



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday afternoon, July 9, 2020

Day 42

The Honourable Nathan M. Cooper, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 30th Legislature

Second Session

Cooper, Hon. Nathan M., Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP), Speaker
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie-East (UCP), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
Milliken, Nicholas, Calgary-Currie (UCP), Deputy Chair of Committees

Aheer, Hon. Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Strathmore (UCP)
Allard, Tracy L., Grande Prairie (UCP)
Amery, Mickey K., Calgary-Cross (UCP)
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Jackie,
Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UCP)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-West Henday (NDP)
Ceci, Joe, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Copping, Hon. Jason C., Calgary-Varsity (UCP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)
Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP),
Government Whip
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UCP)
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UCP)
Glasgo, Michaela L., Brooks-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Glubish, Hon. Nate, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UCP)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche (UCP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Gray, Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Guthrie, Peter F., Airdrie-Cochrane (UCP)
Hanson, David B., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UCP)
Hoffman, Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., Taber-Warner (UCP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Issik, Whitney, Calgary-Glenmore (UCP)
Jones, Matt, Calgary-South East (UCP)
Kenney, Hon. Jason, PC, Calgary-Lougheed (UCP),
Premier
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, Red Deer-North (UCP)
Loewen, Todd, Central Peace-Notley (UCP)
Long, Martin M., West Yellowhead (UCP)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UCP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Luan, Hon. Jason, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Madu, Hon. Kaycee, QC, Edmonton-South West (UCP)
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader

Nally, Hon. Dale, Morinville-St. Albert (UCP)
Deputy Government House Leader
Neudorf, Nathan T., Lethbridge-East (UCP)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, Calgary-Bow (UCP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UCP), Government House Leader
Nixon, Jeremy P., Calgary-Klein (UCP)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Panda, Hon. Prasad, Calgary-Edgemont (UCP)
Phillips, Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Pon, Hon. Josephine, Calgary-Beddington (UCP)
Rehn, Pat, Lesser Slave Lake (UCP)
Reid, Roger W., Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rosin, Miranda D., Banff-Kananaskis (UCP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UCP)
Rutherford, Brad, Leduc-Beaumont (UCP)
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)
Savage, Hon. Sonya, Calgary-North West (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, Calgary-North East (UCP)
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Joseph R., Cardston-Siksika (UCP),
Deputy Government Whip
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, Calgary-Shaw (UCP)
Schweitzer, Hon. Doug, QC, Calgary-Elbow (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Shandro, Hon. Tyler, QC, Calgary-Acadia (UCP)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP)
Sigurdson, Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UCP)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UCP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UCP)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Toews, Hon. Travis, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Toor, Devinder, Calgary-Falconridge (UCP)
Turton, Searle, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UCP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock (UCP)
Walker, Jordan, Sherwood Park (UCP)
Williams, Dan D.A., Peace River (UCP)
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UCP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)
Yaseen, Muhammad, Calgary-North (UCP)

Party standings:

United Conservative: 63

New Democrat: 24

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, QC, Clerk	Philip Massolin, Clerk of Committees and Research Services	Amanda LeBlanc, Deputy Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>
Teri Cherkewich, Law Clerk	Nancy Robert, Research Officer	Chris Caughell, Sergeant-at-Arms
Stephanie LeBlanc, Clerk Assistant and Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Janet Schwegel, Director of Parliamentary Programs	Tom Bell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel		Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

Jason Kenney	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Relations
Leela Aheer	Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women
Jason Copping	Minister of Labour and Immigration
Devin Dreesen	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
Tanya Fir	Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism
Nate Glubish	Minister of Service Alberta
Grant Hunter	Associate Minister of Red Tape Reduction
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Education
Jason Luan	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions
Kaycee Madu	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Ric McIver	Minister of Transportation
Dale Nally	Associate Minister of Natural Gas and Electricity
Demetrios Nicolaides	Minister of Advanced Education
Jason Nixon	Minister of Environment and Parks
Prasad Panda	Minister of Infrastructure
Josephine Pon	Minister of Seniors and Housing
Sonya Savage	Minister of Energy
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Community and Social Services
Rebecca Schulz	Minister of Children's Services
Doug Schweitzer	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Tyler Shandro	Minister of Health
Travis Toews	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Rick Wilson	Minister of Indigenous Relations

Parliamentary Secretaries

Laila Goodridge	Parliamentary Secretary Responsible for Alberta's Francophonie
Jeremy Nixon	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Community and Social Services
Muhammad Yaseen	Parliamentary Secretary of Immigration

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Orr
Deputy Chair: Mr. Getson

Allard
Eggen
Glasgo
Jones
Loyola
Nielsen
Singh

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Neudorf
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Allard
Armstrong-Homeniuk
Barnes
Bilous
Dang
Horner
Irwin
Reid
Stephan
Toor

Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Horner

Allard
Ceci
Dang
Goodridge
Nixon, Jeremy
Pancholi
Rutherford
Sigurdson, R.J.
Smith
Sweet

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goodridge
Deputy Chair: Ms Sigurdson

Amery
Carson
Ganley
Glasgo
Guthrie
Neudorf
Nixon, Jeremy
Pancholi
Rutherford
Yao

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Sigurdson

Gray
Lovely
Nixon, Jeremy
Rutherford
Schmidt
Shepherd
Sweet
van Dijken
Walker

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Cooper
Deputy Chair: Mr. Ellis

Dang
Deol
Ganley
Goehring
Goodridge
Long
Neudorf
Walker
Williams

Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills

Chair: Mr. Ellis
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

Glasgo
Horner
Irwin
Neudorf
Nielsen
Nixon, Jeremy
Pancholi
Sigurdson, L.
Sigurdson, R.J.

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Smith
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Carson
Deol
Ganley
Issik
Jones
Lovely
Loyola
Rehn
Reid
Renaud
Turton
Yao

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Ms Phillips
Deputy Chair: Mr. Gotfried

Barnes
Dach
Guthrie
Hoffman
Reid
Renaud
Rosin
Rowswell
Stephan
Toor

Select Special Public Health Act Review Committee

Chair: Mr. Milliken
Deputy Chair: Ms Rosin

Ganley
Gray
Hoffman
Long
Lovely
Neudorf
Reid
Rowswell
Shepherd
Turton

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Hanson
Deputy Chair: Member Ceci

Dach
Feehan
Getson
Loewen
Rehn
Rosin
Sabir
Singh
Smith
Yaseen

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Thursday, July 9, 2020

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

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

Please be seated.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: Hon. members, it's my great pleasure to introduce to the Assembly today on behalf of the Member for Calgary-Glenmore a number of guests in the gallery from the Ismaili Council for the Prairies and the Ismaili Council for Edmonton. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

Members' Statements

Labour Unions

Member Loyola: Mr. Speaker, it's almost the weekend, and I know that, like so many Albertans outside of this Chamber, we're all looking forward to soaking up the short Alberta summers. Weekends are a chance for barbeques, bike rides, and camping trips with our friends, families, and our neighbours. Weekends are pretty great after all, aren't they?

Well, we have labour unions to thank for them. Without trade unions there would have been no pressure for employers to limit the amount of time employees spend working. In fact, the history of the working week is the history of the labour unions. On March 25, 1872, the Toronto printers' union went on strike to ask their employers for a shorter work week. At a time when unions were still illegal, this was the first time a large group of workers had stood up for themselves and their rights through a strike, and soon enough the Toronto printers' union had the support and encouragement from other groups of workers who felt the same way. Three weeks later around 10,000 workers marched through the streets of Toronto to show solidarity and to make a statement that they demanded to be taken seriously. While their employers didn't take them seriously at the time, it was the government of the day, Prime Minister Macdonald, that passed the Trade Unions Act, making unions legal.

From job-protected leave, paid holiday leave to on-the-job protections labour unions have given us all so many things that we take for granted in the workplace today.

This government's attack on labour unions is an attack on all workers of this province: workers in places like Cargill and JBS meat-packing plants, whom this government failed to protect from the negligence of their profit-driven employers; workers like young people trying to earn money for their rising tuition costs or just trying to earn money to support their families with the rising cost of living; workers like so many of my constituents putting together their overtime paycheques, paycheque to paycheque, to support their families.

As long as this government continues to pick the pockets of Albertans to pay for their multibillion-dollar giveaways to their wealthy corporate friends, on this side of the House we'll continue to stand up for Albertans that are actually the backbone of the economy.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche.

Parliamentary Debate and Political Discourse

Ms Goodridge: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The NDP talk about standing up against bullying and protecting workers from being bullied in the workplace, and we must always stand up against bullying, full stop. However, we need to be careful not to label everything and everyone we don't like as bullying. Not liking something does not make it bullying. On numerous occasions I've had people heckle me both in this Chamber and outside. I would venture that everyone in this Chamber has been heckled at some point. It's part of our parliamentary traditions, and it's not bullying.

With that said, yesterday the MLA for St. Albert called out another member for nonverbal intimidation. What was this supposed intimidation? The member wasn't specific, but it appears that she took offence to a member looking at her as she spoke. Last time I checked, this was still allowed. In fact, I was always told that it was polite to look at somebody when they were speaking. I would suggest that if somebody doesn't want people looking at them when they speak, perhaps they are not in the right field. When the Speaker called her to order, she refused to apologize.

This abuse of the parliamentary system came hours after the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar gave a speech celebrating the death of former U.K. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. He said:

If nothing else goes right for me in a day, I can at least count on enjoying the fact that Margaret Thatcher is still dead, and the only thing that I regret about Margaret Thatcher's death is that it happened probably 30 years too late.

While I understand that some may disagree with her politics, celebrating the death of the U.K.'s first female Prime Minister is absolutely over the line and shameful. [interjections] I didn't hear any of the members opposite condemn the comments made by the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar. However, they quickly got on Twitter to attack the member for this supposed nonverbal intimidation. The double standard must be called out, and this continual virtue signalling must end.

The Speaker: Hon. members, all members will know the long-standing tradition of members' statements, allowing that member to go uninterrupted for the duration of their two minutes even if those members are on your own team.

The hon. Member for Drumheller-Stettler.

Anti-Semitism and the BDS Movement

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Anti-Semitism is evil. Sadly, it is an enduring and pernicious hatred that continues to find support and safe harbour across the world. As legislators we have a duty to fight this evil, to educate, and to stand with Jewish Albertans. Unfortunately, as it is endured, anti-Semitism isn't always as easy to spot as it once was. The new anti-Semitism that we face is more subversive and nuanced than the open and overt hatred that has dominated in the past. It has taken a form where instead of targeting individuals or the Jewish faith, the anti-Semites now target the Jewish homeland, the state of Israel.

One of the ways that the Jewish people are now attacked is through the boycott, divestment, and sanctions, or BDS, movement. This movement seeks to cause economic harm to Israel and the

Jewish people, and it seeks to ostracize them in the international community all while casting a facade of being an advocate for the Palestinian people. But let us be absolutely clear. BDS is an intentional attack on the Jewish people. It is the face of the new anti-Semitism.

Mr. Speaker, this is relevant to a current discussion that we are having in this Legislature because, unfortunately, parts of the Canadian union establishment have been infected by this hatred. Sadly, some radical union bosses have signed up as supporters of the anti-Semitic BDS Movement: Unifor in 2017, CUWU in 2009, CUPW in 2008, CUPE Ontario in 2006, and the list goes on. As the Premier said yesterday, can you imagine being a Jewish union worker and being forced through your own dues to support this anti-Semitism disguised as political activism?

Mr. Speaker, it's time to say no. It's time to give Alberta workers a choice, a choice to reject the anti-Semitic BDS Movement and, frankly, a choice to opt out of even legitimate political activities that a worker may oppose.

Mary Reimer

Mr. Eggen: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pay tribute to a beloved and influential member of our community who passed away on June 23, 2020, at the age of 96. Mary Reimer was an important part of the founding and nurturing of the progressive movement here in the province of Alberta, a lasting legacy to which we are all most grateful now more than ever. Mary was born in Brooksby, Saskatchewan and moved to Regina to pursue an education and later to begin work at the Co-op refinery, where she met Neil, her husband for more than six decades. They moved to Alberta in the early 1950s and made their home in Edmonton.

Mary played a crucial role in the formation of the New Democratic Party of Alberta. Together with her husband, Neil, who was to become the first leader of Alberta's New Democrats, they brought together Albertans from all corners of the province dedicated to building a just, caring, and equitable future for all. Mary was also true to her nickname, Merry, in all aspects of her life, from golf to bowling, social clubs to party events. Mary was energetic, gracious, and, well, merry in all the things that she encountered. I remember Mary and Neil coming to some of my fundraisers when I was starting to get involved, and I was struck by how friendly and supportive the Reimers always were. Mary, of course, was always willing to give me lots of free advice.

Our caucus would like to express our sympathy to the friends and family of Mary Reimer and our deepest respect for all she has done to build a better world for all Albertans.

1:40

Margaret Thatcher

Ms Rosin: Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be one of many women elected by Albertans to serve in this Legislature. The effort to get more women involved in politics and elected into the Legislature is not a partisan endeavour and is something that we should all want to see. In fact, during the last election nearly 50 per cent of our United Conservative candidates were women, and that is something I'm incredibly proud of.

But political discourse has become toxic – there's no denying that – and it actually scares some off from running. Sadly, something we heard yesterday here in this Legislature, amplified by left-wing Twitter, is a plain and outright example of the worst case of political toxic discourse. The disgusting comments we heard, which celebrated the death of the greatest female leader in the 20th century and, in fact, lamented that she didn't die sooner, would not be

encouraging to any woman who wishes to seek elected office in the future.

Mr. Speaker, as a woman who has earned the honour of representing my constituents in this place, Margaret Thatcher has always been a personal hero. She grew up as a daughter of a humble shopkeeper, who instilled in her conservative values, most importantly that through hard work, merit, and self-determination anything is possible. I too grew up with those values. They were instilled in me from a young age by my family, and they've also been a guiding light in my decision to advance into the political sphere.

Mr. Speaker, in Margaret Thatcher's rise to become one of the most powerful and influential leaders in the world's history, she faced countless obstacles, and she conquered every single one. They told her that she couldn't do it because she was a woman, and they told her to be quiet because her voice was too high. The people who said these things fade from our memory and into oblivion, but she is immortalized for all time. She faced down the tyranny of the Soviet communism and won. She faced down the forces of obstructing economic progress, and she won. A dictator once thought he'd test her iron will, and she sent the Royal Navy across the world to defend the rights of free people. Margaret Thatcher helped build the free world, and to hear an elected official across the aisle celebrate her death in this House is appalling.

Mr. Speaker, us Conservative women: we don't back down.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Parliamentary Debate and the Rules of the Assembly

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are rules in this workplace, as there are in every single workplace. I do a job where I signed up for debate. I signed up to have my ideas challenged, I signed up for a vigorous contest of values, and I signed up for democracy. I will not apologize for doing my job.

We have over a hundred years of history and rules on how we respect one another while upholding our duty to challenge one another. That is how we serve the people who sent us to this place to represent them. Those rules do not include being subjected to staring contests, posturing, mocking, or being subjected to targeted intimidation while trying to engage in democratic debate.

Last night I was doing my job. I was debating Bill 30, a bill I profoundly oppose because it is a bill that attacks public health care and paves the way for disastrous American-style health care in Alberta. I will continue to do my job. I will stand up for the right to be heard.

For the women watching and for the women who will follow in our footsteps and eventually fill these seats: change is coming. This Chamber can reflect the diversity of the people who live in our great province. I and my colleagues will lead that change, and we will not be intimidated.

CUPE Support for Venezuela

Mrs. Pitt: Mr. Speaker, the people of Venezuela have suffered immeasurably under the extremism and corruption of socialist dictators like Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro. Chávez seized control of businesses and starved his people while poverty and crime soared. Conditions in Venezuela have become even more desperate under his successor, Nicolás Maduro. Under martial law he has seized control of the country's judiciary, opposition parties, and he has jailed or assassinated his political opponents and blocked shipments of foreign aid. His socialist policies have resulted in extreme shortages of food and medicines with malnutrition and

illness now widespread and chronic. His socialist policies have resulted in a complete collapse of Venezuela's economy. Millions have fled his corrupt, murderous regime. These socialist dictators have been widely condemned by the international community, widely condemned by everyone except the socialist left, including some of the NDP's closest friends and allies.

Last year several major Canadian unions, including the Canadian Union of Public Employees, actually voiced their support for Maduro, attacking those who stand against him. CUPE's position rightly outraged those of its members who support freedom and democracy, and it rightly outraged its members of Venezuelan heritage. They believe strongly that their union's position undermines efforts to restore democracy in Venezuela and does not represent their views. In the words of a Venezuelan CUPE member: I pay my union dues for the union to represent me, not to screw me around.

Mr. Speaker, unions like CUPE can spend their members' dues on these kinds of political activities without fear of repercussion because they know their members are powerless to stop it. It's clear that union members deserve control over how their dues are spent, and this is exactly why our government introduced Bill 32. [interjections] Balance will finally be restored in Alberta's workplaces.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I have provided a caution about interrupting during members' statements. If all members of the Assembly aren't going to be respectful of that, I can assure you that the long-standing tradition of uninterrupted members' statements will degrade to a state where they will be difficult to continue with.

The hon. Member for Livingstone-Macleod.

Union Opposition to Pipelines

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the former Premier made another blatantly misleading comment while defending her union boss buddies' anti-oil agenda. She said, and I quote: I personally worked at various times with representatives from Unifor who were incredibly supportive of TMX and other pipelines and worked very closely with us to make that happen. End quote. That is quite a bold statement from a past Premier who openly opposed pipelines when the facts reveal that Unifor has openly opposed at least three different pipeline projects which would have brought jobs and prosperity to our beautiful province. Don't take my word for it. Unifor themselves filed evidence against the Kinder Morgan expansion, filed for a judicial review to stop Northern Gateway, and openly welcomed the demise of Keystone XL, and that's not all.

The now Leader of the Opposition desperately wants Albertans to believe that her close ally and former NDP running mate Gilbert McGowan is pro oil and gas. Well, Mr. Speaker, Gilbert's track record on this is clear. He opposed at least five major pipeline projects here in Alberta, but that's not enough for the anti-oil AFL front group across the aisle to try and gaslight Albertans into believing their union buddies aren't anti oil. They've also helped unions push their anti-oil messages. Remember when the Member for Lethbridge-West proudly accompanied the AFL in their efforts to kill Northern Gateway? She even helped write a book with instructions on blockading resource development.

Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, imagine being a hard-working union member in the energy sector here in Alberta, where the socialists opposite want union bosses to force you to pay for antienergy political crusades that will destroy your own job. That's not fair, and that's why we brought in Bill 32. We are levelling the playing field and giving workers a choice. We're keeping our

campaign promises to ensure workers get to choose the political activities that they fund.

Imamat Day

Ms Issik: Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Imamat Day, celebrated by Ismaili Muslims around the world on July 11 each year. On this day in 1957 His Highness the Aga Khan became the 49th imam of the world's Shia Ismaili Muslims. His Highness is a global humanitarian leader committed to improving the quality of life for communities world-wide. In Alberta he has commissioned a multigenerational housing complex in Calgary and the Aga Khan Garden in Edmonton, commensurate with his work across the globe to foster peace, pluralism, care for the environment, celebration of the arts and architecture, and care for the vulnerable.

Imamat Day presents an opportunity to highlight the Ismaili Muslim community's ethic of volunteerism and compassion in Alberta, including Stampede and Canada Day breakfasts, which bring together diverse communities. In response to the current pandemic, Ismaili civic volunteers have been busy nation-wide sewing 13,000 cloth face masks for essential service workers, donating 22,000 pounds of nonperishable food to local food banks, hosting a national blood drive, and have committed 70,000 volunteer hours to support front-line crisis response with the Kids Help Phone.

Led by His Highness, the Aga Khan Development Network, a group of international nondenominational development organizations, works to improve the quality of life for people in the developing world in more than 30 countries through social, economic, and cultural programs. One example of the exemplary work they do is a project in Afghanistan that aims to advance women's empowerment by increasing their social and economic participation in supporting their livelihoods. In doing so, the network is able to support sustainable civil societies across the developing world.

Mr. Speaker, through you and on behalf of the entire Legislative Assembly I wish Ismaili Muslims across Alberta for Imamat Day a heartfelt Khushiali Mubarak.

1:50

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has the call.

Financial Reporting by Government

Ms Notley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday Ottawa released a fiscal update which indicated the projected deficit for 2020 will be more than \$343 billion and the debt higher than \$1.2 trillion. These are sobering numbers, and they illustrate the scale of the damage caused by an energy crash and a global pandemic. Canadians will have a range of opinions on that federal government's performance, but at least we will have some numbers on which to base the debate. The same cannot be said in Alberta. Why has this Premier failed to provide Albertans with an update on the state of our province's finances?

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, in point of fact, this government has been far more transparent than the federal government about the state of our finances in the COVID crisis. We've indicated that we believe that the deficit for this year likely will be at least \$20 billion. The hon. the Minister of Finance will be presenting a comprehensive fiscal update to Albertans, I believe in August, and it will underscore what I said on March 16, that there is a great fiscal

reckoning that lies ahead for us. At this time, however, we are focused on saving both lives and livelihoods.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's not quite true. In 2019 the Premier hid his plan to raise taxes to pay for a \$4.7 billion corporate handout until after the federal election, in 2020 his Finance minister knew his budget was pure fantasy before he introduced it, and last month the government rewrote the law to hide their year-end financials and then lied to the Assembly about it being the Auditor General's decision. Why won't this Premier show Albertans the basic respect of giving them a straight answer about their own money?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

The Speaker: Hon. members, a point of order is noted at 1:52.

Mr. Kenney: Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I reject all of the false and misleading preface elements that preceded the question. We have provided a direct answer about our understanding of the current state of the province's finances. We've seen a massive decline in revenues. The government has also acted with unprecedented scale to keep our economy on life support with \$14 billion of fiscal action, both direct payments – grants to small businesses, to people who had to self-isolate – deferrals on utility bills, on business taxes, on property taxes. This massively affected our fiscal situation, as will become evident in August.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're not done when it comes to reporting to Albertans on their money. The Premier wants to hand Alberta teachers' pensions over to AIMCo even though the managers there lost billions upon billions of Alberta taxpayers' money. Now there's a report that shows just how badly AIMCo has mismanaged the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, and by law that should have been made public on June 30. I guess they forgot to rewrite that law. Why is this Premier illegally withholding the truth of AIMCo's incompetence from Albertans? It's their money, after all. Release the report.

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the leader of the NDP is not fully aware of the fact that we've been through the largest public health crisis in over a century, which caused a number of normal government functions and operations to be suspended and delayed as the public service was generally unable to work in their offices and was refocused on matters of urgent priorities. I understand that is one reason why the heritage savings trust fund report was not filed on June 30. I understand that it's expected to be filed in the next week or so. I would ask the leader of the NDP to please give some consideration to our public servants, who have been working around the clock to cope with this massive workload in the past three months.

The Speaker: The Leader of the Official Opposition for her second set of questions.

Ms Notley: That's rich.

Bill 32 Employment Standards Code Amendments

Ms Notley: Alberta families are struggling because this Premier increased their income taxes, their property taxes, their school fees, their tuition costs, their insurance costs, and even their camping fees to pay for his \$4.7 billion corporate handout. Some parents then made the difficult choice to spend less time with their kids in order to earn some overtime and make ends meet. Now this Premier is taking that overtime away from them. They'll either have to spend more time away from home or take another step closer to poverty.

To the Premier, not the minister of labour but the Premier: why is he so hostile to working Alberta families?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, you know, questions like that, loaded with falsehoods that completely contradict reality – it sounds like it's written for, like, a grade 10 high school debate competition. We support working people, which is why, for example, in the legislation we tabled this week, we will give working people the ability to determine whether or not their forced union dues will be directed to political campaigns which they find offensive. While the leader of the NDP stands with the union bosses, we stand with ordinary union members.

Ms Notley: Well, what working people want is for this government to get their hands out of their pockets.

Now the boss can force a working parent to take a double shift without any overtime pay – yes, that's in your bill – but that's not all. The Premier has also removed the need for notice before a temporary layoff. In this volatile economy a working parent could lose two weeks of pay once, twice, three times or more in a year. That could be a 12 per cent pay cut. That's a ticket to poverty. Why won't the Premier admit his bill is an attack on more than 400,000 nonunionized Alberta workers?

Mr. Kenney: Let me be absolutely clear. What the leader of the NDP said is completely, categorically, objectively false, completely false. There is no elimination of overtime pay in the provisions in this bill, and it is time for the NDP, Mr. Speaker, to stop trying to deceive Albertans, as they do in this place every day. The bill is clear. It's black and white on the paper. There is no elimination of overtime pay. It is completely false.

Ms Notley: Well, I know it's not the case that the Premier is lying, so he clearly doesn't understand the legislation he just introduced, and I'll walk him through it any time. Let's meet. I'll explain it to you. You desperately need it.

Now, yesterday we asked the government why they're permitting bosses to wait a month to pay out wages when people have been fired. News flash: half of Alberta's working families have \$200 or less at the end of the month. The minister's so-called simple change in timing pushes those families into crisis and poverty. How can this Premier be so tone deaf and so divorced from the reality of working families in Alberta, 60 per cent of them, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Kenney: You know what the NDP did to working families, to poor families? They imposed a carbon tax, which made everything more expensive. [interjections] Boy, she's angry again today, Mr. Speaker. She just accused me of lying again. Yesterday the NDP leader said that I was lying by asserting that Unifor was opposed to the pipelines. Unifor Says Pipeline Expansion Is Short-sighted; Unifor Files Evidence against Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion; Pipeline Exporting Crude Isn't Good for Canada; Unifor Files for Judicial Review to Stop Northern Gateway; Unifor welcomes the demise of the Keystone XL raw export pipeline: all of these news releases from Unifor. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

The Leader of the Opposition has another opportunity to ask a question right now. I encourage her to do so.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, then.

Petrochemicals Incentive Program

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Speaker, we were pleased to see the Associate Minister of Natural Gas and Electricity announcing the new Alberta

petrochemical incentive program and continuing the NDP legacy in attracting investment in the pet-chem sector. But the government's plan will attract less than half of the private-sector investments and create thousands of fewer jobs than our plan. Alberta was on track to be a global leader in petrochemicals under the NDP. Minister, why are you sending billions of dollars of investment to the U.S.?

Mr. Nally: Mr. Speaker, it feels like Christmas when the NDP caucus asks me two questions in the same year. Just to be clear – and I can appreciate that the hon. member on the other side suffers from a bit of revisionist history. However, the actual PDP program began under the PC government in 2014, so this is just a continuation of our investment in the petrochemical industry. This program is about economic stimulus, it is about economic recovery, and it is about jobs.

Mr. Bilous: Mr. Speaker, when the NDP brought in the petrochemicals incentives, the UCP – not only once, not twice, many times – over and over voted against our program. They also cried that grants were too risky. Now their program is just that; it's grants. The hypocrisy coming from the other side is unbelievable. Minister, why the flip-flop?

Mr. Nally: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate that the hon. member is looking for sound bites on his Twitter account, but I can tell you that there will be no victory laps on this question, because the original PDP program began in 2014 under the PC government. It's true that giving out grants early on is something that is of concern to us because it puts taxpayers at risk. That's why this program – we will not give out a single grant until that facility is built. We're talking about a \$5 billion, \$10 billion facility. We're talking about thousands of jobs. Then we hand out the grant money. No risk to the consumer.

2:00

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

Mr. Bilous: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only thing that the UCP government inherited from the former PCs is their arrogance.

At today's press conference we learned that the new petrochemical program is still not ready, but the minister has been on the job for 15 months. Fifteen months, Minister, and your homework is still not done. Other than costing Albertans hundreds of thousands of dollars for the one job you've created, what were you doing all this time? [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order.

Mr. Nally: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has me at a disadvantage because he is not encumbered by the truth, like we are on this side. I can say that absolutely we have been going hard on this file since April of last year. As you recall, in 2019 we announced PDP 2, which was a continuation of PDP 1, developed by the PC government. We believe in this program. It's a good program, but we wanted to make it better, so we collaborated with industry. We got some advice from industry, we solicited their feedback, and, yes, we made a good program better. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

Calgary Storm Damage Recovery Funding

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday it was revealed that the hailstorm that devastated northeast Calgary caused \$1.2 billion in damage, making it the costliest hailstorm in Canadian history.

More than 70,000 homes and vehicles were damaged or destroyed. The Premier only promised relief for overland flooding, but in case the Premier didn't notice, this was a hailstorm. Will the Premier provide relief to the people of northeast Calgary and cover hail damage?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier has risen.

Mr. Kenney: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, as the member knows, the government, further to the advice of the scientists at the Emergency Management Agency, declared the hailstorm that affected northeast Calgary, Airdrie, and other communities to be a disaster, qualifying for support through the Alberta disaster recovery program. We are working with the affected municipalities to ensure that that funding flows to support affected infrastructure. I'm also pleased to say that according to the Insurance Bureau of Canada, \$1.2 billion in payments are being made by insurance companies even though the NDP said that they were refusing to make payments on those policies.

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

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier likes to claim that providing relief for hail damage is somehow bailing out insurance companies, but this couldn't be further from the truth. Covering hail damage would be helping people, not the Premier's insurance lobbyist friends. Will the Premier immediately address this gap between private insurance coverage and support available through the disaster recovery program so that nobody – nobody – falls through the cracks?

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, if we apply the member's standard consistently, then why did the NDP allow tens of thousands of Albertans who suffered from 30-some hailstorms during the tenure of the NDP government to receive precisely zero disaster assistance support?

Mr. Speaker, in this instance the disaster recovery program will provide support for homeowners who suffered surface flooding, which is an uninsurable element of a disaster. I am pleased to report that according to the Insurance Bureau some 70,000 claims are being processed at a value of \$1.2 billion in addition to the public support.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At times like this we believe that the government should have the backs of people suffering from a natural disaster. Nothing could have been done to prevent the northeast hailstorm, and people continue to suffer due to this government's lack of action. The government was there for Albertans during the 2013 Calgary floods, the 2016 Fort McMurray fire, and the floods in Fort Mac this year. What is so different about the people of northeast Calgary that the Premier refuses to help them?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, again, this government is applying exactly the same law and policy for the disaster recovery program that the NDP had, that previous governments had before that, which provides government support for damage caused, uninsurable damage. He refers to the 2013 flood. That was surface flooding, for which insurance products cannot generally be purchased, whereas hail damage is a standard part of both auto and housing insurance packages, being reflected in the \$1.2 billion in policies being paid out.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Klein has a question.

Election Financing and Unions

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The NDP talk about reforms that they made to election financing in Alberta. Yes, it's true that through bipartisan effort the Legislature enacted reforms to ban direct donations from unions and corporations to political parties. But let's be clear. The NDP weren't exactly altruistic here. They made sure that there was still a way for their friend Gil McGowan, commissar of the Alberta Federation of Labour, to support political efforts. To the Premier: can you confirm that we will follow through on our campaign promise to close the loophole of the AFL?

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have a campaign platform commitment which will be reflected in amendments to the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, I believe later this year, to close the gaping loophole created by the NDP which allows the NDP through its legal, constitutional affiliate, the Alberta Federation of Labour, to spend millions of dollars, unlimited dollars, on NDP campaigns. And we know why the leader of the NDP is so sensitive about antipipeline Unifor, because here I have social media postings of Unifor campaigning for the NDP in the last election.

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

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that it's not just an AFL loophole allowing the NDP affiliates to spend millions to support their partisan efforts that is a problem and given that the NDP still allowed their union bosses to contribute unlimited amounts to their third-party advertisers and given that in the last election we also promised Albertans that we would take big union money out of politics by putting a cap on allowable donations to third-party advertisers, to the Premier: can you also confirm that you are working on keeping the promise to keep dark money out of politics?

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is one of the reasons why we will also, in addition to closing the loophole that allows a formal legal affiliate of the – by the way, Mr. McGowan has a seat on the board of the NDP. Mr. McGowan, who, by the way, has opposed every single pipeline, contrary to the interests of his members, and who is a former NDP candidate, took \$1.8 million of forced union dues to spend it on supporting the NDP, a massive violation of the spirit of the law. That's one of the reasons we'll also put a \$30,000 cap on contributions to PACs.

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

Mr. Jeremy Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you also to the Premier for his efforts and the answer. Given that the AFL and the NDP union bosses not only dumped millions of dollars into political activities supporting the NDP but given that a large part of these dollars came from dues of union members, who were not asked for their consent, and given that every union member should have the right to opt out of supporting political causes that they don't agree with, to the Premier: can you explain to this House why it is so important to give union members a choice on whether their union dues go towards political activities?

Mr. Kenney: Absolutely, Mr. Speaker. Bill 32 keeps another platform commitment, to empower ordinary union members with

an opt-in provision to let them indicate whether or not they want freely, of their own free will, to finance certain political campaigns. I'll give you an example. The Alberta Federation of Labour, under Mr. McGowan's NDP leadership, has opposed every single major pipeline: TMX, KXL, Northern Gateway, Energy East. I think his members have every right to say that they will not fund campaigns to oppose their own jobs, and we'll empower them that way.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

COVID-19 Outbreak at the Misericordia Hospital Public Health Act Review

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Folks in Edmonton are worried, and rightly so. The Misericordia hospital is in a full-facility COVID-19 outbreak. Three patients are dead, 20 patients are infected, and 15 of our health care heroes are in harm's way. The AHS's Edmonton zone medical director, Dr. Zygun, put it best when he said: everybody appreciates that this is a very challenging situation. To the Minister of Health. We are seeing leadership from AHS, and we should be proud of our front-line health care workers. Can you share with the House the leadership steps you are taking to address the situation at the Misericordia? Please be specific.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Misericordia hospital is now closed to new patients due to the ongoing transmission. No new patients will be admitted to the hospital on day procedures, and visits will be postponed and rescheduled to other sites in Edmonton and area. At the beginning of the pandemic we provided AHS, through which Covenant is funded as well, with surge funding. We continue to provide whatever resources that Covenant and AHS require as well as our public health officials to increase our capacity for testing, to increase our workforce capacity for contact tracing so that we can make sure we can react as quickly as we can to the pandemic.

2:10

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, given that Dr. Zygun reassured the public and said that all the other zone hospitals had come together to ensure that patient care is continued for Edmontonians and given that Edmontonians are fortunate to live in a major city with other hospitals, where there is system redundancy, but given that not all Albertans are that fortunate because some live in rural areas with a single hospital and given that many Albertans have started reaching out to ask what the plan is if their remote hospital needs to be shut down because of COVID-19, to the minister: what is your plan for emergency hospital care if a remote hospital has to shut down, and would you be willing to share that plan publicly?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I expect the integrated system in the Edmonton zone as well as all of the other four zones throughout the province to be able to react, as happened here in Edmonton as well, on an ongoing basis because we're going to be living with COVID for quite a while. The plan is: we have a hundred hospitals, including our 16 largest facilities, so each of them can help the others as we need to react to COVID on an ongoing basis. We're going to continue to listen to the medical advice that we receive from our medical professionals as we continue to respond to the pandemic.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Select Special Public Health Act Review Committee is meant to look at the COVID-19 pandemic response along with the Public Health Act and provide recommendations to improve that act in light of the lessons we have learned and given that the Minister of Health has played a central role in the pandemic response and given that other health leaders like Dr. Zygun have also played a key role, as we're seeing publicly in the last few days, and have direct knowledge of how this act is working for Albertans, will the minister agree to come before the select special standing committee, and will he make his tireless zone lead medical officers of health also available for oral testimony at the committee?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, we answered this question yesterday. It's the same answer today. The select special committee was directed by this Legislature to do its work to review the Public Health Act, a piece of legislation that is older than this province, at least some of those pieces of legislation. Look, the NDP are, unfortunately, using this as an opportunity to politicize the response to COVID-19. I would ask the NDP again to take the direction of this Legislature seriously and get to work. The name of the committee itself is to review the Public Health Act.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has a question.

Pension Policies and Legislation

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This UCP government refuses to engage with the tens of thousands of Albertans who have written in, worried about changes made to their pensions and this Premier's surprise attack on the CPP. Members of the UCP are so afraid of these issues that they have repeatedly voted against having any real debate here even though they would control the outcome. Even yesterday the Premier refused to answer my questions about responding to those who have made their voices heard. Well, today I dropped off over 36,000 written submissions at the Premier's office. Will he be reading them, and will he respond to them?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is in the Alberta Legislature, where we debate issues like this. Yesterday there was an opportunity within this Chamber to debate her private member's bill and the decisions that were made by the private members' bills committee. All that had to happen was that one member of the Official Opposition had to indicate that they wanted to have that debate. Interestingly enough, not one member of the NDP could be bothered to stand up to ask for that debate. I think it's rich saying that they want to have a debate about that issue when they can't be bothered to even show up for work to ask for the debate. Our side of the House is always happy to debate legislation inside the Chamber.

Ms Gray: Mr. Speaker, I as one member did indicate and requested unanimous consent so that this debate could happen, and the members opposite gleefully voted against that.

Given that this Premier's attacks on pensions are driven more by his decades-long vendetta against the Canada pension plan rather than the facts about what is best for Albertans and given that his colleagues in the UCP were eager to ignore the tens of thousands of Albertans who signed the petition at handsoffmycpp.ca, to the Premier: who exactly are you representing when you attack the CPP? Will you finally admit that your assault on Alberta's retirements is part of your agenda?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the issue is that you can't come to work late. When you come to work late and you ask to then go back and do a process that was scheduled earlier, that is inefficient, certainly, for the Legislature and disappointing. I know my constituents expect me to be at work on time, and I'm sure they do of the NDP. That's similar to one of my children coming to me, Mr. Speaker, and saying: my teacher gave me a bad mark because I put my assignment in late. That's disappointing. We have a process inside this Chamber. It's disappointing that the NDP could not be bothered to participate in that process, and if I was their constituent and one of the signers of those petitions, I would be very disappointed in the NDP's failure.

Ms Gray: Thirty-six thousand Albertans are disappointed in this government.

Given that the UCP keeps centralizing more and more of Albertans' pension assets under the AIMCo umbrella and given that the Premier continues to muse about a referendum that would take Albertans out of the safety of the Canada pension plan and given that this government continues to try and hide from Albertans the full extent of AIMCo's recent massive failures and losses, to the Premier: when you finally sit down to write the unwanted referendum question about your pension scheme, will you explain to Albertans the immense risk you're subjecting their retirement funds to by entrusting more money to AIMCo?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, I know, takes great pleasure in trying to scare people about their pensions, but let's hear the facts. Alberta CPP contributors send \$3 billion a year net to pension beneficiaries in eastern and central Canada, money that belongs to Albertans, that we could keep here to reduce premiums or increase benefits. Now, I know that the member opposite has a very low view of the capacity of Albertans to manage their own money. I have a much higher view. I think Albertans have every bit as much capacity to manage their money as people on Bay Street do.

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

Bill 32 Labour Relations Code Amendments

Ms Rosin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In last year's election our party campaigned on a promise to restore balance to Alberta's labour laws. We did this because Albertans were sick and tired of watching the NDP reward their union friends at the expense of workers' rights. That's why we made a key platform commitment to protect workers from being forced to fund political parties and causes without explicit opt-in approval. To the Premier: how does Bill 32 ensure that workers in Alberta will no longer be forced to subsidize political campaigns without their approval?

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier has the call.

Mr. Kenney: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I raised the case of a potential Jewish union member being forced to fund advocacy to attack the Jewish homeland, the state of Israel, and the leader of the NDP got out of her seat and started yelling at me. She was so upset that we were shining a spotlight on the unfairness. I want to quote my friend Shimon Fogel, CEO of the centre for Jewish affairs: it is appalling that Unifor has allowed itself to be drawn into the anti-Semitic, divisive BDS campaign against Israel. Bill 32 will allow Unifor members who support Israel to no longer be forced into that anti-Semitic campaign.

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

Ms Rosin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Premier. Given that national unions and NDP affiliates like the AFL use their workers' dues to actively campaign against the best interests of Albertans and given that Unifor, a friend of the NDP, launched a lawsuit against the Northern Gateway pipeline despite representing northern Alberta oil sands workers, can the Premier please explain how Bill 32 will prevent NDP-affiliated unions from forcing workers to pay for lawsuits and campaigns that run counter to the economic interests of Albertans?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NDP leader said that I was, quote, lying, and she said, "Because I know personally and worked at various times with Unifor, who were incredibly supportive of TMX and other pipelines." So let me read the following headlines from the Unifor website: Unifor Says Pipeline Expansion Is Short-sighted; Unifor Files Evidence against Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion; Pipeline Exporting Crude Isn't Good for Canada; Unifor Files for Judicial Review to Stop Northern Gateway; Unifor welcomes the demise of the Keystone XL raw export pipeline; Unifor leader who stood in a rally with Jane Fonda and David Suzuki to call for no more pipelines. Alberta union members should not have to pay for that.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Rosin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again to the Premier. Well, given that our province is facing an unprecedented economic crisis due to COVID-19 and given that the rebound of Alberta's oil industry is vital to the economic recovery not just of our province but of our entire country and given that the AFL president and friend of the NDP, Gil McGowan, has actively opposed Keystone XL, Energy East, TMX, Northern Gateway, and the Alberta Clipper, again to the Premier: how will Bill 32 put an end to oil sands workers being forced to pay for anti oil sands campaigns?

Mr. Kenney: Once Bill 32 becomes law, they'll simply be able to refuse to tick off a box to send Oil' Gil money to campaign against their jobs. The same Gil McGowan, a former NDP candidate, a member of the NDP board and president of a legal affiliate of the NDP, recently referred to parents who send their kids to faith-based schools as – and I quote – religious nutbars. Imagine being the Sikh parents of kids who go to a Sikh school, Muslim parents of kids who go to an Islamic school, or, heaven forbid, Christian parents whose kids go to a Christian school and having been forced to fund advocacy that calls you a nutbar. We're going to let those people withhold the political dues to Gil McGowan in the future.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo has a question.

2:20 Support for Small Businesses Affected by COVID-19

Member Ceci: Thank you. When it comes to supporting small businesses, this government has failed badly. The economic plan they announced last week was nothing more than a warmed-over version of their failed \$4.7 billion corporate handout, which, in addition to not creating a single job, absolutely has done nothing to support small businesses. Calgary businesses have been hard-hit by this pandemic and economic crisis, and they're asking this government for help. Can the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism explain why, at a time when Calgary small

businesses are struggling to hold on, this minister can only offer failed policies from the past?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would encourage the member opposite to do his homework. He may not be aware that our government recently introduced a small- and medium-enterprise business grant to support small businesses as they relaunch. The small-business grant gives up to \$5,000 for businesses to spend where they know is best, whether that's rent, inventory, wages for employees. This is in addition to all of the other measures that our government has introduced from the early days of the pandemic: the deferrals, the supports, the participation in the federal CECRA program, and so much more.

Member Ceci: Small businesses are hurting. Given that the sales across this province have plummeted by 30 per cent since March, a \$2 billion loss, and given that many businesses are reporting that they're likely to close in the coming weeks and given that this government is more focused on supporting big, profitable companies run by their rich friends and insiders and seems to be perfectly fine with leaving small businesses to fend, for the most part, for themselves, to the minister. Your economic plan has failed. Your giving money to corporations has done nothing to support small businesses. What more are you going to do?

Ms Fir: Mr. Speaker, I have to say that after over a year in this House it still blows my mind that the members opposite take zero accountability or even acknowledge the fact that they drove out billions of dollars of investment, caused thousands of job losses. No accountability for it under their NDP socialist regime, and now they're going to preach to us about supporting businesses, something we've done from day one? Again, \$5,000 small- and medium-enterprise business grants. Do your homework.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Member Ceci: Thank you. Given that this government and minister has been dragged kicking and screaming into doing anything for small businesses and given that the Calgary small businesses will need more than deferrals and failed corporate handouts to emerge from this pandemic and given that only 13 per cent of restaurants expect to be profitable within six months and that many could be doomed without more support from this government, can the minister clarify: when will small businesses receive more support? Is she stalling because she's waiting for Justin Trudeau to pick up the ball again?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish the member opposite would give me a hard question. This is too easy. Give me something hard. Once again: up to \$5,000 grants. That has already been introduced. I wish the member opposite would do his homework. I don't know what more to expect from the worst Finance minister ever.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Economic Recovery and Women

Member Irwin: Earlier this week I again asked the minister for the status of women how she's been advocating for women to be

included in the province's economic recovery. Her answer in a nutshell: we're supporting male-dominated industries, which will somehow trickle down and help women. Not only is this offensive; it sends the message that jobs for women aren't a priority for this UCP government. So I want to give that minister another chance. How are you ensuring that women's needs are centred in economic recovery plans? A lot of women are watching, so please, I beg you, answer the question.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to thank the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism, a very strong woman, who has put together with the Premier our economic recovery plan.

Again, maybe a little bit of homework is required to understand the incredible amount of work that's been put into this that is going to help out everybody right across the spectrum. If you want to understand why women are disproportionately being impacted, that member is going to have to look back to their own policies, that desperately impacted women at a disproportionate level while her members were in government.

Member Irwin: Given that countless women have reached out to me and my colleagues to say that it's absolutely critical that issues that predominantly impact women be elevated in this Legislature and given that earlier this week this government introduced Bill 32, which attacks protections like parental leave, job-protected leave, both of which allowed so many women to enter the workforce in the first place, again to that same minister: what are you doing specifically to help ensure that the labour protections so hard fought for and won by so many people before us are not eroded by your legislation?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women.

Mrs. Aheer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I find very interesting about that comment is that, actually, this legislation will protect women, women who have not been allowed to vote without having union thugs looking over their shoulders, watching everything that they're doing. We're actually liberating their ability to make their decisions on their own and actually put their dollars where they'd like to put them without being forced to use their dollars to fund campaigns that they might not actually believe in.

I'm so curious to see if this member is willing to stand up and speak out. If we're going to talk about empowering women, why hasn't she spoken out against the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, who actually used language that was disgusting against one of our female members?

Member Irwin: Given that we're not getting anywhere with this minister, I'll try another. We know that thousands of families are being impacted by the changes to the child and family benefit and that single parents, particularly single mothers, will be hardest hit and given that yesterday a single mother of two kids reached out to me to say that she's learned that she's lost this benefit and she doesn't know how she's going to make ends meet, can the Minister of Children's Services explain to us how cutting financial supports for young families is going to help our province recover, and can she tell me what I should say to that mom and to all the parents who are left in limbo due to her government's cuts?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier this week, the Alberta child and family benefit will now give more support to approximately 65,000 very low-income families across this province. By consolidating this benefit, we're putting more money in the pockets of those most in need and spending less on administration. We're also reviewing our approach to affordable child care to make sure that we can direct the supports at a time like this to get parents in need back to work.

Bill 32 Labour Relations Code Amendments (continued)

Mr. Guthrie: Mr. Speaker, Alberta union bosses are angry right now because we are giving the power back to their members, where it belongs. Unifor, for example, launched a lawsuit against the Northern Gateway pipeline despite representing oil sands workers. AFL president Gil McGowan opposed Keystone XL, Energy East, TMX, Northern Gateway, and the Alberta Clipper despite representing union workers who would be employed on these projects. Can the Premier explain how Bill 32 will redirect union leaders from protesting oil and gas when they're supposed to be representing their members in industry?

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's a very good question. These are big national unions. I think what has happened is that the hard left down east has taken control of some of these unions, and they don't care. They don't care about the jobs, the livelihoods, or the way of life of western Unifor union members who work in the oil and gas industry. So we are going to empower those individual Alberta union members to say no to Jerry Dias, to say no to big labour, to say yes to their own jobs, to say yes to oil and gas, to say yes to Alberta.

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

Mr. Guthrie: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Premier. Given that many workers who are unionized in rural Alberta have a spouse that works in the oil and gas industry and given that many union organizations will use union dues to protest the oil and gas sector and given that their members rely on these industries to put food on their tables, pay their taxes, and even pay their union dues, once again to the Premier: how will Bill 32 give union members a say on where their dues will go?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, through an opt-in provision. In the future Jerry Dias and the union bosses down east won't be able to take millions of dollars from Alberta union members to spend on anti oil and gas campaigns. They'll have to ask for their permission first. You know what this might create? Accountability. That's why the NDP is so ferociously against it. The NDP leader boasted about campaigning with Unifor on pipelines. Unifor openly, publicly, explicitly has opposed every pipeline. We're going to empower their members to say no to that nonsense in Alberta.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Guthrie: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Premier. Given that the NDP and the AFL are one and the same as Gil McGowan sits on their provincial board and given that their union members contribute hard-earned wages to the AFL every year and given that not all union members are NDP supporters, to the Premier: do you think it is fair that nonpolitical people have to

support a political campaign or that others are forced to donate to political organizations that they do not align with?

2:30

Mr. Kenney: Good question. Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. We respect the right of collective bargaining. I fully appreciate that there are many union members who support the NDP. There may even be some who belong to and contribute to the NDP, and they have every democratic right to do so. But for those Conservative or Liberal or nonpartisan supporters in those unions, they should not be forced to fund a political agenda with which they disagree, particularly when it is against their own personal, economic, and financial interests. The AFL spent \$1.8 million supporting the NDP in the last two years and opposed every pipeline. That's a shame.

Automobile Insurance Review

Mr. Carson: Last December this government removed the 5 per cent insurance cap, knowing full well that the insurance industry is making hundreds of millions more in premiums than they are paying out in claims. The minister said that the cap was only a Band-Aid solution. Well, Minister, when you removed that Band-Aid, Albertans hemorrhaged more money to these already profitable insurance companies, with a 30 per cent increase to their premiums in some cases. Will this government stop putting the profitability of large companies ahead of the bank accounts of Albertans and reinstate the insurance cap now?

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

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our government is addressing the issues in the automobile insurance industry, which the previous government wasn't willing to do. Frankly, the previous government didn't want to do the work to fix the problem. We aren't going to ignore this. The expert advisory committee is finalizing their report. We continue to be committed to making the necessary changes to ensure that Albertans have automobile insurance that is affordable, accessible, and sustainable.

Mr. Carson: Well, given that the minister created a panel to address skyrocketing insurance rates, a problem that this UCP government created by removing the insurance cap, and given that this panel is considering a move to no-fault insurance and given that no-fault insurance will only benefit the bottom line of insurance companies by removing the opportunity for Albertans to get fair compensation when they are injured, to the minister: will you do what's right by Albertans and promise that Alberta will not move to a no-fault insurance system no matter what your hand-picked panel recommends?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, it's a problem that we inherited from that previous government. But don't worry; we'll fix it. We're working on it. Out of the \$2.7 million in insured vehicles 53 per cent had more than a 5 per cent increase during the 5 per cent rate cap. The rate increase limitation was a Band-Aid on the problem that made a bad situation worse. The rate cap did not deal with the underlying issues that were driving up insurance premiums. Once again, I don't expect the members opposite to know how to fix a problem; they know how to create one. We've got it under control.

Mr. Carson: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that the Premier's friends in the insurance industry are calling for no-fault insurance with the option to purchase tort, the right for an individual to sue, and given that creating a no-fault insurance system with the option to upgrade a policy to have tort will be creating a system that will remove a right that all Albertans currently have and give it back to only those able to pay for it, to the minister: will you commit to not allowing insurance companies to sell tort, or are you going to allow these companies to commodify our legal rights just so that they can make more profit on the backs of Albertans?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Economic Development, Trade and Tourism.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What we will do is commit to fixing their mess. Again, the previous government didn't want to do the work to fix the problem. We're not going to ignore this. We will fix it. The expert advisory committee is finalizing their report. Again, we continue to be committed to making the necessary changes to ensure that Albertans have automobile insurance that is affordable, accessible, and sustainable. We have the backs of Albertans.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has the call.

Infrastructure Capital Plan for Edmonton

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to congratulate the government for realizing their mistake and finally acknowledging the needs of southwest Edmonton. The expansion of Terwillegar Drive will benefit the constituents of Edmonton-Whitemud. Our government recognized it, and after first cancelling provincial support for the project, the UCP finally has as well. As one of the fastest growing areas of the province southwest Edmonton needs infrastructure, yet the UCP has delayed the timeline for the badly needed south Edmonton hospital by five years. Now that the Minister of Infrastructure has acknowledged that he was wrong about Terwillegar Drive, will he commit to building the south Edmonton hospital on the timeline that our government committed to?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Madu: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I was so proud to finally work with this government to deliver what the people of Edmonton-South West have been waiting for for 40 years. The NDP presided over this particular province for the last four years before we booted them out of office. They had that particular problem, and they did nothing. I am glad that this government finally answered the call of my residents in Edmonton-South West.

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

Ms Pancholi: Thank you. Given that the UCP has been slow to respond to the needs of Edmonton and given that the mayor of Edmonton has expressed concerns about the other city priority projects this government has ignored and given that as the UCP is standing by their delayed timeline of the south Edmonton hospital, my constituents are rightly concerned about what this means for other vitally needed infrastructure, to the Minister of Infrastructure: when specifically will you deliver on the other priority needs of the city of Edmonton?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Madu: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that this government has committed more money to infrastructure in our capital region than the NDP did in the four years that they were in office. You know what they did? What they did was introduce a carbon tax that decimated our communities and businesses, something that nobody asked for. On this side of the aisle we are taking steps to deal with the problems that the people of Edmonton and Alberta care about.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the UCP delayed the timeline for the south Edmonton hospital, which is what I have been asking about, for five years, a hospital that would serve the people of Edmonton-Whitemud and many other constituencies, including those from the riding of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, and given that they are doubling down on their failed corporate handout that has not created a single job or added a single dollar in investment in Alberta, what will it take for this government to realize that building this critical hospital for the constituents of south Edmonton is a better economic strategy than doubling down on their failed \$4.7 billion corporate handout?

Mr. Shandro: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can advise the people of Edmonton that our government continues to do its planning towards getting a hospital in south Edmonton as well as a bunch of other infrastructure. Our government has committed to more infrastructure spending, I think, than the NDP ever did in their four years, in particular as part of our response to our stimulus plan as we relaunch the economy here in Alberta and we continue to respond to the pandemic. Part of that is going to be a significant amount of infrastructure spending in Edmonton as well as in the health system.

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

Bill 32 Labour Relations Code Amendments (continued)

Mr. Milliken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our UCP government has come out with a bill that not only protects workers' rights but that also dismisses the NDP's union buddies from being able to disregard the will of their members and spend workers' union dues to campaign for the NDP. While we uphold ourselves to making legislation more democratic, the NDP creates false narratives about how we are destroying their union comrades when in fact we are making them more accountable to hard-working Albertans. To the Premier: do these changes brought about by Bill 32 make it any harder for employees to join unions?

Mr. Kenney: Absolutely not. In fact, Bill 2 last year restored workplace democracy that had been destroyed by the NDP. They went to what's called automatic carding, which meant that people could be intimidated and harassed into signing a card publicly. We brought back the secret ballot vote. I think I know why they're so sensitive about this. I've got here a list of about 25 unions that contributed \$4.8 million to pro-NDP political campaigns in the past three years alone. Now these members will get to decide instead of just the union bosses.

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

Mr. Milliken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that union bosses such as Gil McGowan aren't interested in creating jobs for workers since he has opposed every pipeline project despite the thousands of good-paying union jobs and given that Gil has shown his true

colours opposing individual rights such as choice in education, calling parents who send their kids to charter schools religious nutbars, to the Premier: what thoughts might you have about NDP union cronies such as Gil McGowan that constantly oppose job creation and freedoms for Albertans?

Mr. Kenney: I want to come back to what I said earlier. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, that you're a parent, a hard-working member of an Alberta union. You make the sacrifices to pay tuition to send your kid to a faith-based school because you want your children to be raised with an awareness of your family's values and heritage, and then the guy that you pay these dues to calls you, quote, a religious nutbar and says that the independent or charter school you send your kid to should be defunded. I can only imagine how offensive that is to such a family. We'll empower that family now to say no to Mr. McGowan's politics of hate.

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

2:40

Mr. Milliken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that CUPE is an organization with a political left agenda – in fact, they are a founding partner in the NDP – and they have been actively campaigning and taking sides in elections across this country and given that CUPE endorses the illegitimate election that returned Venezuela's dictator to power, a dictator whose regime murders, imprisons, and starves their own people, and further given that these are the types of political campaigns that union members pay for without their own choice, again to the Premier: how can we ensure that union members have a choice as to where their union dues are being used?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, the NDP board member Gil McGowan referred to families of faith as, quote, religious nutbars, promoting hatred against them. Unifor participated in what the centre for Jewish affairs called an anti-Semitic and divisive campaign against Israel. CUPE supported the vicious and murderous socialist dictatorship of Venezuela, and we have their refugees being forced to pay their union dues and salaries. It's all wrong, and we will now empower those good, working union members to say no to the politics of hate.

The Speaker: Hon. members, in 30 seconds or less we will return to the daily Routine. Hon. members, I encourage you to exit the Chamber expeditiously.

Notices of Motions

The Speaker: The hon. the Official Opposition House Leader.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to give notice that at the appropriate time I'll be moving a motion pursuant to Standing Order 42. Would you like me to read it out? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning to propose the following motion: "Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly no longer has confidence in the Deputy Chair of Committees following his actions on July 8, 2020."

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: Are there tablings? The hon. the Member for Edmonton-City Centre has a tabling, followed by the Minister of Service Alberta.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table five copies of a petition containing 543 signatures calling on the government of Alberta to remove the overreaching powers given to

the Premier, ministers, and any future governments regarding Bill 10. I have the requisite number of copies.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Service Alberta has a tabling.

Mr. Glubish: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I quoted from a supportive letter for Bill 28 signed by Alberta's child advocacy centres, which was included in a letter I sent to all the provincial and territorial governments. Today I'm tabling the appropriate number of copies of those letters, both the ones signed by me and Saskatchewan's ministers of Justice and Health as well as the child advocacy centres' letter.

The Speaker: Are there other tablings? The Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Member Loyola: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have the requisite number of copies of an e-mail from a retired senior complaining about this government's approach to his pension plan. I submit those in for the record.

The Speaker: Hon. members, we are at points of order. At approximately 1:53 a point of order was raised. The hon. Government House Leader.

Point of Order Parliamentary Language

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order, both on 23(h), (i), and (j), but also I think you will find that there have been other rulings from the chair in regard to the word "lie" being used inside the Chamber. I refer specifically to the Leader of the Official Opposition in an exchange that took place during question period, an exchange that took place at the point that I called the point of order. I do not have the benefit of the Blues – you will – but the statement that I was concerned about was something along the lines that this government is lying or this government lies or something along those lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have talked lots in the Chamber over the last 15 months of the 30th Legislature about the word "lie" or about trying to say things about concerns about how we see mistruths with different sides of the aisle when there is a conversation. Certainly, we all agree that we can't call another member a liar or refer to them as a liar. I will acknowledge that the Leader of the Official Opposition did not refer to the Premier specifically as a liar. She did say that the government is lying. However, the word "lie" has been found to be unparliamentary even when referring to a group.

The reality is that I understand that sometimes it is tough to express your concerns when you think the other side is not telling the truth. For example, when the other side lies about my constituents poisoning water when they're not, my constituents would really like it if I could point out that they're lying, but the reality is that we cannot do that because we don't use that word. I have noticed that the Leader of the Official Opposition continues to use the word "lie" a lot, and I would like you, Mr. Speaker, to provide some advice to the Chamber on where we are at when we are referring to the government as lying or referring to the opposition as lying, the specific word "lying," so that all members of the Chamber can understand whether or not we are now allowed to use the word "lie" inside the Chamber.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that the Leader of the Official Opposition was referring specifically to something that you had ruled on. You ruled on a point of privilege, which is a serious matter inside this Chamber, already. In regard to exactly what the Leader of the Official Opposition accused the government

of, by way of through the government accused the Premier of lying about, Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that there was no point of privilege there. Certainly, when we have points of order in this Chamber and you have made a decision, that is the end of it in this Chamber. I think it is against our process and certainly will cause disorder inside this place for a member to continue to refer to something that the Chair has already ruled on, and I would ask that you would provide some advice and caution on that.

The Speaker: The hon. the Official Opposition House Leader.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is clearly a matter of dispute and not a point of order. I have the question that the Government House Leader is referencing. The paragraph that I will look at is, "Last month the government rewrote the law to hide their year-end financials and then lied to the Assembly about it being the Auditor General's decision," referencing the government.

I will also address the piece around the point of privilege ruling. That was specific to a point of privilege. It was not specific to whether or not there was a matter of dispute around whether or not the government actually did say that the Auditor General or the government made the decision around those financials. Although I appreciate the Government House Leader trying to say that the point of privilege therefore means that we should never discuss the Auditor General and the year-end financials, I think it would be a pretty wide scope in regard to the fact that we still haven't actually seen the year-end financials. In fact, the opposition has a right to ask on behalf of Albertans where the year-end financials are.

In regard to the word "lie" or "lied" I think if we even just go through *Hansard* this afternoon through OQP, the Premier used the word quite a few times. Members of the cabinet had used the word quite a few times. Again, it is about the context. If we are going to rule it as a word that can no longer be used in this place, then we will have to look at both sides of the House because very clearly, if we went through *Hansard* for the afternoon, we would see that it was used multiple times by multiple members in this Assembly. So at this point I do not see it as a point of order. I think it is just a matter of dispute.

The Speaker: Are there other submissions?

Seeing none, I am prepared to rule on the point of order. Both House leaders are correct that much has been said about the use of the word "lie." I think that if there's one thing that we can all agree upon, it is that the use of the word "lie" rarely creates good order under any context in which it is being used. More often than not the context in which it is being used is a member trying to do indirectly what they can't do directly.

2:50

On June 18, just a little more than one year ago, 2019, I said these words.

Here's what I will say. Let us all endeavour to raise the level of decorum and not imply that the government is lying, that individuals are lying. Let's do our very best to not try to do indirectly what we can't do directly as my sense is that this will continue to lower the level of decorum and not increase the level of debate.

I'm not sure if I have said truer words in the Assembly as I did on June 18. I will say them again today. I encourage the Leader of the Official Opposition to find much more creative and helpful ways to debate in the Assembly. I think in turn that will also allow the government to be more creative in just quoting other members inside the Assembly. I think that as we head into what may be a long number of weeks ahead of us, increased decorum will serve all of us and all Albertans well.

As such, I conclude that this is not a point of order at this time. But in the strongest way possible I encourage all members of the Assembly to consider the words they use and each in our own way increase decorum inside this Assembly. I consider this matter dealt with and concluded.

Motions under Standing Order 42

The Speaker: We will now hear the request from the hon. Official Opposition House Leader on a Standing Order 42. I would remind the member that the requirement of a Standing Order 42 is that she speaks to the urgency of this matter and not the content of the motion, and I will endeavour to use the powers of the Speaker's chair to ensure that happens.

Ms Sweet: May I?

The Speaker: Please.

Deputy Chair of Committees

Ms Sweet:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly no longer have confidence in the Deputy Chair of Committees following his actions on July 8, 2020.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise pursuant to Standing Order 42 to request that the ordinary business of the Legislative Assembly be adjourned to debate a motion in regard to a matter that is urgent and pressing. Before I start, I would like to acknowledge that I take this very seriously. This is not something that any member of this Chamber would like to do on a whim, recognizing that I did have this role when I was part of the government. I was the Deputy Chair of Committees, and I recognize how being in the chair at different times can definitely be very stressful, and it is at times hard to maintain decorum in this place.

In saying that, why do I find this urgent, Mr. Speaker? Well, first, I'd like to acknowledge that pursuant to Standing Order 42 I have provided the members of the Assembly with the appropriate number of copies. Further, while a motion under SO 42 requires no notice, my office did provide advance notice to the Speaker of my intention to introduce the motion under the appropriate standing order as per the Speaker's memo. This is important to acknowledge this as in order for the functioning of this Assembly, rules and conventions are important.

While those of us on the opposition side of the Assembly may disagree on policy and on how best to create and implement policy and legislation, the great importance of our role dictates that all rights of the members of this Assembly are protected. The individual in this Assembly who is responsible for that is the Speaker or the member in the role of the Speaker during debate and proceedings. I'd like to note that "it is the responsibility of the Speaker to act as the guardian of the rights and privileges of Members and of the House as an institution," as stated on page 317 of *Bosc and Gagnon*, 2017.

During the debate yesterday there were a number of occurrences that occurred. Now, given the fact that this happened last night and that this is our first opportunity to discuss this, speaking to the urgency of the matter of what occurred last night – and I will take your caution, Mr. Speaker, in regard to going into the details of that exchange last evening – I think that many members of this House will agree that the Member for St. Albert, who was debating Bill 30, had her rights within this Assembly breached by the Deputy Chair of Committees. Now, she was trying to express her feelings. She was interjected upon during that period of time and, in fact, due

to that exchange was asked to leave the Chamber and was named. Those are very serious allegations to be made for ...

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

The Speaker: A point of order has been called.

Point of Order Speaking to Urgency

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, as you indicated in your instructions, the process for where we're at right now in the Chamber is about the urgency, not debating the presence of the motion or the fact that the opposition may not have confidence in the Deputy Chair of Committees. That could happen if this debate is granted by this Chamber.

With that said, further to that, if the hon. member feels that some privileges were breached by a member of this place, including the Deputy Chair of Committees, that would be a point of privilege, and that member then would be able to respond or somebody on their behalf.

Again, going to you, Mr. Speaker, for some explanation. This is urgency. That's what we should be discussing right now. If this House decides to have a debate on the confidence matter, then we will see where we end up at that point.

Ms Sweet: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that absolutely we need to speak to the moment of urgency. This happened last night. I am trying to get to why it is so urgent. I would think every member in this Assembly would want to know why this is so urgent. I will follow your ruling.

The Speaker: I did mention at the outset that I encourage you to speak to the urgency. It does sound to me like you're laying out a case about the position of whether or not the Deputy Chair of Committees – if the Assembly has the Assembly. In saying that, I will provide a short period of time here for you to get back to the urgency of the issue. Then we will put the question.

Debate Continued

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess you're correct. It is hard when we speak of these issues specifically as it relates to this Chamber around urgency. Typically we have a little bit of ability to have context when it relates to Albertans and how this matter is urgent to Albertans.

I will go to the reason that this is so urgent. It affects every single member in this Chamber. It affects every single member from having the ability to stand in this House and be able to feel freely and without harassment to debate with the intent of having the Speaker be a neutral, nonpartisan body. Because of that this is urgent. This is urgent to every single member within this Assembly. How can we be in this Chamber and be able to debate without knowing that the individual who is overseeing the debate, who is to be nonpartisan, who is to not interject, or to interject to ensure decorum remains in this House, when we had a demonstration last evening that may bring question into that? It is urgent. Every single member in this House should see this as urgent, and there should be a conversation and debate around how members in this Chamber feel that they have the ability to continue to do their job effectively.

The Speaker: Hon. members, Standing Order 42 is a request for unanimous consent. That consent, if granted, will result in the discussion of the motion that is before the Assembly. I will ask the question.

[Unanimous consent denied]

The Speaker: There's no reason to stand. There's no opportunity for a division. I understand that many of you have provided no requirement for unanimous consent.

We are at Ordres du jour.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 28

Vital Statistics (Protecting Albertans from Convicted Sex Offenders) Amendment Act, 2020

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Service Alberta has the call.

Mr. Glubish: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to stand and move third reading of Bill 28, the Vital Statistics (Protecting Albertans from Convicted Sex Offenders) Amendment Act, 2020.

The changes that we have proposed in this legislation will help to protect Albertans and their families in their own communities. When I heard that Saskatchewan was making changes to the eligibility of who can legally change their name in that province, I was quick to check on our own vital statistics legislation. I was shocked and disappointed that the same gap currently exists in Alberta. This must not be allowed to continue.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Madam Speaker, survivors of sexual violence live with the effects of that trauma for the rest of their lives, so I think it is common sense that we require their offenders to live under their own names. Albertans deserve to know who is living in their communities. They should feel safe and confident that their neighbour is not hiding from past convictions of sexual offences. The changes proposed in this bill will do just that. If this legislation can help protect one child, one family, one vulnerable Albertan from falling prey to a convicted sex offender, then this legislation will have been the greatest success.

3:00

Madam Speaker, when we first spoke with Cheryl Diebel of Edmonton's Zebra Child Protection Centre in February, she was as surprised as we were that this loophole existed. At the time, she was unaware of any incidents of this happening with the people that organization serves and works with, but it took less than a week for that to change. This is unacceptable. Since tabling this legislation, we have also heard about similar situations that happened here within Alberta. Again, this is unacceptable.

We were honoured to have Sheldon Kennedy of Respect Group with us when we announced this legislation, and he was here in the Chamber when this bill was tabled alongside the cofounder of Respect Group, Wayne McNeil. Sheldon's story is well known here in Alberta. Graham James, a convicted sex offender with a vile history, fled the country and was found to be coaching a sports team in Spain after his conviction, and then he fled again, hiding from his past, and was found in Mexico. He has since changed his name. This, Madam Speaker, is unacceptable.

As government our first duty is to protect public safety. We must do everything that we can, take every step to protect children and vulnerable Albertans. Our government has already taken action legislatively. Last fall my colleague the Minister of Community and Social Services tabled Clare's law, which, I'm pleased to say, passed. That bill enables people at risk of domestic violence to

obtain information on an intimate partner's history of domestic violence. Earlier this spring my colleague the Minister of Justice tabled legislation to combat human trafficking, and again I'm pleased to say that that legislation passed. We have also set up a human trafficking task force led by Paul Brandt, who has been working to bring awareness to this issue of human trafficking and to combat it for many, many years.

Madam Speaker, Bill 28 is another important step forward in protecting Albertans. When I first tabled this legislation, on June 24, I also invited all Canada's provinces and territories to join Saskatchewan and Alberta in implementing these strong protections to keep their families and communities safe. I was joined in that call by Saskatchewan's ministers of Health and of Justice, and I am pleased to say that our Premier has also committed to bringing this issue forward at the next Council of the Federation meeting, urging every Premier across this country to take similar action and implement these strong protections.

Accompanying my letter was a letter from Alberta's child advocacy centres in which they say, and I quote: as leaders in the field of child protection seeking to support the recovery of child and youth victims of crime, this legislation is imperative to provide protection to their well-being, to ensure safety from their offender; by permitting convicted offenders to disguise their identities and past offences, we increase possible revictimization, jeopardize public safety, and unravel the advancement of work done to support the physical and emotional well-being of those impacted by sexual violence. End quote.

That is what we're proposing to do with this legislation, Madam Speaker, and I hope that I can count on all members of this Assembly to consider the safety and protection of all Albertans and vote to pass this legislation. Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak to Bill 28 in third reading? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Ms Goehring: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to Bill 28 in third reading. I've spoken several times to this piece of legislation. I can say from the bottom of my heart that it's something that is important, to ensure that sex offenders don't find a loophole in ways of changing their identity and hiding in the shadows here in the province of Alberta. I thank the Minister of Service Alberta for bringing this legislation forward. I think it's very important in terms of a step in order to ensure that there's another line of defence, another line of safety when it comes to accessing information of sex offenders.

I know we've had some lengthy debate about this, and I think that some of the things that we've heard – I spoke, too, yesterday about some of the misconceptions around potential victims of sexual assault being female only.

I'd also heard yesterday some concerning comments that came from the minister himself regarding the position of this piece of legislation from members of this side of the House. I have to say that it was offensive to listen to him saying that we were opposing this. I can say that I paid attention quite closely to this debate, and at no point had I heard any member on this side of the House speak against this piece of legislation. There are several members on this side of the House that spent careers working to support survivors of sexual violence. For him to make those statements is concerning. It's misleading, and I'm not sure why those statements needed to occur. This is something that we've clearly indicated we support.

What we have done is questioned next steps. What else needs to happen? He listed several pieces of legislation that he in government was able to pass. He mentioned Clare's law. He

mentioned human trafficking. He mentioned the recent victims of crime, all of which this side of the House provided amendments to, which would enhance the legislation put forward, which would actually provide financial support and resources to survivors of domestic violence and sexual violence. That is what we've been asking for.

In those pieces of legislation that he was referencing, that this government has brought forward, they didn't accept our amendments, so the statement that we aren't supporting this is inaccurate. We absolutely are supporting this piece of legislation. It does strengthen the ability to prevent sex offenders from changing their name. There is some solace in that, for the survivors of those sex offenders to know that the person that changed their life forever is not going to be able to hide. There is absolute comfort that comes from that.

But what we are saying is that more needs to happen. When we see a government that takes away from the victims of crime fund and not put supports in place to actually support the victims that we're trying to support, it's frustrating to stand in this House and be told that we're not onside with what the government is doing. That is absolutely not what's occurring. We're saying: we need more.

The people of Alberta, survivors of Alberta have bravely shared stories over and over and over with all members of this side of the House, expressing concern about access to resources, expressing concern about cuts. When we're talking in this place about what needs to happen and our support regarding legislation, I think we have the ability to also question government about what more they are doing, what more can be done. I think it's fair to say that when we're talking about legislation that actually says "protecting Albertans from convicted sex offenders," we need to talk about the Albertans that have been perpetrated on by the sex offenders. To me that means supporting them, and to many members in this Chamber it means supporting them, but it needs more, on top of this piece of legislation, to occur.

We have extensive knowledge in this House. I think that it's incredible that this loophole was identified, and I thank those people that brought this forward, but I'm also asking government to take some of the experience and the knowledge that we've been providing not just as ourselves as individuals but on behalf of Albertans. I know that many of my colleagues have stood in this Chamber and shared stories, numerous stories, heartbreaking stories about survivors of sexual violence. To discredit or not listen to them is tough.

I know that for myself personally, at 18 years old, as soon as I was allowed to volunteer at the Sexual Assault Centre of Edmonton, I did. That was my very first opportunity to volunteer with that wonderful organization, and I'm proud that I was able to do that. Hearing the heart-wrenching stories and the pleas of feeling isolated, feeling alone, feeling not believed is something that I think will never leave you. Knowing that I have this experience – several members in the Chamber have a background of social work – and knowing the impact of hearing those stories on members of the Chamber that don't have that background and that training, it's hard hearing members from all areas of the province express some of those stories. It's something that you will never forget.

3:10

When we're talking about the offender, we can't lose sight of the reason we're talking about the offender, and it's that person that they offended on, the person that – they changed their life forever. So we need to talk about how important this piece of legislation is. I support it, but we can't talk about it without saying that we need to remember why we're doing this, and it's not only to prevent

future assaults from potentially happening. If, you know, a police record check is pulled and this person's information comes up, it's identifying that this person is there. We have national registries that already exist that allow for information sharing across the country, but knowing that Alberta is taking this step is incredible. I really think that in order to have a government that is saying that a priority is protecting Albertans, we need to look at those that they are protecting and be able to honestly say that everything possible is being done to ensure that that survivor is taken care of and that that survivor has the resources that they need to continue coping, sometimes every day, with this trauma that's occurred.

I know that for many, hearing that this piece of legislation has passed will be a sigh of relief. It's that strength. Sometimes it's needed, for a survivor to hear that their offender can't get away with hiding and can't change their name legally, so I absolutely think that this is the right step. I'm just saying that I need to see more, and I'm hearing from so many across the province that more needs to be done.

With that, Madam Speaker, I'll close my comments and just again say that I do support this legislation and I hope that this isn't where it stops. Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to join debate? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and to the minister for bringing this bill forward. I've had a chance to speak to it at an earlier stage, but I am grateful to be here today in an opportunity to speak at third as well because I think it's important to say very clearly that I support this. Our caucus supports this. We think it is a good step.

We've also said that we think that there is more that could and should be done, and we will continue to advocate for that because while banning the legal name change of an individual is a good step, it doesn't actually ban them from going by other names; it just bans them from legally changing their names. We know that regularly in society, probably in this place, many people don't go by the legal name that their mom and dad gave them. Often they'll go by a middle name instead of their first name or go by an abbreviated name or sometimes go by a nickname altogether.

I think it is a good step to ban the changing of legal names. I think in actuality – and some members in prior stages of this bill talked about: well, somebody will have to, you know, say to somebody what their name is before they try to develop that relationship or lure them into a position where they can assault them. I don't think that that's reflective of reality. I think that if somebody always introduced themselves by their legal given name and therefore we were all magically safer automatically, we would have a very different society. I don't think that's the reality.

I think the main route – and I want to thank the Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs for talking about enhanced supports for survivors. But I think the other big way we change us from having the society we do and the amount of domestic and physical violence and sexual violence is through education – through education – and through love, and I think that one of the ways we can best do that is by committing to updating our curriculum in this province, something that's been long overdue for a number of years. I think the curriculum redesign started under now Justice Hancock when he was the Education minister. Inspiring Education: I attended a number of those sessions.

I feel that we are long overdue for adding things like a comprehensive understanding of what consent is and, when your consent isn't honoured, what your opportunities are to articulate that and how you can push back and how you can fight for your

rights if your consent is withheld. I think that that's one area I would really like to see this government express some commitment and some drive to moving forward on in a very quick fashion because I think it is long overdue.

We would have already been through phase 1 of the implementation of the new curriculum last fall, almost a year ago, if we would have committed to the plan that had been mapped out by the previous government. I really do urge the government to take the brakes off that and get on with making sure our kids have a curriculum that reflects the reality in which we all live today.

The other piece I want to highlight is that at the same time that measures like this are being brought in around legal name changes – again, to be very clear, I support this piece of legislation – we're seeing a retraction in the supports and services that meet the needs of folks in this sector. We see cuts to the budget for Children's Services, we see cuts to the budget for Community and Social Services, and we see a general tone of threats of fiscal reckonings in this province by the Premier yet again today, that there will be a fiscal reckoning to come. Again, folks who've survived such harm I think deserve to know that the folks who represent them are going to put them first, put their needs first and will fight for them.

But while we see pieces of legislation being brought forward that make small changes, we see system-wide deterioration of the supports that survivors need in the long term and that we all need to ensure that we address the societal norms and the societal assumptions that have resulted in such harm in the past. I think that this bill doesn't move backwards. I think it does move a little bit forwards, but I think there's so much more that we all need to do and should be doing together as legislators in this place.

With that, again, I do support this bill. Our caucus supports this bill, but we would like to see the government reflect the words and the title through its actions and through its budget, full stop. To continue to erode the protections for the vulnerable I think speaks to some of the real challenges we have with this government and how they are addressing governing in this province and who they are governing for.

But with regard to this bill I am happy to vote in support. Thank you.

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

Seeing none, any members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to take a brief moment to speak to Bill 28, the Vital Statistics (Protecting Albertans from Convicted Sex Offenders) Amendment Act, 2020. I've had the chance to learn a lot over the years in talking with women that I have known, and indeed in those conversations it was stunning to me to learn how unfortunately universal an experience this is for many women. It's something that we perhaps don't recognize or talk about nearly enough, though I think we are making some good steps forward as a society in recognizing the harassment and indeed abuse and, unfortunately, sometimes some very intense sexual offences which are committed against women and how often they are made to feel uncomfortable by men in the spaces in which they live or work or play.

Indeed, far too often excuses are made, you know, or men who commit these crimes are allowed to go free and not pay the consequence, or in some cases, as we're talking about here today, where they have in fact been convicted of an offence, try to find some way to rehabilitate their character or escape the consequences of what they have done. Of course, none of us likes to see that happen, Madam Speaker. We all believe that anyone who commits

such an offence should be held accountable. And I should be clear that this is not necessarily just about offences against women. Certainly, there are sexual offences that are committed by women, and there are sexual offences committed by men against men. There are many different circumstances. But we do recognize that, unfortunately, disproportionately women are the object of these sexual offences.

3:20

I support the government in bringing this bill forward, a bill which amends the Vital Statistics Act, so that anyone changing their name is required to submit to a criminal record check, and if that individual, in fact, is guilty of a sexual offence, they cannot change their name. So for the safety of those that have been hurt, that were the victims of that offence, or for others who might be concerned for their safety, the name of the individual that has committed such an offence remains the same so that it can be known and they can have that knowledge and that safety. That's a reasonable step, and I think many of my colleagues have spoken and laid out why. Indeed, anyone who has been the victim of a sexual offence should be able to have the ability and the safety to know that they will always be able to track or identify the person who committed that offence against them.

As my colleagues have also noted, this is one step amongst many that are important in supporting the victims of sexual violence. There are many, many other responsibilities that we have as elected officials and, indeed, that a government has to support people who have endured sexual violence. The victims of crime fund is an essential part of providing those supports and helping them to be able to afford to access counselling, perhaps helping them financially when they have been unable to work during the period when they were recovering from the violence that was visited on them. That is incredibly important. Unfortunately, we have just seen a bill which perhaps may jeopardize the ability of some individuals who have undergone sexual violence to seek that help, to be able to afford to get that assistance. That is concerning to me, Madam Speaker, and that is another piece for which we are responsible.

This bill is an important and valuable one, but we need to go beyond simply the punitive justice measures, which are important and are needed but are not all. Unfortunately, at times I see governments that fixate on the punitive measures but do not consider the social investments, the many other factors which impact individuals who have undergone or are victims of a crime like sexual violence. They instead choose to fixate only on the law-and-order and the tough-on-crime pieces. It is a balance, Madam Speaker. The step that the government is taking is, again, a good one. I support it. It is part of that balance. But there are many other pieces which, unfortunately, this government, I feel, is putting out of balance and is failing to address.

It is my hope that our belief in morality will not simply stop at a bill like this but will extend to all areas where we are considering how government invests and supports and uses its leadership and its power to ensure that victims of sexual violence are not left without the many supports they need beyond simply knowing the name of the person that committed that violence against them: knowing that they can access the mental health supports that they need and the physical health supports that they may need, that the community organizations that have been there to help them are funded and supported, and indeed that their own economic well-being will not be compromised.

I will be happy to vote in favour of this bill, but I will also continue to work with all of my colleagues in the Official Opposition to hold the government to account on all areas where

we are providing support for victims of sexual violence that affect their lives.

I'd also like to take the opportunity, while I have the floor, to just recognize a guest that came here today, Tory Nawusna, who was here for the tabling of the petition earlier. Thank you, Tory, for joining us.

This is all part of our democratic process, indeed. I am happy, on Bill 28, to support a good decision of the government but also to continue to use the democratic process to hold this government to account in other areas where they may fall short.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Seeing none, any other members wishing to speak to the bill?

Seeing none, would the minister like to close debate?

[Motion carried; Bill 28 read a third time]

Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

Bill 27

Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020

[Debate adjourned July 8: Member Loyola speaking]

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

Member Loyola: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I do believe I ran out of time last time we were discussing this particular bill, and I was actually addressing comments made by the Member for – if I could just remember here – Taber-Warner, actually. I was sharing with the members of this House that when we were in government, the Alberta NDP, I had the honour of having a discussion with the Member for Taber-Warner right here on the steps of this very Legislature. We were discussing how, even though we have differing perspectives, at the end of the day we care deeply about Alberta and we care deeply about our families and how they are represented and the fact that we all want what's best for Alberta.

It is with that in mind that I get up to speak to Bill 27. I feel that we're actually going back in time rather than moving forward on this particular issue with the fact that we have the reintroduction, not only with this bill, of course, with Bill 27, but also with Bill 28, of a total of \$530,000 in money that won't necessarily be transparently disclosed to the Alberta public on how it will be influencing the democratic process.

Now, I'll remind you, Madam Speaker, that I believe we had the honour of sitting together, if I'm not mistaken, on the Select Special Ethics and Accountability Committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The Speaker may or may not ever have sat on any committees outside of this Legislature.

Member Loyola: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

That being the case, I do remember spending a significant amount of time in committee on these particular issues and being absolutely adamant that if money was to be spent during an election process, those monies should be then disclosed to the Alberta public. Now, what we see here in this particular bill is that the money is not going to be traceable. People won't know. People won't know who put the money into particular ad campaigns in order to know who is actually trying to influence the opinion of members of the Alberta public. That's what this is about at the end of the day.

In our democracy we have different ways of making sure that we honour the democratic process. Of course, it's one person, one vote. People are free to vote in whichever way they want, and we respect that because this is democracy. The other part of that is the fact that we also live in a society where repeatedly, time and time again, special interests, particular stakeholders, will spend money to sway the opinion of particular members of the Alberta public to vote in a particular way. This is a very real fact. It's very real. That being the case, we can't stop it from happening. I mean, to stop people from actually spending money on advertising campaigns, which is their free right to do so, would be unconstitutional. I recognize that. By no means am I suggesting at any time that we do not permit this to happen.

3:30

But what I am asking this government to do is to respect precedent that was already set by the Select Special Committee on Ethics and Accountability, where we all agreed that moving forward in this fine province, we would make sure that if money were to be spent on advertising in an election campaign, any election campaign, those monies be disclosed to the Alberta public. This particular cabinet wants to move us back in time, move us back in time when that wasn't disclosed. I ask the members opposite: how is this respecting our democracy? How is this respecting precedent already set?

One of the things that we were very happy to do when we were in government with our very first bill was to ban corporate and union donations. And notice that it wasn't one sided. It wasn't just: okay; we're banning corporate donations. No. Because we understood that we need to be fair. We need to be fair with our democratic process, and what's good for one side is also good for the other.

It's with that I ask the members opposite: then why are you doing this? Those members of cabinet in particular I'm asking: why is it that you want to take us back in time to the way things were done before, when monies spent in elections were not disclosed? Unfortunately, I can't not talk about the track record of this very Premier, who stated that he would disclose. He actually stated that he would disclose who funded his leadership campaign, and to this day he has not put that information forward. He has not put that information forward. What is this Premier trying to hide? Why now do we have a cabinet in front of us bringing a piece of legislation that wants to continue how monies are spent in an election? Why?

This is the question that we are, on this side, asking ourselves. It's not that we don't believe in a referendum. It's not that we don't believe that Albertans should have an opinion on people who could potentially be their Senator. That's not the case. Our critique of this piece of legislation firmly stands on the fact that again we have the introduction of dark money into Alberta politics. That's what it's about.

For once I'd like to see members opposite actually get up and speak specifically to what I'm talking about right now. Don't confuse the debate. Don't say that we're saying something that we're not saying. Don't put words in our mouth when you get up to speak and say, "Oh, you guys don't believe in having a referendum" because that's not what I'm saying. Don't get up and state that we don't believe that people should be able to vote for their Senator or who they think. If that's what is the piece of legislation before us, then I would strongly support that. But, specifically, I want members opposite to get up and speak about why they are reintroducing dark money into the political process here in the province of Alberta. That is my focus.

From my time on the Select Special Committee on Ethics and Accountability my dream has been to strengthen democracy here in

the province of Alberta as much as we possibly can, as much as we possibly can. By now, I think that members know firmly the history from which I came. I don't need to continually repeat it, but I stand up for democracy because – the reason why I'm here in Canada is that we didn't have that opportunity. We didn't have the opportunity to make sure that our human rights were respected, and it's within this arena, within this particular political arena as well as others, you know, within the judicial system and other orders of government, that we need to raise our voices, not just as politicians in this House, but then also stand up with the people who are fighting to make sure that their rights are respected.

We had a firm example of that just a few weeks ago with the Black Lives Matter movement, where more than 15,000 people came onto the grounds of this Legislature to demand that human rights be respected all over this nation, specifically for black people and specifically for indigenous people. It was an amazing act of solidarity between people of different cultural backgrounds. I remember walking through the grounds with pride as I saw Muslim brothers and sisters of mine attending that particular demonstration.

When it impacts one group of people, it impacts us all. This is what we need to take into consideration when we start thinking about how money can again have the potential to sway, because that's the intent, Madam Speaker. That is the reason why people spend money on ads in an election campaign, to particularly sway people's opinion when it comes to casting their vote in that particular election. The very least that we can give to the Alberta public is to tell them, "Look, the person who spent that money on that particular ad: this is who they are."

The Deputy Speaker: Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available.

Seeing none, any other members wishing to join debate? The hon. Official Opposition House Leader.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is my first opportunity to rise and speak to Bill 27. I just want to again clarify that, as my hon. colleague in our caucus was mentioning, our caucus does not have an issue with having referendums or having elections called or having Albertans participate in democracy. Where we disagree with the government is around how that is done and why it is that money and third-party advertising and all of these different changes that the government has now chosen to make are being done within these pieces of legislation.

What we've seen with Bill 27 – because, I mean, this bill was only reintroduced a year ago, and now we're back again amending it. What we're seeing here is that the amendments that are being created under the elections amendment act are actually specific to a labelling of the ability to fund raise. We see in some of the sections where it starts to reference – instead of campaign advertising it's now Senate campaign advertising or Senate fundraising or different things like that, where basically the language within the act has changed it from just political advertising to specify Senate.

Now, when we look at that, you know, it seems like it's not a big deal. Maybe it's housekeeping. Maybe the government would even say it's like red tape reduction or whatever, but what we know is that when we look at Bill 26 and then Bill 27 combined, what has actually happened is that through changing of the language in the act around being able to do Senate advertising expenses and Senate fundraising expenses, an individual, between bills 26 and 27, can actually under third-party advertising submit expenses to the elections officer under two different, now named categories.

3:40

There used to be a cap. There used to be this third-party advertising cap which would have been distinct for all political

engagement. But what's happened now is that an individual can claim, you know, \$350,000 without audited expenses under the referendum advertising expenses, and then they can go under the Senate Election Amendment Act and they can claim another \$150,000 under the Senate third-party advertising.

As we start to see and as we start to look at all of these different pieces of legislation, the numbers really start to add up. There are little loopholes and little pockets that are created for all of these different abilities so that when an election is called – let's say, the future municipal election – we have also a Senate election and we also have a referendum question that's been asked at the same time. And now we have all of these different pockets where a lot of money – people that really want to be able to influence an election have the capacity to do it under a variety of different pieces of legislation all at the same time.

I find that really interesting. This again is where we fundamentally have a concern with how this is being done. It's not about democracy for Albertans and ensuring Albertans have a voice because if that was the case, then we wouldn't even be dealing with Bill 27, because all, really, Bill 27 does is create a financial administration component, and that would be the same with the referendum bill.

Again, referendums are fine, depending on whether or not there's big money in it. Our leader has been very, very clear. Senate elections are fine. They aren't really binding. Federal government can still decide who they want to appoint as a Senator, whether we have an election or not, so they're kind of a – I mean, it's a great, you know, nod to the base for the government, but it, again, isn't binding. It's here or there, but what it does allow is a lot of money to get introduced into elections because of the piece of legislation.

The piece that I also find super interesting and where I still have a really interesting cognitive disconnect between what the government is trying to do when it comes to all of this democracy stuff is that the government created a committee called the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee, which we have members of the opposition on and members of the government on. This whole committee, the whole intent of it, from what I understand – to be fair, we haven't had our first meeting yet. I believe it's on Monday. I am a member of the committee, so I guess I'll learn what we're going to be talking about. Like, there's this committee that this government has created, yet currently we have three pieces of legislation in front of us that are influencing the elections – municipal, Senate – referendums. Some could even argue that Bill 32, when you look at the financial implications in the labour pieces of legislation, is actually somewhat of an election, democratic-jigging piece of legislation. So I'm not really sure why we have this special committee.

Because of that, I actually have an amendment, Madam Speaker, which I can read into the record if you would like.

The Deputy Speaker: Just wait until I have a copy.

This will be known as amendment RA1. Please proceed to read it into the record.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The hon. member to move that the motion for second reading of Bill 27, the Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020, be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 27, Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020, be not now read a Second time because the Assembly is of the view that this legislation should not proceed until such time as the Assembly can consider any recommendations made by the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee.

Now, Madam Speaker, the reason that I feel that this is appropriate, that it not be read a second time, as well as I indicated when I first stood up, is that this is actually now the second time that this piece of legislation has been introduced into the House in the last 15 months. We saw this bill actually in June of last year. We're at the one-year anniversary of this piece of legislation, and the government has already had to bring it back into the Chamber to be amended and discussed once again. First time is okay; second time, we'll see; maybe third time is the charm. I'm not quite sure. You know, to support the government and maybe give them an opportunity to not have to then bring this piece of legislation back into the Chamber for the third time: they may want to hold off on this particular piece of legislation, not have it read a second time, and wait and see, through the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee, whether or not there will be recommendations made that may potentially impact this piece of legislation again, so they won't have to then amend it and bring it back for the third time.

Again, I think that this is a pretty reasonable amendment given that, you know, the government created the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee. They have the majority on the committee. We all know what that means in this Chamber. They'll be able to look at what makes sense. You would think that instead of having all of these pieces of legislation that have to do specifically with elections, they would actually use the committee to review the pieces of legislation and make sure that what they're doing isn't then going to require even more amendments to pieces of legislation.

I'm just here to help. I would like to encourage all the members of the Chamber to vote in favour of this so that, again, the government doesn't have to amend this piece of legislation for the third time.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, 29(2)(a) is available.

Seeing none, any other members wishing to speak to amendment RA1 on Bill 27? The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and speak to amendment RA1, the amendment to Bill 27, Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020. I did speak to this bill earlier this week. It's my pleasure to rise and add some additional thoughts and maybe underline some of the things that I said at that time.

As I said earlier – well, let me first say that I think it's a good idea to send this piece of legislation to committee. As my colleague noted, this is the second time that we're dealing with this issue. I think we could all agree that there's limited time that we have to debate legislation in this place, and I think, given the enormous challenges that we face not just in Alberta but in Canada, globally, whether it's the pandemic, commodity prices, the crash, the challenge in the economy, job losses, all of the things that are going on, we have a limited amount of time to deal with legislation to actually make lives better for Albertans.

[Mr. Walker in the chair]

I would suggest pausing this given that there are some issues with it, taking it to a committee for things to slow down a little bit and for people to really have a look at this. I would also suggest maybe inviting stakeholders. Stakeholders such as members from the AUMA, I think, would be a great idea, to get their thoughts. I believe one of my colleagues tabled this document, but if not, I will table it on Monday. There was a statement released. This wasn't too long ago. It was on June 24, and it was a statement from AUMA President Barry Morishita: "AUMA is committed to fair local

elections." I think that title certainly says it all. I have no doubt whatsoever that the leadership of AUMA and all of the members are indeed committed to fair and local elections.

3:50

In their comments they did outline some principles, some really basic principles that they wanted all of us to think about. I think that it's important that we go through these and really think about this. When we look at Bill 27 and look at all of the potential things that can happen as a result – and we've talked about that. It's not just Bill 27 but bills 26 and 27 together.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Again, let me just preface all of this by saying that nobody's in any way opposed to referendums. What we're opposed to, what we have concerns about, is bringing in more money, bringing in more money in terms of third-party advertising that is really difficult to track and to trace. Those are generally the concerns, and I also mentioned previously that local leaders – I know that in my case of the city of St. Albert it was publicly reported that one of the things that the mayor values, and I completely agree with her, is that the local municipal elections are about local issues, that they are truly, genuinely local elections about local issues that are important. There is no – as much as possible. I mean, nobody's perfect, but as much as possible there is no interference in terms of political ideology or provincial politics, much less federal politics.

Anyway, going back to Mr. Morishita's statement about the principles, they include some things I think that we would probably all agree with. The first one is democracy, that they are democratic, autonomous, local, inclusive and fair, enforceable, scalable, transparent, and nonpartisan. I think those are generally excellent principles when you are looking at democracy and particularly, based on this statement, their view of local and municipal elections, why it's so important to preserve the integrity of those elections. When you have a piece of legislation like Bill 27, Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020 – again, this is not about a referendum in any way. This is about the loopholes that are created with this piece of legislation to introduce more influence in terms of money. I mean, that's what it is, right? It allows more money to be introduced into elections.

Now, coincidentally, this Senate election would run at the same time as the municipal election where, you know, reeves and mayors and councillors and trustees are elected. We are confusing things. The other day one of my colleagues talked about one of – I don't remember the year, but it was an election where there was also a Senate election. It was hard to tell who was who because of the colours of the signs, let's say. There are some people – we are, I think, highly attuned to politics, but not everybody is, especially when you look at local elections. Local elections about local issues: not everybody there is informed about what's going on federally or provincially and often have no idea what's going on in terms of electing someone to suggest to the federal government to appoint to the Senate.

I think the concern is about money. Some of the things that bills 26 and 27 do are literally allow hundreds of thousands of dollars to be raised and spent to influence public opinion on political matters with limited oversight and transparency and only the Premier's permission. I certainly understand that the head of government, the leader of this province, has a degree of authority and power that other people do not have. However, I think when it comes to things as important as this, it's really vital that there be as much transparency as possible.

The changes to the Alberta Senate Election Act allow for third-party advertisers to have a Senate election advertising account, to

keep referendums, Senate, local, and provincial issues separate. Now, I think we also talked at length about: when you look at both of these pieces of legislation, if you were to have an election as well as a Senate election and then a referendum, you're introducing all of these loopholes and opening all of these windows for third-party advertising for big money, not all of which will be easily traced back to its source, and I think that's pretty clear in the legislation. I think if you're going to add questions about, "Who's paying for what, who's paying for the signs, who's paying for the billboards, who's paying for the radio ads, who's paying for all of those things?" if we can't readily understand or know who's doing that, how do you make an informed decision? I think we can all agree that advertising plays a role in politics. We know this. That's why we all fund raise. We know that elections are coming. We know that we are going to have to spend money on all of these things.

I think what we tried to do with the special ethics and accountability all-party committee – that was years ago now – as much as possible was level the playing field. We brought it down. Literally, at the time it was like Albertans could donate, like, \$30,000, I think, to multiple people, actually. I could be wrong about that. I'll have to check. What we changed it to was a maximum of \$4,000 per person, per Albertan, no corporations, no unions, but actual people. The maximum was \$4,000, and that was all in. That could be multiple candidates, that could be, you know, all to one, to the party, doesn't matter.

Member Loyola: To leadership.

Ms Renaud: To leadership. Yeah.

That was it. This particular piece of legislation, under the guise, once again, of doing a Senate election, opens doors to big money.

We already dealt with the Senate election. We already had the ability to do that, Madam Speaker. I think this new piece of legislation or this new amendment isn't about, you know, fixing maybe a couple of phrases that weren't quite right. This is about money. This is about influencing elections, and that's not what elections are supposed to be about. I don't believe they are.

You know, I talked a little bit about how I think that all of us, I would hope that all of us, have a goal or hope that one day this Chamber is easily accessible to all people, so that we see the diversity in this place that is reflected in the province: in terms of age, that we have people of all different ages; that we have at the very least a balance in terms of gender; that we have people with all kinds of backgrounds, all kinds of religious beliefs, all kinds of ideas. Because I believe that when you actually approach a problem and try to create a solution, when you have that kind of diversity and those kinds of fresh ideas from different perspectives, you actually go further. You know, that might sound like I'm wearing some rose-coloured glasses, but that is my belief.

And I believe that a serious barrier for people getting into politics, even at a municipal level, I would say – I can't comment on school boards and things. At a municipal level there is a responsibility to raise a fair amount of money, not just to create the infrastructure in terms of volunteers and a plan and all of those things. There is a lot of money that you have to raise. It requires you to engage with the people whose vote you are looking for. It requires you to reach out to them and ask them to support you, whether it's with their vote or with time or with money. When you open things up and introduce money that you can't actually even track, money that is introduced into an election that seeks to influence the outcome of an election, you start to remove, I think, some of the most basic principles of elections: that it is fair, that it is transparent, that it is open to all people who are eligible. I don't believe this piece of legislation does

that. I didn't believe it earlier this week, and I most definitely don't believe it today.

So I would hope that the members – you know, it's not been the pattern of late that they accept any amendments that we make; I shouldn't say any, there have probably been a couple; I don't know what they are, but there've probably been a couple – consider some of the concerns that we've raised about this piece of legislation. Again, I want to say that ideal elections – I think that, you know, when we all stand up and talk about the importance of democracy and protecting democracy, I think that what we all believe, I hope what we all believe, is ultimately about electors choosing, about choosing people to represent them, whether it's on a city council, whether it's on a school board, or whether it's in the Alberta Legislature. They're electing people that they believe can do a good job representing them to whatever body they're electing them to. So it shouldn't be about big money and their purchasing power in terms of advertising to sway voters. It should not be about that. It needs to be as grassroots level as possible.

4:00

I mean, I can remember that I think probably every election that we've had in the last little while, there's always the debate about: "Why do we have to have so many signs? Why couldn't we just save all the money with the signs, and, you know, we wouldn't have to recycle them all?" Right? And we wouldn't have to take them all down the next day, and there wouldn't be vandalism on the signs. That always happens.

I mean, it's sort of funny because we all do it with signs. I get it. But I think that basically what people are saying is that it's not about that. It's not about how many signs you have or how nice they look or the best locations that you have. It's about the ideas, and it's about the person. Does that person match your ideals? Do you believe that that person can represent you? So going back to the basics of elections, if we bring in more dark money, more money that we can't trace, we start to erode that.

You know, the other thing I would like to say is that I'm not going to assign – not motives. I'm not going to sort of guess what people would do, people that are backed by dark money, whatever. I think that we can be pretty clear about saying that when people invest a lot of money in something, they're usually doing it for a reason. For example, lobbyists: that's what they do, right? They have budgets. They spend their budgets. They do it for a reason. They lobby for a reason. They want something done. They need something done. So it is not unusual for lobbyists with big pockets, deep pockets to introduce a lot of money into elections and expect something in return. I'm not saying that there's a backroom deal, you know, where they've signed off on something. But that generally is the expectation, unless the lobbyist just simply likes the person a lot and just wants to give them a big bunch of money and never see them again.

I would suggest that when we start to introduce a lot of money into elections, there's a reason why lobbyists and why special-interest groups, whether they are corporations, whether they are unions, whether they are lobbyists, whether they are family groups, whether they are groups of lawyers, whatever they are – they have a reason for doing that, for investing, which is why I was so proud of the work with the special ethics and accountability committee. We brought the number down, and we made it fair, as fair as possible. It was an all-party committee. We had a lot of debate about where we should land, about PACs. We had a lot of debate about all kinds of things, but we landed on that number. It was \$4,000 across the board.

The Deputy Speaker: Oh, what would we do without our signs?

Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. I see the hon. Associate Minister of Natural Gas and Electricity.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the caucus across for putting forward what I would describe as a thoughtful amendment for a caucus that doesn't embrace democracy. But when we look at the amendment, it's a step backwards, and it doesn't enhance this piece of legislation in any way.

Now, you know, it's getting late in the day. It's the end of the debate week, if you will, and I just can't help but remind myself of what my grandfather used to say. He used to have this saying that you don't let the fox guard the henhouse. The reason I think that that is so appropriate today is because we have a caucus that has proven that when it comes to democratic values, such as the secret ballot during union certifications, it's not something they embrace. They're against that. So that was something that we had to bring back in. You know, we see the secret ballot as the most basic tenet of democracy. When you don't have the secret ballot during union certifications, it leads to all sorts of other types of abuses.

It was clear during their four years in government that that government was a caucus that chose to stack the deck as much in their favour as possible. We even see it with the citizen referendums we've talked about in this House. The NDP are not a caucus that embraces citizen referendums. Again, you know, we don't understand that. What is more basic and what is more democratic than something as basic and direct as citizen referendums?

So just the fact, Madam Speaker, that they've demonstrated that they don't embrace the same democratic values that we do, we see this amendment as a step backwards and not a step forward, so I would encourage all of the members on this side of the House to turn down this amendment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members under Standing Order 29(2)(a)? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to speak to Bill 27. Are we on 29(2)(a)? Yeah. That's what I thought. A pleasure to rise and discuss some of the comments that have been made by hon. members in this House regarding the amendment. We just listened to a member of the government caucus speak about the democratic process and enhancing democracy, and I can't think of anything more beneficial to the democratic process than having a very critical and detailed analysis of a piece of legislation done by a special committee that is struck precisely for that purpose. To have the hon. member describe that as somehow a step backwards, behooves imagination because, in fact, I believe that is what that committee was struck to do. Giving this work to the committee by passing this amendment to refer this bill to committee is certainly the right thing to do.

There is a triumvirate of pieces of legislation before this House that are somewhat related, and I would argue, Madam Speaker, that it would be beneficial to have all three of them sitting before the committee for consideration in detail because, of course, nothing could be more democratic than to have that committee, struck for that purpose, to actually look in detail at how those pieces of legislation work together because they were designed to work together; as they describe them, a triumvirate.

I would even go further to say that it'll be the government's crosses to bear should they end up passing in this House and becoming law. There are three crosses to bear, Madam Speaker, and I would say that each of them represents a crucifixion of democracy that will have their own stories, whether it be Bill 27, that we're talking about today and the amendment to refer to the committee,

the Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, or whether it be the other two with respect to referendums and local authorities elections. That collection of three pieces of legislation should all, in my view, go to committee for very, very detailed scrutiny.

It certainly is a timely and opportune moment to be able to make use of this committee that the government struck for an untold purpose to this point. We are handing to them a golden opportunity to say: indeed let's use that committee to look in detail at these pieces of legislation, including Bill 27, which we are hoping to refer to the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to speak on amendment RA1 to Bill 27? The hon. Member for Edmonton-West Henday.

Mr. Carson: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's an honour to rise to speak to Bill 27, of course, the amendment that's before us, that this legislation "be not now read a second time because the Assembly is of the view that this legislation should not proceed until such time as the Assembly can consider any recommendations made by the Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee." I think that it's a very reasonable request considering the changes that are being proposed and the ability of that committee to do this very important work.

Through the speech of the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie we had the opportunity to hear that, you know, that member and several other members in this Chamber that are here today and were here over the last four years had the opportunity to review other pieces of election legislation to ensure that we were doing our best to support democracy in our province. I think that at this time with what is being proposed to us, the only thing that I can currently support is the idea of moving this to committee for further review.

The problem is that I was really hoping that we would see a piece of legislation come forward about Senate elections that I would be able to support. You know, the same goes for the piece of legislation on municipal campaign funding, and the same goes for the idea of referendums. I support in principle the idea of ensuring that Albertans have the opportunity, no matter what party they support or who they vote for – I support the idea of direct democracy and offering Albertans the ability to speak, whether it's about Senate elections or any other referendum issue.

4:10

The problem that I have, which is very unfortunate because I did hope that I would be able to support a piece of legislation to this effect – the problem that I'm seeing with this legislation is that it's not so much about ensuring that grassroots ideas are able to make it to the position of being called to a referendum. The problem here is that it's really just an opportunity for the UCP to allow massive amounts of unaccountable money to influence decisions. Whether it be different elections, provincial or municipal, or the idea of referendum, no matter what it is, we're seeing the influence of big money coming back into the picture, and that's been spoken about at length.

The work that we did to ban corporate and union donations when we were in government, to reduce the per-individual contributor amount per year to \$4,000 from \$15,000 – unfortunately, what we're seeing here is a massive amount of money being brought back into the system, not only through this bill but through the other two bills that are brought forward, without the accountability measures that need to be in place to ensure that Albertans know where that money and that influence is coming from.

Once again, the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie went on about the idea, you know, that advertising being involved in elections is a

democratic value, and it's something that I support as well. It was a discussion that came up a lot when we were talking about the influence of PACs over the last four years and the decisions that we made about doing our best to make them accountable. If anything, this UCP government should have come to the table and said, "We are going to work to strengthen what was already in place," but we have seen the exact opposite.

I think back to when those discussions were happening with Bill 1, of course, the NDP's very first bill that came before the Legislature, to ban corporate and union donations to create more accountability within the money and the advertising that was influencing elections. I remember the leader of the Wildrose Party at the time talking about how we needed to do more about accountability, how potentially even that \$4,000 individual contributor amount per year was maybe even too much. I think about the talking points. The Wildrose Party and even members that are here today that were there at that time raised concerns about the influence of money coming in even with the restrictions that we had put in.

So I'm very concerned that now we get to a place where some of those Wildrose members are now in government and some of them are sitting at the cabinet table, and they have totally changed their opinion and their values on the importance of accountability in elections and the importance of accountability in money being spent in our province. I really question why we've gotten to this point and how we've gotten to this point. Not long ago, it wasn't a long four years ago that the Wildrose members who are currently sitting in this House raised very valid arguments about the importance of that accountability, but now, when these members are in government, they've totally changed course. That's very concerning for me.

I'm not sure why they've changed their opinion of that, and I think it's unfortunate because when we look at the value of a referendum, potentially, and giving Albertans the ability to vote on these things, it is an important value. It's something that I do support. But when we look in here that \$30,000 for Senate elections, \$500,000 – half a million dollars – that can be spent on these questions, that could influence a variety of things. But then it goes on to say that the Premier gets to choose what the question is going to be. So if there's 10,000, 20,000, 100,000 signatories to a petition that comes forward on the idea of a referendum, well, they don't actually get to choose what that question is; the Premier does. That doesn't seem very democratic to me, Madam Speaker.

For that reason and a variety of other reasons that we see in here, that the Premier could choose which demographics could vote, which regions of the province could vote on a referendum that could decide across-the-board changes for all Albertans, I'm very saddened that this is how this piece of legislation came forward. I understand that this was a commitment of the UCP in their campaign platform. I don't think that they had explained quite enough how much they were planning to let big money back into it at the same time.

With that being said, unfortunately, at this time I will not be supporting Bill 27. I appreciate that the government tried to bring something forward, but I think it needs to go back to the drawing board, which is why I'm supporting this amendment.

Thank you.

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

Seeing none, any other members wishing to join debate?

[Motion on amendment RA1 lost]

The Deputy Speaker: We are back on the main bill. Are there any speakers wishing to join debate on Bill 27 in second reading?

Seeing none, would the minister like to close debate?

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I close debate.

The Deputy Speaker: Well, there we go.

[Motion carried; Bill 27 read a second time]

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

(continued)

Bill 25

Protecting Alberta Industry from Theft Act, 2020

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Associate Minister of Natural Gas and Electricity.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to move on behalf of the Minister of Justice third reading of Bill 25, Protecting Alberta Industry from Theft Act, 2020.

The theft of metal poses a significant safety risk that Albertans have been asking government to address for many years. Criminals looking for a quick way to turn stolen property into cash often target the critical systems Albertans rely on, looking for valuable metals they can sell for scrap with few questions asked. When the power goes out or when communication links are cut by thieves scavenging for valuable metal wires, it not only endangers Albertans, Madam Speaker, it disrupts our economy and comes at great cost to the companies that operate these essential networks.

In recent months we've also seen how metal theft hurts everyday Albertans, like the dozens of brass plaques stolen from memorial benches in Edmonton and hundreds of catalytic converters stolen from people's vehicles throughout the province. Metal thieves often target isolated locations to avoid detection, which has put rural Albertans in particular danger from trespassers looking for items to steal.

When I tour rural Alberta, Madam Speaker, people ask again and again for this government to do something about metal theft. We listened. In November 2019 we proclaimed the Scrap Metal Dealers and Recyclers Identification Act in response to long-standing calls from stakeholders and Albertans to make it more difficult for criminals to sell stolen metal for scrap. Bill 25 builds on those first steps by amending the act and adding regulations that will deter metal theft, give law enforcement tools to detect it, and ensure meaningful consequences for people in businesses that deal in stolen property.

If passed, the legislation will require dealers to report the purchase or receipt of restricted metals to law enforcement within 24 hours by entering the transaction details into a central database. This legislation will define scrap metal as new or used items made of nonferrous metals that are commonly stolen, including but not limited to aluminum, brass, bronze, copper, and tin. The regulations further define the types of restricted metals that will be subject to reporting requirements. This includes several high-theft items such as copper wires, cables and cable reels, catalytic converters, metal grave markers, funeral vases, memorial plaques and monuments, lead acid batteries, and traffic and utility fixtures such as signs, manhole covers, and guardrails. The list is long, Madam Speaker.

It will also deter criminals by requiring sellers to provide government-issued identification beginning on September 1. As of September 1 dealers would have to record information from a seller's ID as well as several other details of each transaction,

including date and time, description of the metal, weight of the metal, make, model, colour, and licence plate number of any vehicle used by the seller.

There are no minimum weight thresholds for scrap metal transactions, so criminals can't avoid detection by parcelling stolen goods into smaller batches. The legislation includes the establishment of a central database, monitored by law enforcement, for all reportable transactions involving restricted metals.

4:20

Under provisions that would come into force on November 1, dealers will be required to report restricted metal transactions to law enforcement by entering them in the database within 24 hours of receipt. To further enhance the ability of law enforcement to investigate metal theft, police will have the authority to require dealers to hold on to material that is suspected of having been stolen for up to 30 days.

Another deterrent measure and another investigative aid for police is a ban on cash transactions. That would take effect on November 1. From that point onward all payments for scrap will have to be made using a form of traceable currency like an electronic transfer or cheque. The legislation will ensure broad compliance by requiring mobile scrap dealers, in addition to their larger nonmobile counterparts, to obtain and report information to law enforcement.

For those who don't comply, there are stiff proposed penalties. For individuals the maximum penalty for a first offence would

increase to \$10,000 or one year in jail or both. That is up from the current \$5,000 maximum. The maximum fine for a second or a subsequent offence would increase to \$25,000 from \$15,000. For corporations the maximum fine for a first offence would increase to \$50,000 from the current \$15,000. For a second or subsequent offence a corporation would face a maximum \$200,000 fine, a significant increase from the \$50,000 currently on the books.

The intent of this legislation is to deter and detect criminal activity that is endangering Albertans and harming our economy. However, we're also aware that selling metal for scrap is a legitimate legal enterprise for people and corporations and can be a source of income for charities and nonprofits. We don't want to increase the red tape burden on these groups so this legislation exempts bottle depot operators, landfills, registered charities and nonprofit entities, and purchase of receipt of scrap metal from corporations.

I request that we move third reading of Bill 25, the Protecting Alberta Industry from Theft Act, 2020.

I also see that it's getting late in the day, Madam Speaker, and I move that the Assembly adjourn until 1:30 p.m. on Monday, July 13, 2020.

The Deputy Speaker: Would you like to adjourn debate on third reading first? Okay.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 4:22 p.m.]

Bill Status Report for the 30th Legislature - 2nd Session (2020)

Activity to Thursday, July 9, 2020

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

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

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

Bill 1 — Critical Infrastructure Defence Act (Kenney)

First Reading — 4 (*Feb. 25, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 12-18 (*Feb. 26, 2020 morn.*), 96-98 (*Mar. 2, 2020 aft.*), 791-98 (*May 27, 2020 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 859-61 (*May 28, 2020 morn., passed*)
Third Reading — 861-69 (*May 28, 2020 morn., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 17, 2020; SA 2020 cC-32.7]

Bill 2* — Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Amendment Act, 2020 (Hunter)

First Reading — 30 (*Feb. 26, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 857-58 (*May 28, 2020 morn.*), 1004-09 (*Jun. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1238-44 (*Jun. 9, 2020 eve., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 1364-70 (*Jun. 15, 2020 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 17, 2020; SA 2020 c9]

Bill 3 — Mobile Home Sites Tenancies Amendment Act, 2020 (Glubish)

First Reading — 30 (*Feb. 26, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 431-46 (*Apr. 7, 2020 morn.*), 458-65 (*Apr. 7, 2020 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 465-76 (*Apr. 7, 2020 aft.*), 477-507 (*Apr. 7, 2020 eve.*), 572-83 (*Apr. 8, 2020 eve.*), 659-66 (*May 6, 2020 morn., passed*)
Third Reading — 703-09 (*May 7, 2020 morn., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2020 c8]

Bill 4 — Fiscal Planning and Transparency (Fixed Budget Period) Amendment Act, 2020 (Toews)

First Reading — 62 (*Feb. 27, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 858 (*May 28, 2020 morn.*), 869-75 (*May 28, 2020 morn.*), 933-35 (*Jun. 1, 2020 aft.*), 970-72 (*Jun. 1, 2020 eve.*), 1040-43 (*Jun. 2, 2020 eve.*), 1077 (*Jun. 3, 2020 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1257-66 (*Jun. 10, 2020 aft.*), 1311-16 (*Jun. 11, 2020 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 1442 (*Jun. 17, 2020 aft.*), 1452-55 (*Jun. 17, 2020 aft., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 26, 2020; SA 2020 c14]

Bill 5 — Fiscal Measures and Taxation Act, 2020 (Toews)

First Reading — 110 (*Mar. 3, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 224-32 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., passed on division*), 222-23 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft.*)
Committee of the Whole — 232-33 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft.*), 234-41 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 241 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft.*), 242-48 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 20, 2020 Outside of House Sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c3]

Bill 6 — Appropriation Act, 2020 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 215 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 216-22 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 222 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., deemed passed on division*)

Third Reading — 222 (*Mar. 17, 2020 aft., deemed passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 20, 2020 Outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force March 20, 2020; SA 2020 c1]

Bill 7 — Responsible Energy Development Amendment Act, 2020 (Savage)

First Reading — 827 (*May 27, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 858-59 (*May 28, 2020 morn.*), 891-99 (*May 28, 2020 aft.*), 972-76 (*Jun. 1, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1266-72 (*Jun. 10, 2020 aft.*), 1370-75 (*Jun. 15, 2020 eve.*), 1406-11 (*Jun. 16, 2020 aft.*), 1413 (*Jun. 16, 2020 eve.*), 1479-81 (*Jun. 17, 2020 eve.*), 1539-40 (*Jun. 22, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1636-37 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft., adjourned*), 1678-79 (*Jun. 25, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 26, 2020; SA 2020 c16]

Bill 8* — Protecting Survivors of Human Trafficking Act (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 431 (*Apr. 7, 2020 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 509-21 (*Apr. 8, 2020 morn.*), 551-58 (*Apr. 8, 2020 aft.*), 559-72 (*Apr. 8, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 593-618 (*Apr. 8, 2020 eve.*), 671-73 (*May 6, 2020 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 709-12 (*May 7, 2020 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 12, 2020, except Part 2, which comes into force on July 1, 2020; SA 2020 cP-26.87]

Bill 9 — Emergency Management Amendment Act, 2020 (Madu)

First Reading — 276 (*Mar. 20, 2020 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 277-80 (*Mar. 20, 2020 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 280-82 (*Mar. 20, 2020 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 282-83 (*Mar. 20, 2020 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 20, 2020 Outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on March 20, 2020; SA 2020 c2]

Bill 10 — Public Health (Emergency Powers) Amendment Act, 2020 (Shandro)

First Reading — 296-97 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 307-20 (*Apr. 1, 2020 morn.*), 337-44 (*Apr. 1, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 354-57 (*Apr. 1, 2020 aft.*), 407-09 (*Apr. 2, 2020 morn.*), 426-28 (*Apr. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 428-29 (*Apr. 2, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 2, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on April 2, 2020; certain sections took effect on earlier dates; SA 2020 c5]

Bill 11 — Tenancies Statutes (Emergency Provisions) Amendment Act, 2020 (Glubish)

First Reading — 297 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 298-301 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 301-03 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 303-05 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 2, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c6]

Bill 12 — Liabilities Management Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Savage)

First Reading — 297 (*Mar. 31, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 320-25 (*Apr. 1, 2020 morn.*), 344-49 (*Apr. 1, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 350-54 (*Apr. 1, 2020 aft.*), 401-05 (*Apr. 2, 2020 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 406 (*Apr. 2, 2020 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 2, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 c4]

Bill 13 — Emergency Management Amendment Act, 2020 (No. 2) (Madu)

First Reading — 431 (*Apr. 7, 2020 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 521-26 (*Apr. 8, 2020 morn.*), 537-51 (*Apr. 8, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 583-93 (*Apr. 8, 2020 eve.*), 619-35 (*Apr. 9, 2020 morn.*), 648-57 (*Apr. 9, 2020 aft.*), 673-74 (*May 6, 2020 morn.*), 688-99 (*May 6, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 699-701 (*May 6, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 12, 2020, with exceptions; SA 2020 c7]

Bill 14 — Utility Payment Deferral Program Act (Nally)

First Reading — 687 (*May 6, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 724-45 (*May 7, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 758-86 (*May 8, 2020 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 786-90 (*May 8, 2020 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 12, 2020, with certain provisions having effect as of March 18, 2020; SA 2020 cU-4]

Bill 15 — Choice in Education Act, 2020 (LaGrange)

First Reading — 887-88 (*May 28, 2020 aft, passed*)

Second Reading — 937-54 (*Jun. 1, 2020 eve.*), 1011-40 (*Jun. 2, 2020 eve.*), 1058-67 (*Jun. 3, 2020 aft.*), 1228-38 (*Jun. 9, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1375-78 (*Jun. 15, 2020 eve.*), 1470-79 (*Jun. 17, 2020 eve.*), 1541-51 (*Jun. 22, 2020 eve.*), 1575-88 (*Jun. 23, 2020 aft.*), 1620-25 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft.*), 1639-47 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1657-59 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force September 1, 2020; SA 2020 c11]

Bill 16 — Victims of Crime (Strengthening Public Safety) Amendment Act, 2020 (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 888 (*May 28, 2020 aft, passed*)

Second Reading — 954-70 (*Jun. 1, 2020 eve.*), 1109-12 (*Jun. 3, 2020 eve.*), 1127-35 (*Jun. 4, 2020 aft.*), 1179-81 (*Jun. 8, 2020 eve.*), 1209-22 (*Jun. 9, 2020 aft.*), 1285-96 (*Jun. 10, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1428-29 (*Jun. 16, 2020 eve.*), 1455-59 (*Jun. 17, 2020 aft.*), 1551-55 (*Jun. 22, 2020 eve.*), 1588-90 (*Jun. 23, 2020 aft.*), 1647-50 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1676-78 (*Jun. 25, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 26, 2020, with exceptions; SA 2020 c18]

Bill 17 — Mental Health Amendment Act, 2020 (Shandro)

First Reading — 1125 (*Jun. 4, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1203-09 (*Jun. 9, 2020 aft.*), 1272-74 (*Jun. 10, 2020 aft.*), 1316-23 (*Jun. 11, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1396-1406 (*Jun. 16, 2020 aft.*), 1413 (*Jun. 16, 2020 eve.*), 1461-70 (*Jun. 17, 2020 eve.*), 1605-08 (*Jun. 23, 2020 eve.*), 1630-36 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft.*), 1650-54 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1675-76 (*Jun. 25, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; certain sections come into force on June 26, 2020; SA 2020 c15]

Bill 18 — Corrections (Alberta Parole Board) Amendment Act, 2020 (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 912 (*Jun. 1, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 989-1004 (*Jun. 2, 2020 aft.*), 1011 (*Jun. 2, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1413-24 (*Jun. 16, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1655 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 c12]

Bill 19 — Tobacco and Smoking Reduction Amendment Act, 2020 (Shandro)

First Reading — 989 (*Jun. 2, 2020 aft, passed*)

Second Reading — 1079-98 (*Jun. 3, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1424-28 (*Jun. 16, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1495-97 (*Jun. 18, 2020 aft.*), 1555-56 (*Jun. 22, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 c17]

Bill 20 — Real Estate Amendment Act, 2020 (Glubish)

First Reading — 1057 (*Jun. 3, 2020 aft, passed*)

Second Reading — 1125-27 (*Jun. 4, 2020 aft.*), 1169-79 (*Jun. 8, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1185-90 (*Jun. 8, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1279-85 (*Jun. 10, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 c10]

Bill 21 — Provincial Administrative Penalties Act (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 1125 (*Jun. 4, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1181-85 (*Jun. 8, 2020 eve.*), 1296-97 (*Jun. 10, 2020 eve.*), 1355-57 (*Jun. 15, 2020 aft.*), 1442-52 (*Jun. 17, 2020 aft.*), 1819-22 (*Jul. 8, 2020 morn., passed*)

Bill 22 — Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2020 (Hunter)

First Reading — 1301-02 (*Jun. 11, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1591-95 (*Jun. 23, 2020 eve.*), 1655-57 (*Jun. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1798-1804 (*Jul. 7, 2020 eve.*), 1879 (*Jul. 8, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 23* — Commercial Tenancies Protection Act (Fir)

First Reading — 1392 (*Jun. 16, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1529-35 (*Jun. 22, 2020 aft.*), 1601-05 (*Jun. 23, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1879-80 (*Jul. 8, 2020 eve., passed with amendments*)

Bill 24 — COVID-19 Pandemic Response Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Shandro)

First Reading — 1494 (*Jun. 18, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1537-39 (*Jun. 22, 2020 eve.*), 1569-75 (*Jun. 23, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1625-30 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1679-81 (*Jun. 25, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 26, 2020; certain sections took effect on earlier dates; SA 2020 c13]

Bill 25 — Protecting Alberta Industry From Theft Act, 2020 (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 1494 (*Jun. 18, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1719-35 (*Jul. 6, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1804-05 (*Jul. 7, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1904-05 (*Jul. 9, 2020 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 26 — Constitutional Referendum Amendment Act, 2020 (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 1568 (*Jun. 23, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1735-41 (*Jul. 6, 2020 eve.*), 1764-72 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft.*), 1845-56 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 27 — Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020 (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 1568 (*Jun. 23, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1741-47 (*Jul. 6, 2020 eve.*), 1772-79 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft.*), 1822-27 (*Jul. 8, 2020 morn.*), 1899-1904 (*Jul. 9, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 28 — Vital Statistics (Protecting Albertans from Convicted Sex Offenders) Amendment Act, 2020 (Glubish)

First Reading — 1619 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1704-17 (*Jul. 6, 2020 aft.*), 1779-82 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft.*), 1856-60 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1880-82 (*Jul. 8, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1896-99 (*Jul. 9, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 29 — Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, 2020 (Madu)

First Reading — 1619-20 (*Jun. 24, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1784-97 (*Jul. 7, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 30 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Shandro)

First Reading — 1695 (*Jul. 6, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1783-84 (*Jul. 7, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 31 — Environmental Protection Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Nixon, JJ)

First Reading — 1760 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1878 (*Jul. 8, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 32 — Restoring Balance in Alberta’s Workplaces Act, 2020 (Copping)

First Reading — 1760 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1861-63 (*Jul. 8, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 33 — Alberta Investment Attraction Act (Fir)

First Reading — 1760-61 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1807-19 (*Jul. 8, 2020 morn., adjourned*)

Bill 34 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Nixon, JJ)

First Reading — 1839 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 201 — Strategic Aviation Advisory Council Act (Gotfried)

First Reading — 62 (*Feb. 27, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 136 (*Mar. 5, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly*)

Second Reading — 914-26 (*Jun. 1, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1156-61 (*Jun. 8, 2020 aft.*), 1337-47 (*Jun. 15, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1514-22 (*Jun. 22, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 26, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 31, 2020; SA 2020 cS-19.8]

Bill 202 — Conflicts of Interest (Protecting the Rule of Law) Amendment Act, 2020 (Ganley)

First Reading — 136 (*Mar. 5, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 1149-56 (*Jun. 2, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly;*), 1156 (*Jun. 8, 2020 aft., not proceeded with on division*)

Bill 203 — Pension Protection Act (Gray)

First Reading — 1148 (*Jun. 8, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly; not proceeded with*)

Bill 204 — Voluntary Blood Donations Repeal Act (Yao)

First Reading — (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*)

Bill Pr1 — The Sisters of the Precious Blood of Edmonton Repeal Act (Williams)

First Reading — 1125 (*Jun. 4, 2020 aft., passed*)

Table of Contents

Prayers	1883
Introduction of Guests	1883
Members' Statements	
Labour Unions	1883
Parliamentary Debate and Political Discourse	1883
Anti-Semitism and the BDS Movement	1883
Mary Reimer	1884
Margaret Thatcher	1884
Parliamentary Debate and the Rules of the Assembly	1884
CUPE Support for Venezuela	1884
Union Opposition to Pipelines	1885
Imamat Day	1885
Oral Question Period	
Financial Reporting by Government	1885
Bill 32 Employment Standards Code Amendments	1886
Petrochemicals Incentive Program	1886
Calgary Storm Damage Recovery Funding	1887
Election Financing and Unions	1888
COVID-19 Outbreak at the Misericordia Hospital Public Health Act Review	1888
Pension Policies and Legislation	1889
Bill 32 Labour Relations Code Amendments	1889, 1891, 1893
Support for Small Businesses Affected by COVID-19	1890
Economic Recovery and Women	1890
Automobile Insurance Review	1892
Infrastructure Capital Plan for Edmonton	1892
Notices of Motions	1893
Tabling Returns and Reports	1893
Motions under Standing Order 42	
Deputy Chair of Committees	1895
Orders of the Day	1896
Government Bills and Orders	
Third Reading	
Bill 28 Vital Statistics (Protecting Albertans from Convicted Sex Offenders) Amendment Act, 2020	1896
Bill 25 Protecting Alberta Industry from Theft Act, 2020	1904
Second Reading	
Bill 27 Alberta Senate Election Amendment Act, 2020	1899

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

For inquiries contact:

Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875

E-mail: AlbertaHansard@assembly.ab.ca