Mr. S. Anderson: I know. A House amendment. I have the copies here, so I'll wait.

The Deputy Chair: Minister, if you could please send the copies to the table. As soon as I have the original, you can go ahead.

Hon. minister, your amendment is referred to as A1.

Mr. S. Anderson: Perfect. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Municipal bylaw and technical amendments here. The municipal bylaw for pre-election disclosure: this first proposed amendment will give local authorities the discretion, should they choose to use it, to require candidates to disclose their campaign finances prior to election day. Municipalities and school boards can choose to use this authority, but they are not required to. If they choose to do this, they'll need to do it by way of bylaw, and in the bylaw the local authority will need to set out when, how, and what candidates will need to disclose beyond the legislative requirements to disclose postelection. This amendment empowers local authorities to further enhance transparency in the local election process if they believe it is appropriate for their community.

We also have a technical amendment. This amendment simply corrects a drafting oversight. The current bill references section 165 when, in fact, we need to reference section 147.34.

We're also cleaning up language to reference "campaign expense limits" rather than "election advertising expense limits."

This final proposed amendment is, once again, a simple technical amendment to address a drafting oversight. What we're doing here is aligning the offence amounts in sections of the Local Authorities Election Act with the amounts for administrative penalties in the new section 193, which authorizes the Election Commissioner to impose administrative penalties in the event of contraventions of certain parts of the act.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. minister.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mr. Cooper: Well, thank you. It's a pleasure to rise and speak to amendment A1, moved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Madam Chair, you'll know that inside this House over an extended period of time this member spent a lot of time talking about how much consultation he does and how impressive he is. Essentially,

he certainly implied that when we had been speaking about this piece of legislation, it was near perfect. In fact, if you listened to him, you would be surprised that there could be any error in a piece of legislation that he was responsible for. Let me just say this: the irony is not lost on me that the minister would have to come to the House and make an amendment that actually includes a fairly substantial piece here in this particular amendment.

I appreciate the minister actually providing a little bit of a heads-up that this particular amendment may or may not have been coming, but the piece around this law that allows the municipality to make a bylaw that then may require a pre-election report is actually a fairly significant change to the bill. I don't know if you'll remember, but I know that members on this side of the House asked for this particular bill to be sent to committee so that we could study these sorts of things and actually hear from municipalities as to whether or not the bill that he reportedly consulted on actually is going to have the intended consequences that he says it is.

Now, I would submit to you that this evening we have seen the minister make the admission that his legislation has challenges and problems and errors and omissions and, in fact, that it is not complete. I would be surprised now if he didn't think it was a good idea to actually ask some folks about the legislation. Clearly, a municipality raised some concerns, and he heeded those concerns and is now making an amendment. You know, by and large, I support the amendment in its intent, but again, if he had . . . [interjections] It's committee. He can speak as many times as he wants.

Mr. S. Anderson: I'm not talking to you.

Mr. Cooper: I know, but I'm listening to you.

Mr. S. Anderson: First time for everything.

Mr. Cooper: Hey, well, you know. The same could be said here this evening for you, Mr. Minister. There is a first time for everything.

I encourage you to heed the advice because I actually have also been doing some consulting, and while I'm disappointed at your lack of action to send this to committee, where we could do meaningful consultation, I do have a number of amendments to help improve your piece of legislation.

With that said – and I know that we had lots of opportunity to discuss a number of very important things this evening – I would like to make sure that we're moving forward. Given the fact that you are amending section 147 in this amendment – and of course you'll know, being the procedural guru that you are, that when a piece of legislation is opened up to an amendment, that then cannot be amended in another portion of committee.

With that said, I intend to move a subamendment to your amendment and encourage you to support it. I will pass that to the chair now and then proceed in an expedient manner.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, Member.

Your subamendment will be referred to as SA1, subamendment 1. Go ahead.

8:40

Mr. Cooper: Thank you. Subamendment SA1. I move that amendment A1 – that's the minister's – to Bill 23, an Act to Renew Local Democracy in Alberta, be amended in part A by renumbering clause (a) as clause (a.1) and adding the following before clause (a.1):

- (a) in the proposed section 147.4(1) by striking out "\$50" wherever it occurs and substituting "\$250."

Now, for those of you who are following along at home, in section 147 of this particular piece of legislation it speaks specifically about the amount of money that would need to be declared when it comes to donations. In this case someone wants to make a donation to a local candidate. Any amount over \$50 would have to be disclosed in the disclosure act.

Now, for the record I support the disclosure of contributions to campaigns. Having said that, at the provincial level you'll know, Madam Chair, because I understand that in the constituency of Edmonton-Manning there is a significant amount of fundraising that takes place, that if someone is going to donate to your campaign or a PAC at the provincial level, the requirement to disclose is \$250. We've heard the minister speak at some length about trying to make the sets of rules similar in terms of getting big money out of politics, banning corporate and union donations, and all of those sorts of things at both the municipal level and at the provincial level, but what he's doing is that he's creating two totally different sets of rules, one at the municipal level, one at the provincial level.

What this amendment does is that it creates uniformity. I know that those guys over there like Unifor, but this is uniformity. That is in the context of creating the same requirement to disclose at the provincial level and the municipal level. This minister is trying to muddy the waters by creating a \$50 limit municipally and keeping the \$250 limit provincially. I think that this makes good sense, to have one amount at both levels. Whether you're donating to a third party or whether you're donating to a candidate, there is no good reason to have one set of rules at the municipal level, one set of rules at the provincial level.

I strongly encourage the minister to support this common-sense solution that creates certainty and parity. If he trusts that provincial politicians can't be bought at \$250, why does he not trust municipal politicians at a \$50 ability to disclose when it comes to campaign financing? I encourage all members of the Assembly to support a good, common-sense amendment that creates certainty, uniformity, and is an all-round good idea.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak? The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. S. Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would love to speak to this subamendment. Yes, I'm a policy wonk. I know everything that's going on in this House, hon. member, so thank you.

Here we go again. I want to say that I can't for the life of me understand why the folks over there continue to believe that municipal elections shouldn't be beholden to the same transparency rules that they and we have to abide by. If anyone in this House accepts a donation over \$50, we have to disclose the name and address of that donor. It's that simple. We're making the process more transparent in lining it up with the provincial requirements. I have to wonder who you're consulting with, fine sir, who's recommending less transparency in municipal elections. Certainly not me.

I'll remind the members of this House that the current disclosure requirement for municipal campaigns is \$100. Instead of proposing more transparency, you're proposing less transparency by increasing that dollar amount by 150 per cent. The point of this bill is to reduce the influence of big money, increase transparency, and streamline the process for candidates. So far this amendment has been counter to those goals.

When we went out and consulted with Albertans over the summer – yes, consulted – and received over 1,500 responses, they were overwhelmingly supportive of increasing transparency and reducing the influence of money on municipal campaigns. My advice to the opposition would be to start talking with Albertans.

I will not be in favour of this subamendment, Madam Chair. Surprise, surprise.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Fildebrandt: I want to thank the minister for his comments. I think it's overall a positive bill, but I think the amendment before us is rather common sense. I just have a simple question for the minister. Does he believe that a \$250 donation can significantly influence a politician seeking office?

The Deputy Chair: Are there any other members wishing to speak to the subamendment?

Seeing none, I will put the question on the subamendment.

[Motion on subamendment SA1 lost]

The Deputy Chair: We are now back on the original amendment, amendment A1. Are there any other members wishing to speak to the amendment?

Seeing none, I will call the question on the amendment.

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

The Deputy Chair: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills to speak to this bill as amended.

Mr. Cooper: Well, thank you. I'm sorry that the minister didn't support our subamendment, which was not that exceptional of him, and I continue to not agree that that is what the amendment did do. Clearly, he knows that the amount at the provincial level that has to be disclosed is \$250, not \$50. We are creating two sets of rules, and that is problematic.

One thing that's very interesting, though, Madam Chair – and I know that you, too, will find this interesting – is that we just heard the minister speak about wanting to be open and transparent. If he, in fact, does want to be open and transparent, then he should have absolutely no problem – absolutely no problem – supporting this next amendment that I intend to move. One thing that has come as a bit of a surprise to many – well, in fact, it's not a surprise at all – is that this government is trying to again create special rules for their friends, and it's tucked away in the back. [interjection] Let me just say that you don't have a friend in me.

It's tucked away in the very back of this particular piece of legislation, Bill 23, in section 170, for those that would like to get their bills out, and this particular section is around additional rules for groups. You'll know, Madam Chair, that those groups typically are third-party advertisers, unions, those who want to engage in the process.

Section 162(1)(h) on page 55 defines a group as an unincorporated group of individuals or corporations acting in consort for a common purpose and includes a trade union and an employee organization or any combination of individuals, corporations, trade unions or employee organizations.

So that is what a group is.

8:50

Now, in section 170 it defines how those groups can utilize the resources that they have and also puts some parameters around what resources can be applied to the members and what will be considered a contribution of the group. But here's the big problem, Madam Chair. The big, big problem is that this government in this piece of legislation has created one set of rules for non-union groups or employee organizations and another set of rules for unions.

In section 170 it clearly makes it against the rules for a group to collect fees from its members and apply them or spend them on political contributions and then spread it out amongst their members. It prevents people from doing that except in clause (c), where it essentially creates an exemption for unions. So the union

still could make a contribution to the third-party group or they could still spend the resources, but they don't have to have explicit permission from their members. So I don't know. Let's, say, just use for an example mandatory union fees that they may take from their members and then spend on a political contribution. It creates an exemption so that they don't have to have that from their members but every other non-union member organization has to.

Now, I think this is crazy. It is absolutely wild that this government goes around talking about how they want to get big money out of politics, that they want to create similar rules for unions and corporations, yet they have put in an exemption.

I'll pass the amendment to you, as I see you're just waiting with bated breath for it. I'll wait for you to provide me with the indication to proceed.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. member, your amendment will be referred to as amendment A2. Please go ahead.

Mr. Cooper: Amendment A2. It's shocking to me that the government – and now I can predict, I'm pretty certain, that the minister is going to stand up and be, like: "No, no, no. My lawyers are better than your lawyers, and this isn't really what the path forward is." However, I have consulted extensively with those in the legal profession, and they very clearly state that this, in fact, is what the government is doing. They are creating themselves an exemption for their friends and union allies that makes one set of rules for them, allows unions to continue to take mandatory fees and utilize them for political gain or political contributions against the will of their members, but wouldn't allow, say, a chamber of commerce, without explicit permission from its members, to utilize their resources for a third-party contribution. I say: shame on you. I don't understand why you are saying one thing and doing another.

So the solution is very simple, Madam Chair. It is to strike out clauses (b) and (c) – essentially, both get removed – and, as such, all of section 170(a) would be applied equally to both of those types of organizations. This would mean that "an advertising contribution from funds collected from a group's members may be attributed to its members only if," and then sections (i), (ii), and (iii) would also, then, be followed.

You know, I said it was surprising – but it's not really – that the true face of this government is now showing in what, we can all hope, may be the dying days of this government, that they are endeavouring to create one set of rules for unions and employee organizations and another set for non-unions and other groups.

The other significant concern here is that this particular piece of legislation is only going to apply to municipal PACs or municipal political advertising, and there's another complete set of rules at the provincial level. So if we're going to do as the minister says and – you know, I'm surprised that this isn't a democratic reform bill and is actually a Municipal Affairs bill because so much of this has to do with elections. But it's clear that the left hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing over there. We all know that there's very little right hand over there. It's by the left, by the left, by the left. The left hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing because the minister responsible for democratic reform and renewal, that passed six pieces of legislation in this House on election reform, passed them under one set of rules, and now the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who, you know, has done consultation, is passing virtually another set, totally different than the last set. The previous failed amendment was an example of that.

So if the minister actually wants to do the right thing, to not create one set of rules for unions, to not prop up his union friends, then he will support this amendment, repeal these two clauses, and allow all organizations to be treated equally.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak to the amendment?

Mr. S. Anderson: First off, I don't think you understand how unions work. They're democratically elected people that are in there, and they have to be accountable for every cent that their union members bring forward. But that's cool; you can look that up.

As well, we are going to reject this. This is verbatim what's in the provincial legislation. So on that count we will reject this amendment.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. minister.

Are there any other members wishing to speak?

Mr. Cooper: Well, Madam Chair, it's no surprise that the government wants to protect their union friends and allies and not support an amendment like this. I seem to recall some significant discussion about this particular amendment in the provincial legislation as well. It was equally bad there.

The minister isn't afraid to have two sets of rules although I think that it is outrageous, and if he truly wants to send the right signal to nonprofits, business groups, municipal organizations, all of these types of organizations who are being treated differently by their leadership than the leadership of non-union organizations, he would in fact repeal these two sections. I know that many of my colleagues have a lot of things to say on this. I also think that it's a bit ironic when he says that unions are democratically elected. Sure, they are, but that doesn't mean that they don't continue to spend mandatory fees on things that their members don't support.

I just have a sneaking suspicion that my colleague from Drayton Valley-Devon has some concerns around this very issue. So I encourage my colleagues to make the case as to why the government shouldn't just reject this out of hand and should take some serious thought about this. I don't believe that Albertans look lightly upon the fact that this government creates one set of rules for unions and one set of rules for the job creators.

9:00

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak to amendment A2? The hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon.

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Madam Chair. I wish to rise and speak in favour of the amendment. One of the things that I think we try to strive for in this House is that we want to create an Alberta, a society, in which its citizens have the freedom to be able to control their finances and their spending and have some control over the organizations that they belong to. We've heard clearly from the Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills that this piece of legislation would allow unions to have a different set of rules than would other organizations. That creates a serious situation that we really need to address.

I know that as a teacher in the public school system I did not have a choice as to whether I was going to be part of the ATA. I was automatically a member of the ATA, and I had no problems with that. I saw many valuable things in the ATA in my 30 years as a teacher. I appreciated it. It was a professional association. I appreciated the fact that at the ATA we were able to get together and work on professional issues, on professional conduct, that it allowed teachers to work together on setting standards for professional development, that my professional association could help to set best practices.

These are legitimate uses and were very positive things that the ATA could work together on, and as a teacher and as a part of that professional organization we could work together to advance the

cause of education. I even appreciated the ATA as a collective bargaining unit that would work towards helping teachers to bargain collectively, to work on working conditions, to promote collegial relationships. So when I stand up here today, I am not trying to present a situation that is bashing a union. However, I will bring to the attention of this Legislature that there was one thing that always bothered me when I was part of the ATA, and that was that you should not make mandatory dues pay for what should be voluntary, what should be a voluntary choice of the individual who is a part of that organization.

Voluntary decision-making is an important piece of being a part of a profession. I would argue that when you pay your dues and you're part of a union or professional association, it's a fine thing for those dues to be used – for instance, I can remember as an ATA member that we had a special levy attached to our dues for a number of years in order to help build Barnett House in Edmonton. That was a perfectly good use of my dues. But now to have those dues, in turn, used to support Public Interest Alberta: well, there are many teachers in the ATA who would not necessarily support the work of Public Interest Alberta. Why should our mandatory dues be used to support that?

I would argue that this amendment allows for an even playing field. It means that professional associations and unions should only be able to use those dues for professional issues and that anything else should be a voluntary decision of the individual member of that organization. For instance, there is a criteria that we use for all other organizations in this bill that says that you would use the same criteria for a non-union organization when deciding how to use those dues, that they would be (a) voluntary, (b) for the purpose of the donation, and (c) attributed to the member from which the funds came. First point: it's voluntary.

I would suggest that this amendment speaks to a level playing field, to a fairness. It doesn't limit the ability of any group to donate money as long as it is collected in a voluntary and transparent fashion. That seems eminently reasonable and should have the support of all the members of this Assembly. All of us should have the capacity to make voluntary choices about how our monies are spent.

Thank you very much.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you, hon. member.

Are there any other members wishing to speak to amendment A2? The Deputy Government House Leader.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this moment I would like to move that the committee rise and report progress.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion that the committee rise and report progress carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:07 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Eggen	Miranda
Anderson, S.	Fitzpatrick	Nielsen
Bilous	Hoffman	Phillips
Carlier	Horne	Piquette
Carson	Hunter	Rosendahl
Ceci	Jansen	Sabir
Connolly	Kazim	Schmidt
Coolahan	Kleinstauber	Schreiner

Cortes-Vargas	Larivee	Shepherd
Dach	Loyola	Smith
Dreeshen	McCuaig-Boyd	Stier
Drever	McKitrick	Sucha
Drysdale	Miller	Westhead

Against the motion:

Clark	Fildebrandt	Luff
-------	-------------	------

Totals:	For – 39	Against – 3
---------	----------	-------------

[Motion that the committee rise and report progress carried]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

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

Mr. Sucha: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a certain bill. The committee reports progress on the following bill: Bill 23. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Does the Assembly concur in the report? All those in favour, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Acting Speaker: Opposed, please say no. So ordered.

Mr. Fildebrandt: Madam Speaker . . .

The Acting Speaker: There weren't enough of you standing when I looked over.

The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Ms Larivee: Thank you, Madam Speaker. At this time I would like to move that we adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:26 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[Ms Sweet in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Eggen	Miranda
Anderson, S.	Fitzpatrick	Phillips
Bilous	Goehring	Piquette
Carlier	Hunter	Rosendahl
Carson	Jansen	Sabir
Ceci	Kazim	Schmidt
Connolly	Kleinstauber	Schreiner
Coolahan	Larivee	Shepherd
Cortes-Vargas	Loyola	Smith
Dreeshen	McCuaig-Boyd	Sucha
Drever	McKitrick	Westhead
Drysdale		

9:40

Against the motion:

Clark

Totals:	For – 34	Against – 1
---------	----------	-------------

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 9:42 p.m.]

Table of Contents

Government Motions	
Committee Membership Changes.....	2119
Division	2122
Division	2122
Government Bills and Orders	
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 23 An Act to Renew Local Democracy in Alberta	2123
Division	2126

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