



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday afternoon, November 26, 2020

Day 72

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, Hon. 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)
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)
Dreeschen, 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, Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UCP)
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)
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),
Deputy Government House Leader
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),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
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 | Amanda LeBlanc, Deputy Editor of <i>Alberta</i> |
| Teri Cherkewich, Law Clerk | Research Services | <i>Hansard</i> |
| Stephanie LeBlanc, Clerk Assistant and | Nancy Robert, Research Officer | Chris Caughell, Sergeant-at-Arms |
| Senior Parliamentary Counsel | Janet Schwegel, Director of Parliamentary | Tom Bell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms |
| Trafton Koenig, Senior Parliamentary | Programs | Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms |
| Counsel | | |

Executive Council

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Jason Kenney | Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Relations |
| Leela Aheer | Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women |
| Tracy L. Allard | Minister of Municipal Affairs |
| Jason Copping | Minister of Labour and Immigration |
| Devin Dreesen | Minister of Agriculture and Forestry |
| 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 Justice and Solicitor General |
| 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 Jobs, Economy and Innovation |
| 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 |
| Martin Long | Parliamentary Secretary for Small Business and Tourism |
| 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

Eggen
Glasgo
Gray
Jones
Phillips
Singh
Turton

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Neudorf
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

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

Select Special Democratic Accountability Committee

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Horner

Ceci
Dang
Fir
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
Glasgo
Guthrie
Neudorf
Nixon, Jeremy
Pancholi
Rutherford
Sabir
Yao

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Sigurdson

Ceci
Lovely
Loyola
Nixon, Jeremy
Rutherford
Shepherd
Sweet
van Dijken
Walker

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Cooper
Deputy Chair: Mr. Ellis

Dang
Deol
Goehring
Goodridge
Long
Neudorf
Sabir
Walker
Williams

Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills

Chair: Mr. Ellis
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

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

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Smith
Deputy Chair: Mr. Reid

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Deol
Issik
Jones
Lovely
Loyola
Pancholi
Rehn
Reid
Renaud
Yao

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Ms Phillips
Deputy Chair: Mr. Gotfried

Barnes
Dach
Guthrie
Reid
Renaud
Rosin
Rowswell
Schmidt
Stephan
Toor

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Hanson
Deputy Chair: Member Ceci

Dach
Feehan
Fir
Ganley
Getson
Loewen
Rehn
Singh
Smith
Yaseen

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Thursday, November 26, 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, setting aside all private interests and prejudice, keep in mind their responsibility to seek to improve the condition of all.

Please be seated. Correction: don't be seated. Hon. members, we will now be led in the singing of *God Save the Queen* by Ms Brooklyn Elhard. In observation of the COVID-19 public health guidelines, as outlined by Dr. Deena Hinshaw, please refrain from joining her.

Ms Elhard:

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

The Speaker: Hon. members, please be seated.

Members' Statements

COVID-19 Related Decision-making and Leadership

Ms Ganley: Leadership: at its core it simply means bringing people together to achieve a common goal. There are some pretty different views on it, but one thing is clear. In a crisis it's critical, which is why it's so hard to see the people of this province face this crisis without it, because I can feel it. I feel it in the tension of the people I pass, the anxiety that causes strangers and friends to speak harshly to one another, in the tears of the people who call my office. They are scared, and they need leadership.

Leadership is bringing people together to achieve a common goal: to keep infections down. It isn't misleading tweets about doctors, threatening nurses with layoffs, or telling front-line staff that make \$17 an hour that they're overpaid. Leadership is making the best decisions you can with the information available. It isn't refusing to even consider smaller class sizes, it isn't name calling scared parents, and it isn't telling teachers, who work every day to protect our kids, "to tidy up."

Leadership is making hard decisions. I won't deny that they are hard, but that's no excuse to hide behind public servants and claim that they are making decisions they don't even agree with. It's no excuse for calling those who criticize you as attacking science or attacking public employees or attacking Christians because you can't defend your position. Leadership is not dodging public accountability for over a week because you can't figure out how to dial in to a press conference, then turning up and telling Albertans how hard it is on you to make decisions.

I'm afraid I'm out of sympathy for decision-makers who have failed to make the tough calls when they were needed. I will save my sympathy for parents struggling to figure out who stays home with their kids on their third isolation, seniors forced to miss their

families because of the out-of-control spread, businesses with no supports, and the doctors who fear having to make the most difficult choice of all: who gets a ventilator.

Albertans need leadership.

Official Opposition Remarks on COVID-19

Mr. Sigurdson: Mr. Speaker, in times of great challenge Albertans have always come together. The spirit of community and voluntary co-operation has always been a value integral to life in our province. This pandemic has been no exception. The vast majority of Albertans have come together to act responsibly, work together to reduce the spread of COVID-19, and support those who are struggling. We have seen the spirit of this co-operation across the country as well, even in the realm of partisan politics. In fact, broadly across the country we have seen opposition parties do their best to work with government to support the pandemic response and play a role to unify the public.

Unfortunately, there is one exception: the Alberta NDP. Mr. Speaker, the party opposite has been anything but helpful. Somehow they've become more partisan, more angry, more irrational, and more divisive than they have ever been. They spread misinformation and fear at every opportunity, creating anxiety for political gain. They have constantly sought to undermine the actions and advice of Alberta's public health officials wherever they've seen an opportunity to stoke their base, fund raise, or otherwise further their partisan goals. Albertans see right through this despicable strategy of misinformation, division, and fear from the NDP.

Just last night I was watching the news, where I heard the media ask the question, quote: is this just a chance for the opposition, an opportunity where they can try to hit the government? The question was posed to political science Professor Duane Bratt, who said, quote: oh, absolutely; and they know better. Professor Bratt went on to say: they're playing partisan games here to put pressure on the government.

Mr. Speaker, maybe it's time for the opposition and, more importantly, the Leader of the Opposition to stop doing what's in the best interest of the NDP and start acting in the best interest of Albertans.

Provincial Parks

Mr. Loewen: Last night the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society hosted an online town hall to discuss what they called the future of Alberta parks. Event organizers claimed that Alberta parks are being sold, privatized, and developed for industry. They repeated their ludicrous theory that Alberta's parks and landscapes would be made available for coal development. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The Environment and Parks minister has repeatedly gone on the record, in this Chamber and in the media, to dispel these rumours, that have been spread by the NDP and many environmental NGOs.

Why did CPAWS hold a town hall in the first place if Albertans will still be able to use and enjoy our provincial parks going forward? A quick listen to the event proves informative. The event host repeatedly called for Albertans, many of whom are already struggling through the worst economic crisis in nearly a century, to, quote, donate what you can to support the campaign. This so-called town hall was a fundraising exercise, plain and simple. CPAWS, which is already funded by the radical Tides Foundation, is just one of the few special-interest groups across the country that have made a cottage industry out of misinforming the public and separating well-meaning people from their hard-earned cash. CPAWS in

particular has a history of trying to block recreational access to the landscape. For them to claim that they are concerned about campsites is laughable. They want to sterilize Alberta's public lands.

This isn't what Albertans want. Albertans want to be able to enjoy this beautiful province in all of its natural beauty. Whether it's hiking mountain trails in Kananaskis, hunting in the Peace Country, fishing in the eastern slopes, snowmobiling in the boreal north, or enjoying the wide open prairie views, Albertans need to be assured that they will be able to enjoy activities such as these in our great province. We also know that many people around the world appreciate what we have here and travel here just for that reason.

Groups like CPAWS don't share Albertans' views on the enjoyment of our public lands, never mind the use of our precious Alberta parks. Crown land covers 60 per cent of our province and is used for many purposes. Our government promised a common-sense conservation plan that will balance protections of our ecologically sensitive areas and our treasured wild species along with a need for access and economic development. It's a plan that the majority of Albertans support, no matter how many special-interest groups try to hit them up for money.

Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance Program

Member Loyola: Last night I hosted the first of two online conversations through albertasfuture.ca with small-business owners about the struggles they are facing. The biggest stress across the board was the lack of a substantial rent subsidy and the need to make up for the failure that was the Canadian emergency commercial rent assistance.

Don, owner of an early childhood learning and tutorial school, shared with me that he was unable to access any rent subsidy because his landlord refused to apply for CECRA. He was on the hook for \$9,000 a month, every month, since COVID-19 hit Alberta. He has not reopened his space since being shut down in March. He's not alone. Thousands of small and medium-sized businesses did not receive a rent subsidy, the majority of small and medium-sized businesses that are located in malls and other properties where the landlord owns multiple locations, because the filing process was too complex, while other landlords chose not to participate because they did not want to surrender the required 25 per cent.

With many businesses unable to apply for CECRA, it was shocking to hear yesterday that only a budgeted \$64 million of the \$67 million budgeted has been used to date. That means that this government spent over 95 per cent of the budgeted amount for an estimated 22 per cent of small and medium-sized businesses. It is clear that this government shortchanged Alberta's small businesses. They knew that the CECRA program was going to be a failure and budgeted accordingly, and that is shameful.

Small-business owners are hard-working Albertans that create good jobs and invest back into their communities. They are looking to this government for a fair shake. Instead, this government continues to give billions to large corporations through their corporate handout while shortchanging the programs that small businesses rightfully deserve. To the government: do better, step up, and actually support small business.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

1:40

COVID-19 Protective Measures

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We live in unprecedented times, and our government had to take extraordinary measures this

week to limit the spread of COVID-19. The strategic and targeted measures our government has taken target the most common scenarios of COVID-19 spread such as personal gatherings and indoor locations, but these measures are not something that we decided upon lightly.

Many people will be dismayed that they cannot see people outside of their household for the next few weeks in an indoor setting, and I understand that dismay. I also worry about the impacts that these measures have on mental health. I'm especially worried about young adults and teens, many of which have been under extreme stress and dealing with mental health challenges before this pandemic began. As a father of two boys I've seen the impacts that COVID-19 has had on their social lives, their personal relationships, and extracurricular activities.

But, Mr. Speaker, regardless of our age we must all do our part to reduce the spread of this virus so that we can protect our friends, our neighbours, and our communities. Nobody wants businesses and restaurants to close, but if we do not do our part, that may be the case when we reassess health guidelines next month.

For the past two days I've spoken to countless residents of Spruce Grove and Stony Plain, and I have heard clearly their concerns. I will say to this House what I've said to them. Please follow the rules that were put in place. Our families, our homes, and livelihoods depend on it. We must put the health of others above our own personal opinions and desires and do what we need to do to ensure that this virus does not overwhelm our health system and cause more undue hardship to our communities. Above all else, we need to ensure that lives and livelihoods are protected. Although we may have different opinions of COVID-19, I have hope that as we work together and follow the guidelines of our chief medical officer of health, Dr. Deena Hinshaw, we will get through this because we are all in this together.

Thank you.

Disability Caseload Growth Review

Ms Renaud: The Premier lectured Albertans that we must all do our part to protect the poor and most vulnerable as COVID spreads virtually unchecked in our communities, threatening to overwhelm health care systems, but words without action are meaningless.

In just a short time and during a public health crisis this Premier has cut AISH and income support benefits, changed AISH payment dates to make the books look better, privatized disability support to some of the most medically fragile disabled Albertans in Alberta. What we're seeing during a public health crisis is a twisted ideology of austerity politics, as evidenced by unrealistic reliance on spending cuts versus revenue generation; systematic restructuring of the public sector; downsizing; privatization; structural reform of social programs; policies that reduce benefits and limit access; blame shifting, as evidenced by this Premier's ignorant musings about some AISH recipients not being disabled enough. Austerity politics and budgets harm people, harm communities, and the economy.

Albertans should know that this UCP government is in the process of hiring yet another contractor to review programs. In government-speak that means that they are giving themselves cover for the austerity they're about to unleash. The UCP is hiring a contractor to examine disability caseload growth in four huge programs: AISH, income support, PDD, and FSCD. These programs support over 150,000 Albertans with low incomes or with disabilities. According to government documents this new review will start next week and be completed by December 23. The review will not include anything other than reviewing internal documents, data, and interacting with officials. No real consultation again.

Make no mistake, this is the UCP giving themselves cover to introduce further austerity on vulnerable Albertans who already struggle with abject poverty and barriers to inclusion. Yet again we see evidence of the dangerous ideology of this race-to-the-bottom Premier, whose actions do not match his words. I suspect history won't be kind.

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

Rural High-speed Internet

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, since the pandemic began, there's been a marked increase in interest for families wanting to move to my riding of Livingstone-Macleod. This is especially true in communities like Nanton, where the house market is booming. The need to distance has demonstrated how easily some occupations can be transitioned to online working and has given people the opportunity to live their small-town dreams.

It was once said to me that all the cars are in the city, but all the good parking is in the country. We have plenty of open spaces. We have fantastic schools and other amenities. My riding is absolutely brimming with desirable qualities, but there is one big issue we struggle with, and that's rural broadband. Let me say it again: broadband. Rural areas across this great province, just like in rural areas across Canada and the United States, are at a disadvantage because of the lack of a digital infrastructure.

This impacts nearly all aspects of business and life in my riding on some level. The lack of digital infrastructure of high-speed Internet affects farmers and their families. Agriculture technology has advanced greatly in the last decade, but if the infrastructure isn't there, farmers cannot fully embrace these advancements. The lack of broadband negatively impacts advancements in agrifood production and deters investment in rural Alberta. Investment and job opportunities in towns in my riding are also hindered by this. Where I live, being online for work or for fun can be painful, and folks wonder if we will ever see an improvement as large telephone companies seem to feel that there is no financial benefit to providing broadband to these smaller communities. The lack of broadband hurts our ability to be competitive in this modern world, which is why the ongoing work done by this Alberta government to address this has been so important.

The pandemic, with all of its negative impacts, has shown us some positives, one of which is that people now see the possibility of living in small-town Alberta while working remotely. We must capitalize on this opportunity by continuing to bring all levels of government to the table and private business to the table to address this current gap in broadband infrastructure.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Camrose.

COVID-19 and Seniors

Ms Lovely: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This year has been a hard year for all of us across Alberta and Canada. The COVID-19 pandemic has made a significant impact on the mental health and well-being of everyone from schoolchildren to our elderly. Alberta's government is and has been committed to curbing the spread of COVID-19 since the virus shook the world earlier this year. One of the most at-risk groups of people for the virus are seniors. Part of the reason why governments around the world announced measures as early as March was the intention to protect seniors.

Across Canada there have been hundreds of outbreaks of COVID-19 in long-term care facilities, which has resulted in further isolation for our seniors who live in these facilities. Before COVID-

19 their families could visit. When COVID hit, they were no longer permitted to. Even our seniors who do not rely on long-term care facilities are unable to hug their loved ones, their children, their grandchildren, their siblings out of fear. This has made a significant impact on our seniors' mental health.

In fact, there have been stories reported across the country that elderly individuals are looking to euthanasia. When news broke last week of the 90-year-old woman in Ontario choosing a medically assisted death, her family said that she chose it after she declined so sharply during a lockdown that she didn't want to go through more isolation this winter. No senior should have those thoughts go through their mind because of a global catastrophe.

Now more than ever we need to all be resilient. I want our seniors across the province to know that we are here for them. To all Albertans: call your seniors, send them letters, do whatever needs to be done in a safe, physically distanced manner. You could save a life.

Opioid Addiction Treatment

Mr. Orr: Mr. Speaker, opioid addiction is a rapidly growing tragedy for many Albertans, claiming 450 lives in the first half of 2020, some from rural communities. Drugs drive disconnection. Treatment and recovery creates reconnection with a community of care. Distance and lack of access to local services disadvantages rural Albertans.

Seeing this, Dr. Nathaniel Day started the virtual opioid dependency program. A completely virtual opioid dependency program is feasible and demonstrates positive clinical and functional outcomes for clients who might not otherwise have access to treatment. Dr. Day and his team use phone, telehealth, text, and Zoom conferencing to reach everyone seeking treatment, especially in rural Alberta. The program offers same-day medication, a start to transition to a treatment provider where possible, or all-virtual ongoing care where no provider is available.

The Health Quality Council of Alberta recognized the program with a 2020 patient experience award. Dr. Day recently reported at the international and Canadian Society of Addiction Medicine that VODP is delivering excellent results. More people are recovering, saving lives, increasing access at a minimal cost to government. This program works. Since 2017 the program grew from 201 patients to 1,225, communities served from 43 to 176, while wait times have declined from six days to zero. VODP reports that accidental overdoses have fallen from 39 to 11 per cent over one year. Suicide attempts went from 35 to 10 per cent, and emergency room visits dropped over the same period. It worked so effectively that they have outgrown the space at the Centennial Centre for Mental Health and Brain Injury in Ponoka. The municipality has written, asking for a solution. I appeal to the appropriate ministries to find a facility for this great program.

1:50

Thanks to Dr. Day and the virtual opioid dependency program more Albertans are getting the help they earnestly need, and I applaud the Alberta government's support of \$4 million over four years to provide an excellent solution to a tragic problem.

Oral Question Period

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

COVID-19 Response Decision-making

Ms Notley: We now have irrefutable evidence that this Premier is putting his own political ideology ahead of the health and safety of

Albertans. In documented and leaked audiotapes released today by the CBC, there is evidence that the Premier, the Health minister, and other members of cabinet are ignoring or outright rejecting public health advice, pressuring and controlling civil servants, and refusing to put the health of Albertans first, allowing uncontrolled spread of COVID-19. To the Premier: how can anyone trust you when these tapes prove that their health appears to be the last thing you think about when you make a decision?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, the only ideological agenda being driven here is the NDP's desire to put hundreds of thousands of people out of work, to close, perhaps permanently, tens of thousands of businesses, and to impose lasting damage on Albertans' livelihoods. Our government instead is taking on board the expert public health advice that we receive. Of course, we have to balance that with the broader social, economic, mental, emotional, and physical health concerns, as our chief medical officer has pointed out, because, ultimately, it's the elected representatives of the people of Alberta who must make these very difficult decisions.

Ms Notley: Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier tells Albertans he's taking the advice of the CMO, but we now know that this government is lying. Trust has been irrevocably broken. Today we have proposed that this government establish an independent panel of medical experts who would make public health recommendations. Their recommendations would be published publicly so Albertans could see what was advised and what the Premier accepted or rejected. Premier: will you do the right thing, rebuild trust with Albertans, and establish this panel today?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, let me quote our remarkably capable chief medical officer in her testimony at the Public Accounts Committee, in which she said: it's really critical that elected officials be the ones to make final decisions because there are public health considerations, but there are other considerations such as the wishes and values of the population who elected leaders to make decisions on their behalf. Alberta is a democracy, and under this government it's going to stay that way.

Ms Notley: Well, Mr. Speaker, for months this Premier hid behind Dr. Hinshaw's skirts, claiming that he was following her advice, advice he refused to share with Albertans. Now we know why. The tapes describe a cabinet that would only approve "the minimal acceptable recommendation from public health." Senior officials, including the CMO, described cabinet meetings as an "uphill battle" and "a bloody and excruciating campaign." More than 50,000 Albertans have been sick; 13,000 still are. Why is this government lying to Albertans?

Speaker's Ruling Parliamentary Language

The Speaker: The Speaker made some significant comments about saying that the government is lying or the opposition is lying yesterday. What is unparliamentary in this place is for them to say that an individual is lying. I heard the Leader of the Official Opposition say that the government is. While I did provide a caution yesterday at some length, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition missed it because it certainly doesn't increase decorum in the Assembly to use language like that. It's not a point of order at this time, but, like I provided the caution yesterday, perhaps she might consider using different words.

COVID-19 Response Decision-making (continued)

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, according to today's revelation, my attitude was that I "wasn't going to close down anything that affected the economy unless [the Premier] was provided with . . . evidence about how it would curtail the spread." I plead guilty. I have sought evidence and data to inform our challenging public health decisions and ensure that they are taken in a balanced way that maximizes the positive public health impact while minimizing the negative social and economic impact.

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

Ms Notley: He hasn't shown that evidence, Mr. Speaker, and what we know is that, again, your negligence is far more dangerous to the economy than public health measures.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Notley: Now, one troubling revelation is the suggestion that political officials interfered in quasi-judicial decision-making. The tapes suggest attempts by the Health minister's office to exert total control over enforcement. The day the Premier announced his economic relaunch, the Health minister's office made it clear that they expected AHS to seek permission before any action was taken to enforce health orders. Does the Premier not understand that his politics have no place in enforcing laws made to protect . . .

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, every word just uttered by the NDP leader is false. The Minister of Health's office simply asked to be advised if enforcement action was being taken. That is entirely normal because the minister has to answer to the Legislature about questions that arise. Let me quote Dr. Hinshaw further. She said that it's the role of cabinet to make the extremely difficult decisions about how to take the information provided and include it along with all the other considerations that must be brought to bear on these very impactful decisions. I know that for the NDP this is not difficult because they just want to shut down everything and destroy countless livelihoods, but for this government it is a challenging decision to balance all of these considerations.

Ms Notley: Allowing this virus to spread uncontrolled is what is going to destroy Albertans' livelihoods, and the majority of Albertans understand that. It's this Premier who doesn't.

Now, also, the tape itself said, in contrast to what the Premier just said, "Don't turn a blind eye but don't issue any orders . . . come to us, and if push comes to shove, I think it will be up to the ministry to figure out if we are going to do something." That's with respect to enforcing orders. Premier, this is a clear abuse of authority. Why are you playing political games with the enforcement of laws designed to keep Albertans healthy and safe?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, that is simply and completely untrue. The minister's office asked, per normal, to be advised if there was enforcement activity occurring, which would be normal practice with any high-profile enforcement activity. You know, the shocking lede of the CBC story to which the NDP refers says that I asked – again, I plead guilty; I'm sorry – to get pros and cons on serologic testing. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I actually asked for additional information to inform important cabinet decisions.

Ms Notley: The CMO is on tape. “They don’t want us to enforce anything. [They] just want us to educate, and no enforcement.” In Alberta we have 62 enforcement actions. Meanwhile B.C. has 700 actions and 51,000 inspections. To the Premier: why would you pass public health orders and then direct that they not be enforced? Don’t you realize that in doing this you are risking the lives and livelihoods of Albertans throughout the province?

Mr. Kenney: No such directive has been made, Mr. Speaker. That is categorically false. As I’ve quoted our chief medical officer at the very beginning of COVID, when, quite frankly, we were all at a loss about how best to respond – I remember her advice every day that we’re not going to enforce our way out of this. Through the first eight months of this pandemic Albertans have done very well without an excess of lockdown-style policies that the NDP advocates. We now have to impose more stringent measures that are enforceable such as the prohibition on indoor social activities, an extraordinary and unprecedented use of state power.

Ms Notley: The actual audio tapes of the CMO show that what the Premier just said is not true.

COVID-19 Testing and Case Increases

Ms Notley: Now, yesterday when I asked the Premier why our case numbers are so much higher than B.C.’s, you know, where they have greater restrictions and a province-wide mask mandate, he tried to claim that it was because we lead the country in testing, but again that’s also not true. On a per capita basis Alberta is actually in the middle of the pack. Ontario and Manitoba are testing far more for their population. Will the Premier stand up today, recognize that he is the reason that our case numbers keep going up, and apologize for saying things that aren’t true here in the House?

Mr. Kenney: Once again, the NDP pathetically trying to politicize a pandemic, as they have done, irresponsibly, from day one. Secondly, the chief medical officer is not responsible for enforcement, Mr. Speaker; law enforcement officers are, police and designated peace officers are, and AHS inspectors are. Thirdly, with respect to testing it is a matter of public record that Alberta has led per capita testing across Canada for most of the last nine months, not on every day, but part of the dispute on that CBC article is our government seeking higher levels of asymptomatic testing and the Health department not agreeing on that point.

2:00

Ms Notley: The Premier needs to be better briefed, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that we are not leading the country. That’s just true.

Now, testing is what detects cases, not what drives them. Quote: we’ve had the highest per capita level of testing; “Their case count is lower because their testing has been one-third of our level.” Quote: cases are up because we have the best testing in the world, and we have the most testing. End of quote. Now, one of those quotes is from the Premier, and one of them is from Donald Trump. To the Premier: do you think it’s a problem that Albertans can’t tell which is which?

Mr. Kenney: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me explain a very simple concept to the Leader of the Opposition. When you test a larger number of individuals, you identify more cases, and amongst those cases some of them have infections. The reality is that for most of the last nine months, as a matter of record, Alberta had the highest per capita testing levels in Canada, amongst the highest in the world, substantially higher through most of the past nine months than our neighbours in B.C. One of the reasons for that is that Dr.

Henry there refused to do asymptomatic testing. We wanted as a cabinet to do asymptomatic testing to get a broader picture of where we were, one of the reasons that we have had higher testing levels.

Ms Notley: Middle of the pack. The facts are clear.

Now, this Premier has called COVID-19 the influenza. He said that it only affects the elderly. He’s backed hydroxychloroquine as a cure. He hid from Albertans for days on end. He rejects scientific advice and evidence. Now cases are exploding, the health system is overwhelmed, and Albertans have lost all trust in his leadership. Mr. Speaker, does the Premier realize that if he keeps following Donald Trump’s pandemic response, he, too, will be overseeing hundreds of thousands of needless infections, serious illness, and enduring economic strife?

Mr. Kenney: Mr. Speaker, to highlight just how absurd and self-contradictory the NDP’s position is, consider this. The member is criticizing this government for not currently having higher testing levels. The primary reason we do not currently have higher testing levels is because we have adopted the chief medical officer’s advice largely to suspend asymptomatic testing in order to have faster turnaround times for priority population cohorts and people who are symptomatic. She’s criticizing us for not following the CMO’s advice, when we are actually following the CMO’s advice. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mask Policies

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday and indeed just moments ago again the Premier claimed that data drives his decisions in responding to COVID-19. The Premier, however, blatantly contradicted himself in an online discussion last night, where he finally told the truth and said that his refusal to implement a province-wide mask mandate came at the urging of a rural MLA, who said that some people would take masks off if the government ordered them to wear them. This is a shocking and dangerous revelation. To the Premier. Your own comments prove you’d rather appeal to fringe antimaskers in your party than keep us safe. How is that possibly acceptable?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, none of that is true. In fact, we just announced measures that include mandatory masking in indoor workplaces in Edmonton and Calgary. We were one of the first jurisdictions in the world to encourage the use of masks as an important measure and tool for people throughout the pandemic to be able to protect themselves as well as their loved ones and our health care workers. We’re going to continue to encourage the use of masks. It’s a great way and fantastic way – also, it’s one of the reasons why we distributed 40 million masks throughout Alberta, to be able to start encouraging people to use that tool to keep themselves safe.

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

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, this Premier’s rationale for not masking Albertans really is akin to eliminating speed limits because someone might still decide to speed. It’s disturbing, and it proves that this Premier lacks the courage to govern during this pandemic. We know that the Premier has already refused to condemn the remarks of his misguided, science-denying MLA for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, who claimed that wearing masks would somehow actually contribute to the spread of COVID-19. To

the Premier: was that maybe the MLA who told you not to put in a mask mandate? Who was it? Should you really be listening to antimaskers in your caucus or instead maybe look at kicking them out?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, this is a party who in their members' statements were criticizing and attacking the government for daring to use data in its decisions. They continue to betray the fact that they are the antidata, anti-evidence party in this Legislature's time – quite frankly, for the NDP to give their heads a shake, perhaps the same way as Edmonton-Strathcona gives her head a shake every time she rises to ask a question.

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

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister again demonstrates his utter lack of class.

Health care workers have been fighting this virus on the front line for months. Our health care heroes have been pleading with this government to listen to the evidence, only to find that a fact-free anecdote from an antimask fringe UCP MLA has greater value in the eyes of our disappearing Premier than the expertise of health care heroes. So, Premier, will you just admit that this decision was more about saving your political skin than protecting Albertan lives? Will you apologize to the people of this province for your horrendous absentee leadership and put a provincial mask mandate in place?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, none of that is true. While we were responding to the pandemic starting in January and February, the NDP were AWOL. They only started becoming interested in COVID here in November, but we've been responding since January and February. We're going to continue to work with AHS. We're going to continue to work with our continuing care operators. We're going to continue to make sure that all of those folks have the resources that they need to keep Albertans safe and to continue to make sure that all Albertans and their loved ones and the health care workers have all the resources that they need to respond to the pandemic.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

Adoption Services

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Adoption is a wonderful life-changing decision, and adopting a child or children creates and completes families. This process, however, can be challenging and emotionally draining for families. Given that prospective adoptive parents often face unnecessary barriers that can cause years of delay and cost thousands of dollars before they're able to actually adopt a child and given the opposition sat on simple changes such as the proclamation of Bill 206 that would make this process easier for families, to the Minister of Children's Services: how is this government actually making the adopting process easier and faster for prospective families?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In May 2019 this House unanimously supported Motion 501 put forward by the Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain to take all necessary measures to make the process for all forms of adoption more efficient and timely for families. This motion coupled with the red tape reduction submissions we received has informed several changes we've made to make this process easier and simpler and faster for families. One of those changes was quite simple. As the

member alluded to, we proclaimed Bill 206, the private member's bill that the now Minister for Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women introduced back in 2017, something that sat on the desk.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the minister for her answer. Given that there are a relatively small number of adoption agencies in Alberta and just last year one of them went bankrupt and given that this disrupted the adoption process for many families in Alberta, causing even further delays in their adoption journey, can the Minister of Children's Services please inform this House what her plans are to ensure prospective adoptive parents are protected and supported?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you that that situation mentioned by the member absolutely broke my heart. I can't imagine the disappointment that these families went through as they were going through their adoption journeys. The ministry followed all policy, regulatory, legislative requirements, but it did identify an area where I thought we could provide better transparency to support these families like requiring adoption agencies to inform clients within 10 days of any conditions placed on their licence. This is something that has been respected by potential adoptive parents.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the minister for her answer. Given that current adoption processes have made it very difficult for individuals who have already been adopted to reconnect with their birth families and given that these processes have also prevented them from accessing their own biological information, to the same minister: how is this government supporting individuals who are facing these information barriers?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 48, recently introduced here in the House, will reduce red tape but also remove barriers in adoptions. Some of the proposed changes will increase the amount of information that can be shared with adoptees and their families and will clarify and expand information regarding their history. Families across Canada are increasingly finding ways to connect with their biological families; that's things like 23andMe, ancestry.com. We're going to make it easier through our processes to make that quicker, faster not only for families right across Alberta but in examples of '60s scoop survivors so that they can reconnect with their culture and their families.

2:10 Essential Service Provider Wage Supplements

Ms Gray: Mr. Speaker, more than 200 days ago, in the early days of this pandemic, the federal government developed a \$3 billion program to support front-line heroes during COVID-19. The money was for nurses, emergency responders, social workers, retail workers, and others. These are people putting themselves in the path of COVID-19 to keep providing Albertans with the services that they need. To access this important program, there was only one string attached. Provinces would have to kick in one-quarter of the funding. To the Minister of Finance: why hasn't Alberta taken full advantage of this program to support front-line heroes?

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

Mr. Toews: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, want to acknowledge the very difficult workplaces that so many employees and workers attend to every day during the pandemic. Our government did provide wage top-ups for health care aides working in contracted long-term care and designated supported living facilities as they work to combat COVID-19, and we continue to work with the federal government on funding agreements under the federal wage top-up program.

Ms Gray: Given that the minister would rather insult workers with smears in his fiscal update than provide them with hard-earned COVID top-up pay for providing essential services during the pandemic and given that based on population we suspect that Alberta's cut of the federal money should be around \$300 million – that's \$300 million that should already be in the pockets of Alberta's pandemic heroes – and given that the minister's acknowledgement of their hard work will not put food on the table, to the minister: are you really going to leave \$300 million on the table in Ottawa just because you'd rather demonize our front-line heroes than support them during the greatest health crisis we've ever faced?

Mr. Toews: Mr. Speaker, I categorically reject the assertion in the member's question on our view of public-sector workers. We appreciate the great work our public sector is doing each day in delivering to Albertans. As I mentioned, our government did provide wage top-ups for health care workers in long-term care facilities, and we continue to work with the federal government on funding agreements under the federal wage top-up program.

Ms Gray: Mr. Speaker, given that it's been 200 days and given that this minister has pretty words but no money behind them for these workers and given that they openly reject mask mandates that would protect front-line workers and given that they've planned to fire 11,000 health workers and given that they've described public-sector workers as being little more than a drain on the economy and given that we all know the pain and suffering, financial and emotional, that Albertans are going through, to the minister: how can you justify not investing in caring for the very heroes among us who are caring for us in our greatest time of need?

The Speaker: The Minister of Finance.

Mr. Toews: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, we're working with the federal government on additional programs for federal wage top-ups of employees that are working in very challenging environments. I want to again acknowledge that there are employees across the province that are working in challenging environments due to COVID. One thing we agree on with the members opposite is in our respect for public-sector workers. Where we differ is that folks on this side of the House also respect taxpayers. [interjection]

The Speaker: Order. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods had her opportunity.

It's now the hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning's, the Official Opposition House Leader, turn.

COVID-19 Response

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Premier claims he relies on data and public health advice decisions on how best to combat

COVID-19. Clearly, the media story emerging today and the Premier's own words on why he refused the mask mandate made it clear that that's not the case. The truth is that contact tracing has collapsed. The source of more than 85 per cent of new COVID-19 cases is unknown, and we aren't even tracing cases that go back more than 10 days. To the Premier: how can we possibly believe your claims that COVID-19 isn't being spread in places like schools and restaurants when the truth is you have no idea where the virus is coming from . . .

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: The answer, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is because the idea that all of a sudden in two weeks we would have nine months of data being flipped around and inverted completely is completely insane. But let me speak a little bit more about the CBC story.

Ms Sweet: Point of order.

Mr. Shandro: It's, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, a crude political attack. It discloses nothing. It adds nothing to the discussion. I'm concerned about it for one reason only, that it violated Dr. Hinshaw's confidence and embarrassed her. I called Dr. Hinshaw this morning to tell her that she has nothing to apologize for, unlike the coward who secretly recorded her. Deena Hinshaw is an outstanding public servant, and I am proud of her.

The Speaker: The hon. Official Opposition House Leader.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that last night while this Premier was justifying how he listened to the antimasker members of his caucus, our MLAs were joined by actual public health experts on online discussions and given that Dr. Joe Vipond, an emergency room physician at Rockyview general hospital in Calgary, told us that COVID-19 is spread in situations where people are indoors, in close contact with others for a long period of time without a mask and given that Dr. Vipond said that those are the conditions in restaurants, casinos, and bars, again to the Premier: are you really expecting Albertans to believe you?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, I'm not asking Edmonton-Manning to believe the Premier. I'm asking her to believe the evidence, nine months of evidence where we've had an enormous amount of information that's very Alberta specific. We're going to continue to listen to that evidence. We're going to continue to use that. It's going to inform our public policy decisions, and we're going to continue to listen to the advice of our public health officials as they continue to help us in the response to the pandemic.

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

Ms Sweet: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that none of us want to see restaurants close or more people lose their jobs but given that small businesses I heard from during a conversation we hosted online last night said that their biggest fear was being closed without any support and given that the Premier can't even listen to medical experts who suggest that restaurants, bars, and casinos are likely places to transmit COVID-19 and given that if he would accept those facts, we would probably get to the real business of developing actual supports for businesses to help them pay their bills, again, will you help them?

Mr. Shandro: Mr. Speaker, the only help that the NDP have offered those 13,000 businesses – 175,000 Albertans work for them – is to shut them down. That's exactly what Edmonton-Strathcona

said on the radio this week that she would do. She would shut them down, and she would ignore, quite frankly, the data. This is a party who said in their members' statements that they are attacking this government for listening to data and using data to make its policy decisions. But why would we be surprised at this behaviour from the NDP?

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

Agricultural Research and Development

Mr. Orr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Agriculture and ag research are important to the lives and the economy of residents of Lacombe-Ponoka. Ag research is the exploration of improved farming methods, plant protection, and better management of resources or even efficient marketing. Agricultural research is essential to the success and innovation of ag producers and value-added processors across Alberta. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry has made a recent policy change regarding this research. Can the minister explain the policy change, known as results-driven agriculture research, and why the ministry moved in this direction?

The Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the question from the hon. member. The minister of agriculture is doing a great job. I didn't hear the full question. It was so loud in here with the NDP heckling that I could not fully hear it, but I want to encourage everybody, while I wait for the supplemental, to take time to watch the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry's great Christmas tree video on his social media.

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

Mr. Orr: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister. Given that the Lacombe Research and Development Centre has been a part of the Lacombe agricultural community for almost 115 years and given that this research centre employs 103 people and many others since it opened, including my grandmother in the 1940s, and given that it has contributed to the advancement of livestock and meat production, integrated crop production, and even honey bee health and management, could the minister please inform the constituents in my riding what role the Lacombe research centre will play in the future under the results-driven agriculture research mandate?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, as part of our transition to RDAR, the Field Crop Development Centre and barley breeding program have moved over to Olds College. For over 100 years Olds has been the go-to school for people looking for hands-on, agriculture-focused learning. Our government invested \$10.5 million over three years to fund the barley breeding programs and Field Crop Development Centre at Olds College. The college will take ownership of the program, providing the capacity to support more world-leading research and new teaching opportunities. Great question. It was good to hear it. I'm glad the NDP stopped heckling long enough that I could hear it.

Mr. Orr: Thank you again to the minister for his response. Given that one of my constituents has a business that is developing specialty dog foods and given that he has been working with the Food Science and Tech Centre located in Brooks and given that this centre has been closed and given that my constituent is worried this may cost him business due to lacking a facility that will test his product, can the minister please inform my constituent and others

if research like this will be conducted elsewhere so that they can get the assistance that they continue to need?

The Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are focusing all of our efforts around food science into our facility in Leduc. We will be working with the pet food companies that have been impacted to try and find a co packer and assist them through this transition. As a government we are focused on diversification, empowering the processors in our province. It's just another way agriculture is leading our economic recovery.

That's two questions where I could actually hear the question from the hon. member. The NDP is learning . . . [interjections] Oh, no. The Opposition House Leader is starting to heckle again. Hopefully, the next question and answer we'll have a chance of being able to hear, but I'm glad I was able to hear that second question.

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

2:20 COVID-19 Response Decision-making (continued)

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Alberta needs decisive action against COVID-19, which is spreading out of control. Instead, the Premier produced a grab bag of half measures and a lot of excuses. One of those is that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms prevents him from acting, but the Charter explicitly allows emergency actions when they are demonstrably justified. Hundreds of Albertans are dead; 13,000 are infected with COVID-19. To the Minister of Justice: if this doesn't justify action, what does?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Madu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Here we go again with the members opposite. Right from the beginning all they have done is politicize the government of Alberta's response to a pandemic, the likes of which we have never seen in a generation. This is the only opposition party in all of North America that has sought to demonize our public health care experts, demonize government response. It is time for the NDP to cut it.

Ms Sweet: Point of order.

The Speaker: A point of order is noted at 2:22.

Mr. Sabir: Given that Professor Kathleen Mahoney, a human rights lawyer at the University of Calgary, says that the Premier failed to do enough to protect life, liberty, and security of the person in Alberta and given that the only lawyer arguing against keeping people safe is John Carpay, the far-right, antimask extremist, why isn't the Minister of Justice telling the Premier to protect Albertans from COVID instead of protecting his vulnerable political career from John Carpay?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General.

Mr. Madu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Despite this second wave of the pandemic I am exceedingly proud of the government response from day one on this pandemic. We led for the first eight months of this pandemic on virtually every single index of monitoring progress and success of government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. What we will not allow is the members opposite to politicize something that ought to be based on data, evidence. You

can rest assured that on this part of the aisle we will do everything to protect our citizens.

Mr. Sabir: Given that Avnish Nanda, an expert in constitutional law at the University of Alberta, says that this Premier's Charter claims are just political bluster and given that Premiers across Canada of all political stripes have already taken far more decisive action to protect families and businesses in their jurisdictions, to the Minister of Justice: will you tell the Premier to stop hiding behind the Charter, stand up, and take real action to save lives and livelihoods in Alberta?

Mr. Madu: Mr. Speaker, it is shameful, listening to the members opposite. All that they would want any government to do to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic is to shut down our entire businesses, shut down our entire lives. Do you know what that would do? That would cause more havoc and more disaster for the people of Alberta, and we will not allow the NDP to get away with that. That will never happen so long as this province is under our management.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Energy Industry Jobs

Ms Ganley: Yesterday Calgary received more sombre news. Imperial Oil will be laying off 200 workers. Exxon Canada is laying off an additional 100 staff. Imperial has already laid off 450 contractors during the year. That's 750 jobs. This comes in addition to the thousands of layoffs we are seeing at Suncor and as the result of the Cenovus-Husky merger. Albertans are losing hope. This government is nearing the halfway point in its term. Minister, why have you failed working Calgarians so badly?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I find it utterly ironic that that member would get up and ask a question like that when her leader and her party just spent the entire week inside Edmonton calling for the shutdown of thousands of businesses across the province and just spent this entire question period calling to shut down all Alberta and criticized the Premier for asking for data before he made decisions about health implications or health restrictions that could impact tens of thousands of jobs across the province. Here is the reality. That member and the NDP have no credibility when it comes to jobs and should just stop asking questions about it.

Ms Ganley: Given, Mr. Speaker, that Albertans take the issue of jobs seriously even if that minister doesn't and given that the International Energy Agency is projecting that oil demand will not recover to prepandemic levels until 2023 or 2025 and given that the failed economic policies of the Premier and that minister cost Albertans 50,000 jobs prepandemic and given that this government has called diversification a luxury and doubled down on its failed \$4.7 billion corporate handout, to the Minister of Energy. You have admitted that your corporate handout isn't working. That was a year ago. Where is the new plan to help Calgary families?

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

Mr. Toews: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We are facing a very difficult time. We've witnessed an unprecedented collapse in energy prices, we're experiencing a massive contraction of the global economy, and we're dealing with a pandemic. That's why we brought in Alberta's economic recovery plan.

Mr. Speaker, when the members opposite governed, their policies, their economic policies, sent tens of billions of dollars of

capital out of this province and, with it, hundreds of thousands of jobs and the collapse of thousands of small businesses. That was all without a pandemic. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Ms Ganley: Given that the government's self-proclaimed recovery plan has very little action in it and that the UCP making plans to make plans will not actually create any jobs and given that this government is literally taking years to spend a billion dollars waiting for the federal government to create jobs now and is instead focused on doing damage control for its bogus war room, to the minister: will you apologize to working Albertans for your failed policies, go back to the drawing board, and finally come up with an actual plan?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this government is very, very proud of our Energy minister, who is working tirelessly to defend our largest industry. For that member to even get up in this House and ask that question is utterly ridiculous. She sat 18 months ago with a government who did everything in their power to shut the oil and gas industry, to attack the very people that work within that industry. Her behaviour in that government was shameful. She has no business to even ask questions, from my perspective, when it comes to energy. They utterly failed this province, and our Energy minister is going to continue to work to make sure that our product gets to market and to stand up for our largest industry. Shame on her. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order.

COVID-19 and Children's Programs and Activities

Mr. Yao: Our Premier has declared a public health emergency and announced new targeted measures to stop the spread of COVID and protect lives and livelihoods. It's a given that child care is extremely important for working parents, especially those working so hard in essential services. Child care will play an important role in our ability to relaunch Alberta's economy. Our government's new measures include changes to the school calendar, but I don't see any guidance for child care centres. Can the Minister of Children's Services please update the House on the new public health measures related to child care?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The current situation in Alberta is critical, and these steps are not being taken lightly but are needed to protect us all and the capacity of our health care system. At this time there are no changes to the guidelines or cohorts for child care centres, out-of-school care centres, day homes, or preschools. We are working on some very specific guidelines for out-of-school centres for that first week in January, where we are delaying the beginning of in-person classes in schools. Along with the federal government we've committed nearly \$100 million, in fact already invested nearly \$100 million in child care across the province. We will continue to support this important sector.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

Mr. Yao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for her answer. The government made a decision a couple of weeks ago to suspend recreational sports programming for children and adults. My constituents asked me to consider the perspective of supporting mental health in children and adults by supporting these

activities. To the Minister of Children's Services: why did you institute this change, and how do you anticipate it'll help stop the spread of COVID-19?

2:30

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do know that physical activity is important to the physical, mental, and emotional health and well-being of all Albertans, but we also know that fitness and sport activities in some cases have a higher risk of spreading the virus due to physical exertion of the participants and also mixing and mingling of these participants or spectators before, during, or after activities. As a mom of a Timbits hockey player in U7 in south Calgary I do understand that this is tough on families with young children or children of all ages, but with active cases on the rise, we all have to come together and do our part.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Yao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister. As Alberta's government institutes these new, stricter public health measures to help stop the spread of COVID-19, your ministry and your child care operators that you work with have been able to successfully operate to ensure that parents have access to safe, high-quality child care, but I still get the question as to why our communities can't access play spaces like playgrounds. Can the Minister of Children's Services please explain these issues and why not?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do understand that sometimes it can be difficult to interpret why some things are not open and some things are, and I know that parents are looking for outlets for their kids. Child care and preschool programs differ significantly from other settings like children's play places, particularly because they have very strict guidelines around participation, parent drop-offs, very specific cohorts for children as well as educators, and they've remained open because they've done an exceptional job of adhering to the guidelines put forward by our chief medical officer of health. Since March I've hosted monthly town hall meetings with these operators and continue . . .

School Attendance and Funding

Ms Hoffman: Yesterday the Minister of Education revealed a shocking lack of knowledge of her file, of the consequences of her actions. She didn't even know the number of students enrolled in Alberta schools or how much of the federal grant to support schools had been spent to address the pandemic response so far. Hopefully, she's learned more about her job today. Minister, how many students are in Alberta schools now, and how much of the federal transfer have you spent? If you can't answer those two questions, how can we possibly trust that you will be able to keep kids safe?

Member LaGrange: That is such a ludicrous statement and a ludicrous question. First and foremost, we know that all the students that parents are sending to schools are accounted for. We also realize that some parents have chosen to keep some of their children at home, particularly the ECS and kindergarten children, where it is voluntary. We continue to track numbers. School divisions are providing me with final numbers, and I will have a final count very, very soon.

On the federal funding, we have provided all of the federal funding out to school divisions.

Ms Hoffman: Given that yesterday the minister said that she didn't know even though we're three months into the school year – she also said that she couldn't account for \$12 million because maybe half of it would be spent this year and maybe half will be spent next year – and given that the minister keeps talking in circles and clearly doesn't know her file and given that K to 6 students can't be left at home, Mr. Speaker, and given that parents who work outside the home will be expected to go back to their jobs that first week of January, to the minister: what plans, if any, have you made to support parents who work outside of the home, especially single parents, who you're now asking to miss an extra week of work due to your failure to keep kids safe?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the only member here that's confused is the member opposite. I was able to share yesterday through supplementary estimates that, in fact, the Alberta government has spent about three-quarters of a billion dollars to date, taxpayer dollars, I might add, to ensure safe learning environments. I will say that every school authority across the province received roughly about \$120 million in aggregate additional dollars for their budgets; \$250 million in accelerated capital infrastructure maintenance and renewal funding; \$10 million in PPE; \$363 million . . .

Ms Hoffman: Given that none of that spin the minister just offered would pass a grade 6 math test and given that some of the parents are also teachers themselves and given that they are supposed to be teaching their students online at the same time as they're keeping their children at home, Minister, you must know . . .

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Hoffman: . . . that you're creating a system that is set up for failure. You've already failed students once. More than 13 per cent of schools have COVID in them right now. Take some responsibility, or throw in the towel and tell us that you're not up for the job, because Albertans already see it.

The Speaker: A point of order is noted at 2:34.

The hon. the Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm proud to say that our school divisions have been doing incredibly well. They are managing COVID. In fact, .1 per cent of students and staff currently have tested positive to date with COVID. As of today only .1 per cent. That means that 99.9 per cent do not have COVID within our schools. The fact that we are taking part in our responsibility in the greater effort to curb the pandemic is something that we want to do, absolutely.

Arts and Culture Grant Programs

Ms Goehring: Mr. Speaker, our artists are essential to our culture. They have dedicated their lives to showcasing their unique talents and skills and provide entertainment for Albertans and Canadians nation-wide. To the minister of culture. Please share with us the specific ways you've helped Alberta artists. How much funding has been put specifically towards helping artists during this incredibly difficult situation?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member opposite for the question. I am happy to answer on behalf of my colleague the minister of culture. Specifically, she has said a number of times in this House that the arts and culture sectors are hugely important to Alberta's economic recovery. We absolutely know that when the arts thrive, our province is a better place to live, to invest, and to do business. To help artists through this difficult time, the Alberta government gave \$150,000 in a grant to the Alberta Spotlight Online Concert Series as well as more than \$300,000 in Alberta Culture Days grants, supporting many events that paid artists for their work.

Ms Goehring: Given that many artists rely on grants during a normal year and that these grants help them build a career and given that with a pandemic going on, these grants are now more vital than ever and given that the second wave will keep entertainment venues closed longer or operating at severely reduced capacity and given that that will only add to the hardship for artists who rely on performances at these venues to help pay for the roof over their heads, to the minister: how many artists will be out of work by the time this pandemic is over, will you do anything to help them, and if so, what?

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

Ms Schulz: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that I answered that at the end of my first question. Once again, to help artists through this difficult time, the Alberta government did – in addition to the \$150,000 grant to the Alberta Spotlight Online Concert Series, \$300,000 was also provided in Alberta Culture Days grants, supporting many events that paid artists for their very important work. Artists and nonprofits can also access Pivot Online, which is an online tool kit for artists and nonprofit organizations to keep their businesses and nonprofit organizations accessible to patrons. The minister of culture continues to work with this very important industry and address their needs as . . .

Ms Goehring: Given that our creative industries are actually a piece of our future economic puzzle and given that Alberta could be a powerhouse for future talents but, sadly, they've been ignored by the current government and don't have a seat at any UCP table discussing the economy and given that our NDP caucus will be hosting consultations with artists, venue owners, and many more early in the new year as part of our project to build a new economy for Alberta at albertasfuture.ca, to the same minister. Those in our creative industries have powerful input and important voices. Why do you seem bent on silencing them?

Ms Schulz: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely not true at all. I do also want to provide some additional information. Artists and culture-sector workers in Alberta can access federal supports to help all Canadians deal with the challenges brought forward by this unprecedented pandemic. Another grant program that I do want to address is the Alberta-made production grant, which is helping to grow Alberta's screen-based production sector, creating jobs, bringing in investment and more business opportunities for film industry workers here in Alberta. The grant will help with emerging talent and help our film industry thrive. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. [interjections] Order.

The hon. Member for Highwood is the only one with the call.

Heroes Fund

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Bill 47 encompasses several key elements, including changes to occupational health and

safety and radiation legislation and changes to the Workers' Compensation Act, which will both bring balance back to our labour laws. It also includes the incredible creation of Alberta's heroes fund. To the minister: can you please explain the intent behind the heroes fund and the impact it will have on the lives of Alberta's first responders and their families?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General.
2:40

Mr. Madu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Member for Highwood. Alberta's government is following through on its commitment to create Alberta's heroes fund for first responders. There is no higher form of public service than to risk one's life to maintain public safety, and we want to honour that. We want to recognize and honour the noble service that first responders provide by increasing benefits that support their families. The fund will provide a one-time tax-free payment of \$100,000 to eligible families of first responders who pass away as a result of performing their duties.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Highwood.

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the Alberta heroes fund is meant to improve benefits for the families of fallen first responders and given that first responders have been there to faithfully serve their communities and that we need to be there for their families in their time of need, to the minister: will families eligible to receive the money from the provincial program have any of their WCB fatality benefits clawed back?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General.

Mr. Madu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The first responders commit their lives to serving their communities, and we must honour their heroic work and ensure their loved ones have the support they need. Our government committed to ensuring that families of Alberta's fallen heroes are supported, and while I wish this fund wasn't needed, we are delivering on our promise to honour them and the sacrifices that they have made. The heroes fund is separate from regular workers' compensation fatality benefits. WCB fatality benefits would not be clawed back if a family receives the heroes fund as well.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister. Given that when a family member passes away, it is a very stressful time, where the family is grieving and is faced with what feels like an overwhelming amount of paperwork and decisions, and given that Alberta's government is committed to cutting red tape and streamlining processes wherever possible, can the minister please advise what steps the families of our fallen heroes will need to follow to apply for the heroes fund?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Madu: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can assure that there will not be red tape in this process. Families will not have to apply for a heroes fund permit. The WCB will identify eligible families using its fatality claim process and administer the funds. The heroes fund will take effect when the legislation passes, and the WCB will begin identifying eligible families and administering permits soon afterwards. Families of first responders who have died from April 1, 2020, onward will be eligible for this fund.

The Speaker: Hon. members, this concludes the time allotted for Oral Question Period, and in 30 seconds or less we will return to the daily Routine.

Notices of Motions

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am rising pursuant to Standing Order 34(3) to advise the Assembly that on Monday, November 30, written questions 2 and 3 will be accepted and that Written Question 1 will be dealt with.

Also, on Monday, November 30, motions for returns 6, 12, and 13 will be accepted, and motions for returns 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 will be dealt with.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Highwood has a tabling, followed by Edmonton-Glenora.

Mr. Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As deputy chair of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices and in accordance with section 4(7) of the Election Act and section 4(2) of the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act I'm pleased to table the following report, the Chief Electoral Officer annual report 2019-2020.

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

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have three tablings. One is a letter from the president of Canadian Parents for French, Alberta branch, Ms Victoria Wishart, to the Minister of Education highlighting her deep concerns for the lack of federal funds being passed on to French second language and French immersion as well as francophone students in the province of Alberta, accompanied by their media release and their response from the minister, which is far from fair or addressing the issues that have been highlighted by Ms Wishart.

The Speaker: Hon. members, we had a very, very exciting Thursday afternoon. As a result, there are at least four points of order, so we will go to those now. At approximately 1:55 the Government House Leader raised a point of order.

Point of Order Addressing the Chair

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise, and I will refer you to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, page 610, in regard to remarks addressed to the chair. It says:

Any Member participating in debate . . . must address the Chair, not the House, a particular Minister or Member, the galleries, [or] the television audience . . . Since one of the basic principles of procedure in the House is that the proceedings be conducted in [terms of a free and civil discourse] Members are less apt to engage in [direct] heated exchanges and personal attacks when their comments are directed to the Chair rather than to another Member. If a Member directs remarks towards another Member and not the Speaker, [he or she] will be called to order and may be asked to rephrase the remarks.

In a Committee of the Whole members must direct their comments to the chairman or chairperson.

Mr. Speaker, this could have been called several times, and it happens to all of us as we've been in the House. But I do think that

the remainder of question period – the fact that we are getting ready to argue about four or five points of order proves that when the Leader of the Official Opposition chose to continually direct her comments directly to the hon. the Premier, she created discourse in this House. I'm only going to refer to one. In the segment of questions where I called a point of order, she looked at the Premier and said, quote – I recognize that you have the Blues, which I will trust more than my transcript, but according to my transcript she turned to the Premier and said to the Premier: to the Premier, do you think it's a problem that Albertans can't tell which is which? There are several other examples inside that exchange.

When we're dealing with emotional issues inside this House, it is best if we all attempt to put our remarks through the chair, through you, Mr. Speaker, so that we can try to keep the emotions in this House down for a civil debate to take place. I would ask that at least you remind the House of your role and the need to be able to not directly refer comments to each other.

Ms Sweet: Well, Mr. Speaker, that was not what I thought we were going to be discussing on this first point of order. The irony is real, I think, though, in this conversation, that the hon. Government House Leader would stand and say that that is a point of order when it was directed at an individual member when we have historically seen, even more recently, particular members in this Chamber that have directed comments that are very unparliamentary at members in this very Chamber and then quickly withdrawn those comments and done it again. So I think that there is a matter of dispute around this very point of order. I mean, I appreciate the Government House Leader's comments, and I would look forward to seeing the Government House Leader and all members of this Chamber follow the exact same process.

The Speaker: I am prepared to rule on the first point of order. I would like to make a couple of comments. Perhaps they will set the tone for the rest of the points of order that are before the Assembly. I, too, was going to refer to page 610 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, and I'd like to particularly draw the attention of members of the Assembly to this line: "Since one of the basic principles of procedure in the House is that the proceedings be conducted in a respectful manner." I am more and more convinced the longer and longer this legislative session proceeds that the desire amongst members to keep debate respectful is seemingly declining.

I would like to highlight one of the other things that was said in that very section of question period today in which the first point of order was called, when the Leader of the Official Opposition specifically referred to "your negligence" with respect to the Premier. On three occasions in the past 24 hours the hon. the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly – some of you may have known him – has actually intervened and reminded members that they ought to be speaking through the chair, using statements like they/them as opposed to you/your. I feel like an English teacher for a moment here, seeing the hon. Member for Drayton Valley-Devon.

2:50

I think that the underlying principle is critical, both what we see on page 610 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* with respect to the underlying principle of debating in a respectful manner, which we've seen decline over the last number of days and weeks, and in particular a special reminder to the dean of the Assembly, the Leader of the Opposition, to keep her comments and all members' comments through the chair. While it's likely a point of order, I won't find one today. It'll be a strong caution to all. But if that language persists next week, it certainly will require an

intervention from the chair. I consider this matter dealt with and concluded.

Point of order 2: at approximately 2:05 the Government House Leader rose while the hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre was speaking.

Point of Order Insulting Language

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will keep this one brief as well because I know there are a few more to come. Standing Order 23(j) is why I rise, “uses abusive or insulting language.” In that exchange between the Member for Edmonton-City Centre to the Health minister, my transcript has this, quote: the minister demonstrates his utter lack of class. That is certainly abusive and insulting language and again, from my perspective, takes away from the debate in this place. I would expect better from the Member for Edmonton-City Centre, and I do hope that we do not see, as the 30th Legislature continues to go on, us continue with name-calling about individuals. There is certainly enough business that we must undertake for the people of Alberta that I don’t think we need to spend our time calling each other names like we’re in elementary school.

Ms Sweet: Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I think, going back to your first point of order and now this piece of comment from the Government House Leader around acts of class, I believe that if both sides of the House at this point would bring the tone down and acknowledge that maybe the Minister of Health prior to that had made a comment that would have created disorder in this House and a member may have responded to that – again, I don’t see that this is a point of order. But it speaks to the tone of this Chamber as we are right now, and I would encourage the Government House Leader to talk to his members of his caucus about bringing the tone down as well so we both can work on changing the decorum.

The Speaker: I am prepared to rule on the second point of order. The hon. the Minister of Health said: “. . . quite frankly, for the NDP to give their heads a shake, perhaps the same way as Edmonton-Strathcona gives her head a shake every time she rises to ask a question.” Followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre: “Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister again demonstrates his utter lack of class.” Both of the hon. members – both – didn’t speak through the chair and spoke specifically to the member. While I’m not entirely sure that either of them in isolation would reach the level of a point of order, I think the hon. the Opposition House Leader has made a very strong point here, and in conjunction with the Speaker’s point of order ruling immediately prior, if we raise the level of decorum, I think we would all be well served.

Perhaps there’s mutual agreement in points of orders 3 and 4, that are fairly similar. The hon. the Opposition House Leader.

Point of Order Parliamentary Language

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to rise on a point of order, trying to create disorder in the House, use of abusive or insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder, which . . .

Mr. Jason Nixon: It’s 23(j).

Ms Sweet: . . . is 23(j). Thank you, Government House Leader, for helping me out on that.

We have heard yesterday and again today the hon. Health minister using the word “insane” in his responses to the opposition. [interjections] As a government and as an opposition I would like to encourage all members, as the Government House Leader is laughing, that when we talk about mental health and addictions and mental health in this province and the fact that we would like to support individuals that are struggling with mental health, using the word “insane” is a very derogatory comment that insinuates negativity towards individuals and their mental health. Given that it is the hon. Health minister that uses it repeatedly, I would like to recommend that the hon. member withdraw those comments and maybe refrain from using the word “insane.”

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Official Opposition House Leader has not pointed to anything within any sort of House of Commons procedures, *Beauchene’s*, standing orders, former Speakers’ rulings where the word “insane” is not parliamentary. I don’t even follow the logic of that within her point of order. Further to that, the hon. Health minister did not refer to an individual as insane; he said that the question was insane. I’ve heard some bizarre questions in my time in this Chamber. That was one of the most bizarre ones, though, from the Member for Edmonton-City Centre. They are fairly bizarre most of the time when he asks them. I’ve seen lots of bizarre things when I’m inside this Chamber. The hon. minister pointing out that something is bizarre that is being asked of him is a far cry from saying anything about any individual. This is a matter of debate.

The Speaker: I appreciate the interventions from both of the House leaders. I would say that I appreciate that the hon. the Official Opposition House Leader did point to Standing Order 23(j), which is the one that she referred to with the Government House Leader’s help, I might add. While the hon. Government House Leader will know that there is no longer a list of words that are unparliamentary, merely the context in which those words are used – we had a discussion about that as well during question period; again, the Speaker continues to provide caution around the use of the word “lying” because it creates disorder every single time – could be considered to be unparliamentary.

While I consider this to be a matter of debate at this point in time, I do take the hon. Official Opposition House Leader’s comments under advisement with respect to the mental health of Albertans. Perhaps the hon. Health minister would make some considerations around that as well. At this point it’s not a point of order. I consider the matter dealt with and concluded.

Point of order 4.

Point of Order Parliamentary Language

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn’t sure if it was myself or the Government House Leader at this point because I think we have two more.

Mr. Jason Nixon: I withdrew one.

Ms Sweet: Oh, you withdrew one. Perfect.

Ms Sweet: Under Standing Order 23(j), just to make sure that the Government House Leader is aware that I’m referencing a standing order, referencing the word “demonize.” Now, the reason that I’m bringing this up is actually going back to the Government House Leader’s point of order when he was talking to the fact that one of the members had said: an act of class. What led up to that and some of the responses that we’ve seen from the hon. Minister of Health

is that there continue to be – actually, it wasn't. It was the Minister of Justice. My apologies. There is an obvious response to this word "demonize." For some reason it continues to be used in this Chamber to create disorder amongst both sides of the Chamber. Again I would like to remind all members to refrain from using some of this language so that we can move on and maybe address the decorum in the Chamber.

The Speaker: This is not a point of order. I consider the matter dealt with and concluded.

Hon. members, we are at Ordres du jour.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 37 Builders' Lien (Prompt Payment) Amendment Act, 2020

[Adjourned debate November 25: Mr. Neudorf]

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Lethbridge-East has 10 minutes remaining should he choose to use it.

Seeing not, is there anyone else wishing to join in the debate? I see the hon. the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie, and he has the call.

Member Loyola: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to say how happy I am that – you know, I don't agree with many of the things that this government has been doing within the great number of pieces of legislation that they have brought before this House, but on this particular one I have to say that I'm in agreement. I'm happy to say that our entire caucus is in agreement because, of course, as I stated in this House before, this is something near and dear to my heart, something that I was working on when we were still in government.

I had the opportunity to meet with many, many, many subcontractors throughout the province of Alberta, and they stipulated to me in no uncertain terms all of the challenges that they face even though there are specific contracts basically outlining the agreements that exist between subcontractors and contractors and owners when it comes to the particular projects that they were working on.

3:00

For me, I can't tell you the number of times that I heard from so many subcontractors. The fact that even though there were these contracts that stipulated payment in either 60 or 90 days for the work that they were doing on a particular project, sometimes 90 days would go by, 120 days would go by, Mr. Speaker, and still these subcontractors would not be paid.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

One of the main reasons why I decided to pay so much attention to this particular issue and concern on behalf of subcontractors was because, of course, as I've described before and as I've shared with the House before, I had the opportunity – well, just last night I was talking about how I had my own business. I started it from the ground up, doing lawn maintenance, doing snow shovelling. Eventually I started doing landscaping projects, and then after that it became building decks and fences. Eventually during the wintertime I gained enough knowledge that I started doing finishing carpentry. Now, for the most part, in all of my experience being a small-business owner, I would only have to deal with people one

on one because, of course, lawn maintenance, small yard projects like building a fence or a deck are things that you deal with one on one, right?

But then when I entered into the whole world of finishing carpentry and actually working for bigger corporations, one experience, I will say – and not all of them because, as I've stated in the House before, here in the province of Alberta we have many great employers. We have many great businesses that when they have a contract, they honour that contract. They stick to it. They work out any issues that they may have as a difference between owners, the general contractor, and the subcontractor. For the most part this is the case.

But, unfortunately, within this province we have individuals that will do the bare minimum, and we even have general contractors that see it in their best interest to actually hold on to the monies provided by owners in their bank accounts for as long as they possibly can. The reason for this, as was described to me by many a subcontractor regardless of what kind of subcontractor they were, whether they were, you know, an electrician, a drywaller, everybody, is that it would be beneficial for them to hold on to that money inside of their own bank account because, of course, they're collecting interest on it. Now, if it was just one month, well, maybe that's not a big deal. But you know that when you're going 60, 90 days, all of a sudden now we're, like, 120 days after the work has been completed on a particular contract and they're still holding on to that money: you can imagine that they're getting a significant amount of interest on the money that they're actually holding inside of their bank account. That's but one factor, one reason why general contractors would do this, right?

Now, I'm so happy that we did a number of consultations through Service Alberta when we were in government, but of course one of my biggest regrets is that we actually didn't get to bring this piece of legislation in front of the House. That being said, we were on track to do so. We did all the legwork. I went across the province, and I talked to so many subcontractors. So I'm really glad that when this government came in, this was a file that they didn't let go of. I'm glad that the Minister of Service Alberta continued working on this particular issue and concern of subcontractors and has actually brought this bill before the House. Regardless of a very, you know, minimal substantial amendment that was required, that the government saw in their piece of legislation, we've managed to reach what I consider to be a pretty good agreement on this.

I can only hope that, with time, this will benefit all stakeholders involved in the work that's being done in the private sector because, of course, as I may have mentioned before, Madam Speaker, while we were in government, we actually addressed it on the public side. We did a number of issues to actually help subcontractors who were working on public projects. When they weren't being paid by a general contractor, they were given a 1-800 number where they could call, they could double-check to see if the general contractor had been paid for a particular job so that when they completed their work, they could make sure that they were getting paid on time.

I want to remind the House how important this bill is. I know so many people – and I'm sure that the members on the other side do, too; they know a lot of these people personally – and how hard they work in order to make sure that their businesses are successful, that they do their work honourably. They go in to a job, they get the job done, and they do it to the best of their ability, you know, and they take pride in the work that they do. So when a contract is not honoured because of a misunderstanding, because that's often – well, I can't even pretend to know what's going through the minds of certain people when they're withholding payment.

For the majority of cases I can tell you that there were many subcontractors who would come to me and be like: "You know

what? Ninety-nine per cent of the work was done. There may have been, like, one thing here, one thing there that wasn't completed according to specifications, but I am so willing to go back in there and get that job done the way that the general contractor wants to get it done." But for some reason there was just confusion and there was misunderstanding and miscommunication. Instead of things being worked out, well, the general contractor would just hold out, like: "I'm not going to pay. I'm not going to pay because of one or two things that weren't done properly." Of course, they would hold on to this amount of money, and then individuals weren't getting paid on time.

Of course, to me it's important that we acknowledge this and that we're rectifying it. I'm thankful for that, but I want us to understand that at the end of the day these general contractors, everybody who gives so much time and energy towards these projects and they're doing it in an honourable way, working, they have families. They have families, those are Albertans, and I'm so happy that this particular piece of legislation is now before us in third reading, Madam Speaker. I'm so happy to support it. I can honestly – I'd like to think that we all had a part to play in making sure that this piece of legislation is, hopefully, going to pass third reading here shortly.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Any other members wishing to join debate on Bill 37 in third reading?

Seeing none, would the minister like to close debate?

Mr. Glubish: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am pleased to rise to speak one last time on Bill 37, which brings amendments to the Builders' Lien Act by bringing a prompt-payment system into the construction industry here in Alberta. Here is the problem we face today: construction companies are not getting paid in a timely manner for the work that they have completed. This is a serious problem with grave financial consequences, pushing many companies to the brink of bankruptcy. This problem is real, it's growing, and it has been a problem for at least a decade. This problem needs to be fixed.

Madam Speaker, in my earlier speeches on this bill I have highlighted many stories from members of the Alberta construction industry who have been calling for action on this matter for many years, so I'm very pleased to be moving on this and bringing relief to the construction industry well within my first two years as Minister of Service Alberta. This legislation is all about strengthening the construction industry in Alberta. This is all about protecting jobs in the construction industry in Alberta. The changes we proposed in this bill give confidence and certainty to all parties working in construction, from project owners and general contractors to subcontractors. That confidence will help Alberta job creators and employers to expand their businesses, attract investment, and create more jobs.

3:10

I'm sure that we can all agree, Madam Speaker, that today, as we remain in the midst of the global COVID-19 pandemic, this is incredibly important. We need this certainty and confidence more than ever. Alberta's construction industry employs roughly 1 in 10 Albertans, so when we say that there is an issue of timeliness of payments for work completed in the construction industry, what we are also saying is that that contributes to paycheque uncertainty for a large number of hard-working Albertans. That's why it is so important that we work with the industry to bring forward these changes so quickly.

This bill would not be what it is today or where it is today without the input and involvement of so many industry members, and I want to thank all of those who have contributed to the conversations to date on issues of prompt payment. I'm grateful to each of those members for working with us to bring forward a prompt-payment system to address these problems. It's been an ongoing, highly consultative process, and I expect that as we continue to work towards fleshing out the regulations, it will continue in a very collaborative way. I will personally work to ensure that that happens.

Should this legislation pass, Madam Speaker, I am committed to ensuring that when it is proclaimed next July, this legislation and its accompanying regulations are exactly the solution that Alberta's construction industry needs. Ultimately this will ensure that small, medium, and large construction companies all across the province will be in a stronger financial position and be better equipped to face whatever challenges may arise in the years to come. We cannot afford to wait any longer on this, so I urge all members of this Assembly to vote in favour of this legislation.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 37 read a third time]

Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

Bill 50 Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020

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

Mr. Toews: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to move second reading of Bill 50, the Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020.

The supplementary amounts provided by this bill reflect the fiscal picture outlined in the mid-year fiscal update. The total amount requested from the general revenue fund is \$5.7 billion. These funds will ensure the government is able to meet its obligations and fulfill its commitments for the current year, including resourcing our health care system in its response to the COVID-19 pandemic, funding to municipalities as part of the safe restart initiative, capital grants for infrastructure projects as part of the municipal stimulus program, funding abandonment and reclamation work on oil and gas sites as part of the site rehabilitation program, furthering technology innovation and emissions reductions projects, covering the Workers' Compensation Board premium abatement, maintaining and renewing schools, funding infrastructure projects across the province, including repairs and expansions for highways and bridges.

Madam Speaker, while I've outlined the largest items, this bill will also provide funding for many more projects and important initiatives to support Albertans during the pandemic and our province's economic recovery. I respectfully urge my colleagues in this House to support the bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Any members wishing to join debate on third reading? The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and speak on second reading to Bill 50. Just to add my comments to what I'm sure other colleagues have already said, it is certainly understandable that the government needs additional funding to deal with the pandemic. Certainly, that is understandable, and I'm

hoping that the minister will be able to provide some clarity to some of the questions that I have today.

I'd like to start, first, with just the document. I have some questions about the document, the 2020-21 Mid-year Fiscal Update and Economic Statement. On page 6 government talks about operating expenses: "Operating expense (excluding COVID-19/Recovery Plan) is forecast to be \$47.7 billion, a decrease of . . . \$64 million from budget." The first bullet point talks about "\$129 million due to lower caseloads in income support programs," which are in Community and Social Services. I'm wondering because I don't – certainly, there is always fluctuation in caseload in this particular program. But I do know that a number of people on income support, particularly barriers to employment – there is a sliding scale. If they're successful in finding work and securing work while they're transitioning, they're actually able to keep some of their income to augment the really small amount that they get from income support.

We know that what happened when things got locked down in the spring is that a lot of people lost jobs. That includes people on income support. We know, then, that many were eligible to receive CERB. We know that CERB ran from March 15 to October 3. My question is: how much of that \$129 million in lower caseload costs in income support is related to federal funding? That is my first question.

My second question really goes to – I'd like to focus, well, anyone's attention, really, on the 2020-21 supplementary estimates. Page 24 looks at expense in the Ministry of Community and Social Services. It talks about "\$14,400,000 for the COVID-19 federal agreement for wage top-ups to disability workers." Well, Madam Speaker, I was happy to see this number but a little bit surprised because that is not what I have heard from Alberta's disability workers. As I've said before in this place, there are tens of thousands of disability workers right across the province, and I absolutely believe that they earned, that they need a wage top-up. This is a group of people that are not paid very much, primarily women. They do tend to have to work a few different jobs to support themselves.

I think that they have done a phenomenal job, actually, during this pandemic keeping people safe. If anyone has ever supported someone with a disability, sometimes it can be quite challenging when routines change, particularly routines where everything changes, and you're stuck at home now, and it's a complete life change. That, in itself, can be fairly challenging to find meaningful activities. You know, this is a group that has done an amazing job keeping people safe. Certainly, there have been outbreaks in different places, but I've not heard of the devastation there as we have, obviously, in long-term care or supported living.

I would really appreciate an answer about: where did those federal dollars go? If we did in fact receive federal transfers specifically for disability workers, as this document would suggest, or if at least some of the funds are being directed there, I would like to know where. Where did it go? Did it go to direct operations? Did it go to community disability supports? Did it go to family-managed supports? Was it in-year contracts? What happened? Where did it go? That would be most helpful.

Flipping over to the next page, page 25, if you go down, you can see the different lines in this particular ministry, where it looks like they're going to need some additional funds. I have some questions about that. One of the lines, line 3, is assured income for the severely handicapped; 3.2 is actually the line that says "financial assistance grants," which really are AISH payments. They call it grants, but that's what it is. See here that they have fallen somewhat short and need to augment this budget.

Now, I just want to draw people's attention to the fact that – I think it was last week; well, no, it's the week before – we saw the Auditor General's report, the November 2020 report, where the AG talked about this government's \$1.6 billion in accounting errors. One of those very significant errors was related to AISH. Based on the timeline from that audit report we saw that in November of 2019 ministry officials – I have no idea who – clearly understood that the growth of that particular program was not keeping pace with the budget. If you'll recall, Madam Speaker, in budget estimates we repeatedly asked this question. What are you going to do when the amount that you budgeted for AISH doesn't keep pace with growth, population growth, people turning 18 that become eligible, people that become injured, people that become more severely disabled? We just know based on – I think the average that we were using was probably based on the last five years at least. We all agreed on what that growth percentage was, and we could see that the budget wasn't matching.

3:20

The question was: what are you going to do? Are you going to reduce something? Is something going to go down? Are we going to change eligibility, which we've suggested a number of times? Unfortunately, the government used a piece of legislation, so eligibility can actually be changed outside of this Chamber. We don't get to debate that here anymore, so I guess we'll have to wait and see what happens. I would like to know what is going on with AISH. What is the actual growth? How many people are requiring this assistance?

The other question I have is on income support. We saw in the last budget that income support took a huge hit, a huge cut. For people that don't know, we have AISH, which is an income support program. Then we actually have something called income support, and there are two levels: barriers to employment, and then expected to work. Very often there are literally thousands of people with disabilities sitting on income support that are not yet on AISH or are in the process of applying for AISH, and they get about half of what AISH recipients get, but they have been able to survive, some of them because they got supplemental benefits. That means they got their little core, which is under \$900. Then they would have received a rent supplemental, maybe about \$300. Food supplemental I think it is, like, \$20. They would have received a medical transportation supplemental. That's about \$100. Those are being systematically cut by the UCP, by this government. We know that. That's just kind of a fact.

We know that's happening. We saw the budget was reduced, but I would like to know what amount has been clawed back from recipients, from AISH income support recipients and their spouses, because that's the kicker. It's not just a person who's on AISH or on income support that qualified for CERB because they lost work, but it's also their spouse. If their spouse lost work, went on CERB, and is, because they're on CERB, earning more than they were at their job, now that person, the person who they live with, their spouse, their income is impacted by this change. It would be really great to know what's been clawed back or how many people have been moved off the rolls of AISH and income support onto the federal government rolls while they received CERB, while they received the new benefit that is very much similar to employment insurance, that would be very helpful.

The other question that I have is – one of the lines is persons with developmental disabilities. That is line 4.2. Again, it looks like it has fallen significantly shorter than what was originally budgeted. It makes sense where I'm imagining this expense comes from, but I would like some clarification for that. What happened when things locked down is that people lost jobs. They lost the ability to, if they

went to a day program or they volunteered somewhere or whatever – that all changed. They locked down. They had to stay home. Whereas before that they didn't need staff support; after that they did need staff support, so there were increased costs, especially for, you know, people that were perhaps still in school. We sometimes have students past 18 that stay in school. Suddenly that's no longer an option. They're back at home. They need staff supports, because they can't be home alone.

We know that there have been a number of changes. I would like to know – within persons with developmental disabilities we're asking for additional funds for this program. That's great. I would like to know specifically why. Has there been an increase in caseload growth? Are there new people that are receiving PDD supports? Are there in-year increases for people that already have PDD contracts? I mean with community service providers as well as family-managed supports.

I would also like to know: is any of this increase going to community service providers or family-managed support financial administrators for increased COVID costs? That's what I've heard, Madam Speaker. I've heard from providers all over the province.

I'm sure that we can all agree that, politics aside, if you're supporting someone with a disability or multiple people with disabilities, you can imagine what those increased costs are. Suddenly you have no more activities, you're focused at home, you need additional staffing, obviously you need PPE. Very often you're providing very personal support where the distance, you know, you have to be very close to somebody. We know that there are all of these increased costs, increased cleaning costs. We know that the staffing costs have gone through the roof just because of the sheer number of people that have to isolate and quarantine, a lot of staff having been exposed to COVID by a person with a disability. That's just the reality. However, I'm happy to say that for the most part people are doing very well. They're exhausted, they're very, very tired, they're overworked, and they're underpaid, quite frankly. You know, going back to my earlier question: how much of the federal agreement for wage top-up is going specifically to disability workers? It's right here on page 24, so it would be really good to get an answer to that.

Going back to persons with developmental disabilities. What would be really helpful at this point, where the request is being made for increased funds, is what the percentage is, the breakdown is between the people being supported in direct operations – well, actually, no, excuse me; not direct operations but in community support delivered by service providers as opposed to community supports or disability supports delivered with family-managed contracts. That would be very helpful.

We've asked about AISH caseload growth, asked about PDD caseload growth, asked about income support changes, asked about the depth and breadth of the clawbacks that have occurred because of the CERB benefits – and not just clawbacks, so not just the amount that you take back every month, but I'm talking about where there've been people that have been completely moved off of the rolls of, say, AISH to a federal benefit.

What we're hearing also is that – I would also like to know if people are losing their medical services card. For the members that may not understand this program or know it, people that are on AISH – let's say that they're transitioning. They have a disability, they finally get a job, and they're working more and more, they're working up towards it. As they earn more, their benefits go down, and until, you know, we're certain we get to that point, they get to keep the medical services card because, as you could imagine, their equipment and medication is often very expensive when it is disability related. So people are able to retain those medical services and then continue to work until they get to the place where they're

independent and then free of AISH, off they go. But I'm hearing anecdotally that some people who are transferring from a provincial benefit to a federal benefit because of COVID are losing the medical services. I would just like to know: throughout this COVID period or at least in this financial reporting period, how many people on AISH or income support have lost health benefits, medical services? That would be very, very helpful.

I did actually, not in this Chamber, watch some of the exchange yesterday as members asked questions and some answers were given. You know, I would like more clarity around the federal transfers to Alberta. We know that it's \$2.2 billion higher. I don't think that we received a lot of clarity yesterday about where those funds are going, so I'm going to add my question to that, and that is specifically to disability workers. Just to remind the Chamber that \$2.2 billion – higher than what we expected, thankfully. We needed that. We're in a public health crisis. We have \$1.3 billion to a safe restart – I look forward to seeing details on that – \$263 million, safe return to class; \$215 million in wage top-up, that was labour market assistance; and then, of course, \$1 billion to site rehabilitation, not all of that being received right now. I do understand that.

Those are my questions, Madam Speaker. I will look forward to getting some information. Any information would be great at this point from government members or ministers or whomever has information and is willing to answer questions. With that, I will take my seat.

Thank you.

3:30

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

Mr. Hanson: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's a pleasure to speak up on supplementary supply even though the members opposite might think we're still in committee. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic our government has been allocating billions of dollars to support our COVID response and support our health care system. As the Minister of Health said yesterday, the updated estimate on this amount is around \$1.7 billion. Although this is an astounding amount of money, each dollar is necessary to carry out an effective response to these unprecedented times.

The \$1.7 billion breaks down as follows: consumption of personal protective equipment, drugs, and testing supplies, \$625 million; contact tracing and lab testing, \$344 million. This includes all of the amounts that relate to the testing, including the assessment centres that AHS set up throughout the province, the contact tracing as well as the data management that was required for both the testing and the contact tracing.

Also part of the \$2.7 billion is continuing care, \$271 million. This \$271 million is the most diverse line item discussed as it includes funding for our continuing care operators, for enhanced staffing, extra cleaning supplies, lost accommodation revenue as well as increased health care aide staffing levels. Madam Speaker, it is worth noting that there were a \$2 top-up wage and paid student practicum positions as well. As well, there was additional funding for all of the AHS long-term care as well as designated supportive living operated facilities throughout the province.

It is worth noting that although this funding model outlines a clear level of response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the response to the pandemic is consistently evolving. This is a dynamic situation that requires dynamic responses. That is why our government is committed to monitoring the impact of COVID on the province, including the health system, to continue to respond and make sure we're working very closely with AHS to ensure that they have all of the resources they need.

This dynamic approach is something our government has been practising for months. In January and February this year we purchased personal protective equipment, PPE, anticipating possible shortages based on trends in other provinces. We used our purchasing power in one integrated system here in Alberta to be able to buy not just enough PPE for the first wave but also for future waves such as right now. What this example shows is that the data collection that our government is committed to provides us with the flexibility to respond to the developing pandemic in real time and to also anticipate future issues, making our province more prepared.

As we move closer and closer towards a possible vaccine to COVID-19, our government is working with the federal government as it enters agreements with possible vaccine manufacturers. However, at this point it is just too early to estimate the costs of purchasing and distributing a vaccine. At this moment we are working to ensure that we have the medical infrastructure to effectively store and distribute this vaccine. While this is not as specific as, I am sure, people would like to hear, the fact is that we cannot know the exact parameters around a vaccine that does not yet exist on the market. As I said earlier, our government has committed to a dynamic response and will continue to monitor developments of a vaccine so that we can act as soon as one becomes available.

Until then, as I mentioned, the most significant part of our response budget is the PPE, the personal protective equipment. That's \$625 million of our budget. Right now our front-line health care workers are consuming PPE at a rising rate as they continue to care for patients. Ensuring that our province maintains an adequate amount of PPE for our health care workers is a top priority.

As our province continues to weather the COVID storm, we are ready to react to whatever may come our way. With the health budget we are not confining our response just to the issues of today; we are also ready to react to any significant changes. The health and safety of Albertans are our top priority. Ensuring that we have adequate access to PPE, adequate contact tracing and lab testing, all while maintaining a great level of continuing care for patients will help Alberta fight this pandemic effectively.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Seeing none, any other members wishing to join debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Manning.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to rise and acknowledge that we will be supporting this bill. We recognize that this money is related to COVID, and of course we want to make sure that the government has the money that they need to be able to address the pandemic in the province.

In saying that, though, as much as I appreciate the hon. member that just spoke before me making comments about us asking questions, there is a reason why we are doing that. Of course, we're asking questions because what we've seen already is that there have been transfers of funds from the federal government to the provincial government that haven't been even utilized yet by this province. We see a bill that's currently in front of us for monies that are being identified to help address COVID at the same time that we are seeing that there is still money on the table that hasn't been spent.

Although I appreciate the hon. member prior to me speaking about PPE – I agree. We should be making sure that our health care workers have access to all the PPE that they need. He made a comment about rising rates of access and rising rates of use around PPE. That's a very important point. We recognize that our health

care workers right now are using PPE on a daily basis, using more than probably one or two PPE. They're using a variety throughout their shifts because they need to, you know, take them off and put new ones on.

What we don't see is the transfer of funds that has come from the federal government in regard to wage top-ups for those health care workers. I appreciate that the Alberta government is putting money into the budget for interim supply for PPE. I'm glad to see that the government is taking the safety of our front-line workers and making sure that they have access to those, but what I would also like to see is that they have access to their wage top-ups in recognition of the hard work that they have been doing over the last 200-plus days of this pandemic.

What I'd also like to acknowledge is that at the same time that we're seeing that, when the press release came out on this piece of legislation and on supplementary supply, there were comments made about front-line workers and how they're not taxpayers and how they do nothing to support the economy. Well, let's be clear. In respect to taxpayers who are front-line workers and are front-line health care workers, there was \$3 million that was given from Ottawa to help support front-line workers and their wage subsidy.

You know, we hear a lot from this government about transfer payments and how we send money to Ottawa and we never get anything back. Well, we have seen money come back. We've seen \$300 million come back, which is actually 3 to 1 of what the province is actually spending on PPE and wage subsidies. Yet that money hasn't been all spent yet. We haven't seen the province take the money that's come back from Ottawa to Alberta to meet the needs of what's going on with COVID. The province hasn't even spent it yet, not all of it. They've spent some of it, for sure. There's that piece.

We overall have received \$47 million, the money that the minister has said has no strings attached, and we've unofficially seen that about \$347 million was allocated. Currently the government is using language that we suspect that Alberta has allocated over \$300 million based on the population, but of course we don't know that because we have no transparency right now about where this money is going and where it's come from.

Again, we go back to this. We give \$4.7 billion to corporations, but we won't give the \$100 million to essential workers when we get \$300 million from the federal government to help with wage subsidies. That money is there, yet we haven't seen it be put where it belongs, which is with the working people of this province, the people that that money has been allocated for, but we have a bill currently in front of us that is pushing through corporate tax giveaways.

Again, I want to go back to – when we see this conversation and we hear things about, “Well, look at all the PPE that we're giving the front-line workers”: well, yeah. I mean, I don't know why that should be something we celebrate. That's common sense. Our nurses need their PPE. Our doctors need their PPE, our porters, our clerks, the people in the hospital that are being exposed to COVID on a daily basis because they work in health care. That's not: look at us; we should be celebrating all the money that we're giving towards PPE. That's a common-sense tool that we need to be giving our front-line workers access to, the very tools they need to do their jobs. It's not a gift. It is the reality of the work, of the environment that they live in.

But what we would like to see is that wage subsidy that was already transferred from the federal government put where it belongs and not just sitting in general revenue creating interest for the government to help, you know, balance their books. Put the money where it belongs. Stop having it sit in bank accounts. We

also have seen through this the 11,000 workers that we've talked about being laid off.

3:40

Again, as much as I appreciate the government standing and talking about investments and vaccines and, "Look at all the good things that we're doing," the reality of it is that we haven't seen this money go where it's been allocated to go since the last fiscal update. What I would like to see – and why my colleagues continue to stand up, even while we're debating Bill 50 and we're not in Committee of the Whole anymore, is because we do have questions. We would like to see the Finance minister stand up, the minister of labour stand up and explain to us why there was money that was allocated for COVID-19 over the last eight months, last six months – I'll give some leeway there because there was some time the government needed to adjust to the pandemic – that hasn't been directly put where it was allocated to go. There is still money from the last fiscal update that we received that was designated to go to certain services that hasn't been allocated yet.

We will ask questions, as we see more money being allocated to COVID-19, as to where it will go and when it's going to be used, not because we think that there's an issue with it. We're asking the question because we want to support Albertans to get access to the financial supports that this government has committed to them, because that is our job, to ask those questions, and we want to make sure that the money that we were receiving from the federal government that has been allocated for PPE, for fast distribution, for wage subsidy is being used for that purpose and not sitting in general revenue gaining interest.

With that, I will close my remarks.

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

Seeing none, the hon. Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland.

Mr. Getson: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Happy Thursday. It's been pretty interesting here today.

Mr. Walker: Hear, hear.

Mr. Getson: "Hear, hear," says the Member for Sherwood Park. I think we're all getting to that point where we'd like to get home.

I would like to speak, though, to Bill 50 here. Madam Speaker, with the COVID pandemic posing so many immediate challenges to Albertans' families and businesses, it's actually easy to forget that there is life after COVID and the other challenges and the long-term challenges that we face in the province. The Alberta government responded to the pandemic and economic downturn with important supports for communities, businesses, and everyday people. Despite what you might hear in some of the press or from the opposition, actually things are going forward.

We have this thing called the economic recovery plan. It's an actual bold and ambitious strategy to get Albertans back to work, putting us on a path to a generation of growth. The main pillars of that recovery plan, Madam Speaker, are protection, job creation, building, and diversifying. Bill 50, the Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020, is an example of Alberta government's commitment to ensuring that Albertans meet our targets for recovery as well as maintaining our support for Albertans while we protect the health care system and bend that curve in light of the recent rise of COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and, of course, unfortunate deaths.

Since our election in the spring of 2019, Alberta's government has made it our mission to bring spending in line with other provinces, keep Alberta's net debt-to-GDP ratio well below 30 per

cent, and develop a plan to balance the budget once the pandemic is over. As the Minister of Finance mentioned during his second-quarter fiscal update, Alberta's government is continuing to be fiscally responsible. Our deficit has dropped by \$2.8 billion. That's right, Madam Speaker. It's dropped by \$2.8 billion, largely due to improving revenue and our government's efforts to hold the line on spending. Revenue for the last year is nearly \$3 billion higher than last quarter due to improved forecasts for nonrenewable resource revenue, tax revenue, gaming revenue, investment income, and transfers from the government of Canada.

While there is a long road ahead to full recovery, our economy is gradually emerging from the depths of a downturn. We continue to fight our way out of this devastating pandemic for everyone, Madam Speaker. It should not be forgotten that Alberta's government has done some tremendous work to achieve this while stimulating the economy and reducing emissions. Bill 50 highlights the continued commitment of our government to invest in the environment and make sure the environmental and economic stability programs help lower Alberta's greenhouse gas emissions and stimulate and initiate the economy. These programs include the technology innovation and emissions reduction system, or TIER as it is otherwise commonly known, as in newspapers, media, et cetera; low-carbon economy leadership fund projects; the watershed resiliency and restoration program; the Alberta community resilience program; the strategic energy management for large final emitters program – there's a mouthful; I'll say that one again: the strategic energy management for large final emitters program – the public land management fund; and other community environmental projects.

Our government has proven that Albertans do not need to cede jurisdiction of our natural resources to Ottawa in order to actually take practical and effective action on environmental matters. Our province has been doing it for two decades and plans to continue that going forward. The TIER system is an example of Alberta partnering with industry to meet our environmental and economic targets through meaningful relationships. TIER is funded by large industry players who pay into the fund when they do not meet the emissions targets. The fund is paying into the system and is used to accelerate development and deployment of clean technology projects. This is beneficial not only to Albertans and to our communities but also has a positive impact on the industry as it further proves their commitment to be environmental, social, and governance leaders.

This positive partnership can be seen in the Minister of Environment and Parks' recent announcement that the Alberta government is using \$280 million from the TIER fund and the federal low-carbon economy leadership fund to support projects that reduce emissions even further. This investment will get 5,000 Albertans back to work in industries of all sizes and across all sectors, and it will reduce an estimated 13 million tonnes of emissions by 2030, equivalent to taking 4 million cars off the road. That's right, Madam Speaker, and unlike that haphazard carbon tax plan that was put in by the opposition, we have metrics that we can actually perform and report to.

Alberta's industries have a strong reputation as leaders in innovation and technology, made possible by forward-thinking companies that are not only benefiting from the cost savings and the emission reduction initiatives under TIER but are going one step further by spearheading their own emission reduction targets and plans. Yesterday in this House the minister spoke further about the work the government is doing on emissions reduction, highlighting the significant investment of almost \$750 million. This has been matched with contributions from industry of over \$1.15 billion,

totalling \$1.9 billion. It's estimated that this investment will create over 9,000 jobs inside our province.

Another program that will receive additional funding under Bill 50 is the watershed resiliency and restoration program. The WRRP is a program that increases Alberta's natural ability to reduce the intensity, magnitude, duration, and effects of flooding through mitigating measures. It aims to restore degraded areas in order to enhance a community's ability to withstand future flooding and droughts.

Madam Speaker, these programs are important to Alberta's commitment to reduce emissions and uphold our campaign promise of conservation and common-sense land management. On top of our environmental support, these programs are also essentially our economic recovery. Times are tough, but Albertans are tougher. By investing in communities, industry, and job creators, Alberta's government will continue to work with industry towards a more sustainable and more competitive future for our environment and our economy. That's what real Albertans do. We push ourselves to do better by doing the right things because it's the right thing to do.

Thank you.

The Deputy Speaker: Any members wishing to speak under Standing Order 29(2)(a)?

Seeing none, any other members wishing to join debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this interim supply bill. It's always interesting to get a chance to peek at the interim supply. It's a chance for government members to stand up and talk about the great things that they're doing, and I appreciate that that's what they wish to do. What it also does is reveal where they're not putting their priorities and the kind of work that could be done that they are failing to do. Clearly, you know, there are government programs. You can always stand up and announce those programs, but you aren't actually giving a true, full picture of what is supposed to be happening in the House.

I want to just take a moment to follow up a little bit on what a previous speaker, Edmonton-Manning, was just asking about. I think that we really need to look at how this government, while they say that they're doing good things and they say that they care about workers and so on, have really not demonstrated that in terms of their relationship with workers in the community. You know, the big defining factor, which every speaker gets up and talks about as they talk about interim supply, is the fact that much of what is happening is defined by COVID. It's also been defined by the most negative relationship between the government and the people who work in the public health sector. I'm very concerned . . .

3:50

The Sergeant-at-Arms: Order!

Mr. Feehan: Sorry. I'm aware. Do you want me to leave and come back?

The Deputy Speaker: I think that would be best.

Mr. Feehan: I'm sorry?

The Deputy Speaker: I think that would be best. Sorry, hon. member.

Mr. Feehan: Sorry. Be right back, then.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other members wishing to join debate? The hon. Member for Calgary-Peigan.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It comes as no surprise that throughout this year our province has been through a tough time. The global health crisis, the economic recession, and the ongoing weakening of oil prices have left an overwhelming impact on our government's financial situation. Our government had to react quickly to an unprecedented crisis, which required allocation of funds to be altered to pay for the effects of COVID-19.

Yesterday the Minister of Municipal Affairs outlined the reality of how the unexpected costs of the pandemic affected their budget and what it will take to start working towards a balanced budget once the pandemic is over. Municipalities in Alberta needed help, Madam Speaker. This government provided them with supports to address governance and challenges that resulted from this pandemic that they desperately needed. Those supports included \$500 million for the municipal stimulus program, \$208.3 million for disaster recovery, and further COVID-19 pandemic responses.

A program that stood out was the municipal stimulus program. It was developed as a key component to get Albertans back to work. This innovative program will provide \$500 million in funding across the province for shovel-ready projects and shovel-worthy projects that will create jobs for Albertans while building critical infrastructure that will be used by generations to come.

On top of the municipal stimulus program, the minister discussed the safe restart program. This is another program that is a direct response to the effects the pandemic had on our municipalities. It gives them the resources they need during this unprecedented time and allows municipalities to continue to support their citizens, provide essential services, and invest in infrastructure to get people back to work.

The cost of COVID-19 has impacted each and every Albertan. Although the impact may be different for each and every person, every Albertan is going through this unprecedented time together. Our government committed to action. We committed to practical solutions to combat the harsh effects of this virus on our people, our livelihoods, and our province, and I am proud to say that that is exactly what we are doing, Madam Speaker. The UCP government saw that temporary solutions are not the way to handle the large impacts that COVID-19 has had on our province. Now is not the time to wait and see what happens when there is no money left. Now is the time to put critical mechanisms in place in order to protect the future of Albertans. Through the carefully thought out recovery plan, our government planned ahead for what Albertans need now and in the future.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs has taken concrete action on what municipalities need in this province, and the biggest thing they need is to get citizens back to work. Through these solutions our government has taken action on, we are doing just that. These programs are not temporary handouts either. They are programs that build a stronger Alberta. Temporary handouts are temporary solutions, and Alberta is a resilient province. Albertans don't need temporary solutions. When times are tough, Albertans find a way to fix it long term, and long term is what we will do. Long term is renewing the Alberta advantage. It is paving the pathway to prosperity through creative and innovative ways such as direct supplies of PPE when Albertans needed it most or stimulus for infrastructure projects that our province desperately needs, projects that will get Albertans back to work now and provide sustainability in the future.

I thank the minister for her tremendous dedication and tireless efforts to Albertans during this difficult time. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Seeing none, any other members wishing to join debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Dach: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise to speak to supplementary supply estimates this afternoon in the House, a Thursday afternoon, and I wanted to start by saying that the government has given me an opportunity to dwell on some topics that are near and dear to my heart and also germane to debate that took place earlier today during question period. I'm referring, of course, first to page 16 of the '20-21 supplementary supply estimates, general revenue fund, document. Under the heading Agriculture and Forestry on page 16 a supplementary amount of \$72,608,000 is requested, and under one of those bullets it states that \$25 million will be requested "for wildfire response and prevention to mitigate potential risk during the pandemic."

Well, Madam Speaker, that sounds exactly like the type of thing that the rappel firefighters would be responsible for doing if they still actually existed in Alberta. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, of course, saw fit to cut the rappel firefighting program. Back about a year ago, in November, when we were fighting to maintain this program, the FOIP request that was made showed that the total savings by the government of Alberta in cutting this program turned out to be about \$1.4 million annually. Of course, the government claimed that it was a big cost-saving measure and that there will be more efficient means of fighting forest fires or, as the document I have before me suggests, providing a "wildfire response and prevention to mitigate potential risk," in this case during the pandemic.

That figure is \$25 million. Well, of course, if you take the \$1.4 million that was determined during the FOIP request for information, the amount that it was determined would be saved on an annual basis, and you divide that into \$25 million, Madam Speaker, you come up with about 18 years' worth of rappel firefighter budgetary amounts. In other words, this amount that's being requested to suppress wildfires and prevent and mitigate the potential risk of wildfires during the pandemic, this \$25 million, would have sustained the rappel firefighting unit for 18 years.

It shows, Madam Speaker, I think, how disingenuous the argument was by the government about the huge amount of cost savings that would be made by the government by getting rid of the program. It still behooves me, Madam Speaker, to say that this program was cut. Of course, you can call me the rap attack that just won't go away, but I still campaign, as I do now on my feet in this House, to have the government revisit this rappel attack firefighting program in the face of this supplementary supply estimates request for \$25 million for fire suppression, wildfire response and prevention during a pandemic period. We've got 25 million bucks allocated and requested, yet \$1.4 million was considered an exorbitant expense to keep a program that's been around for 40 years.

Some of those firefighters, unfortunately, have gone. Those elite firefighters have gone to British Columbia. Some are employed in regular, quote, unquote, firefighting duties with the fire service here in Alberta still. But many of them are lost, and their talents are gone for good. Of course, retraining is a costly measure. How much of that \$25 million that's going for wildfire response and mitigation during the pandemic, that is being asked for now, would it have cost to retrain some of these elite firefighters?

4:00

How much of this \$25 million might have been saved if indeed we had the very first point-of-attack crew, the 63 firefighters of the rappel attack crew, still in place? Would this money have been necessary as an expenditure? Would this request have been made

for \$25 million to mitigate fires and provide for wildfire response during the pandemic if indeed that rap attack crew was in place? We dismantled something that was working extremely well for 25 years. I know that there was an inquiry done, a report produced, and it showed that they were good value for money. The many proud members of the Alberta rappel team begged the minister to reconsider, and of course at this point so far he has not.

You can see clearly, Madam Speaker, that I and many others in this province have not given up on the desire to see the rappel crew brought back before too much time has passed, before this next fire season begins, in fact. With \$25 million on the table for wildfire response, new dollars that are being requested, I see no reason that \$1.4 million a year couldn't be allocated to bring back this elite fire protection that, right there in the line item, this \$25 million is supposed to be paying for. I'm flabbergasted, and I call upon the government to bring back this rap attack firefighting crew to do exactly what they say they want this \$25 million to do, and that is to mitigate potential risks during the pandemic of wildfires. You can rest assured, Madam Speaker, that this is not the last that you'll hear from me on this topic.

There were numerous campaigns in rural Alberta, in many communities in the foothills, and in northern Alberta, where you find our boreal forest and our forestry industry, that many, many Albertans – I believe the number is 40,000 – depend upon for their direct employment. They were going to the extent of hiring their own billboards to demand that the government revisit their decision to kill the Alberta rappel team. Of course, it was to no avail. But that's a pretty strong response in rural Alberta to a government decision which really went to the core of what this government supposedly purports to be, and that is a champion of rural Alberta, yet they were driven – not just the rappel attack firefighters but the community, in support of those firefighters, was taking out billboards, demanding that the government change course on this decision.

That request, that demand, fell on deaf ears, just as the request for reconsidering the taxation of infrastructure and oil field infrastructure in rural areas fell on deaf ears, even when counties and rural municipalities were screaming that it was going to bankrupt them, that 30 to 40 per cent of their income was disappearing because of the policies of the government. The government turned its back on rural Alberta on that issue as well, also giving the oil and gas companies the ability to not pay their taxes. Same thing: it hurt municipalities, rural municipalities, and it really, really cut their budgets, cut their revenues, and that's still an issue that's not yet solved.

Killing the rap program was one other example of this government taking rural Alberta for granted. Even when they're begging the government to change its mind, it still said: "No. We're committed to doing what we're doing. We know you're going to vote for us anyways, so we're just going to go ahead and kill this program." I think that that is a glaring example in the supplementary supply estimates of this government once again being deaf to the demands of rural Alberta. Twenty five million dollars on the table for wildfire response during the pandemic, yet a year ago, less than a year ago the government saw fit to kill a program which was valuable, good value for money, and which got wildfires under control quickly and satisfied the needs and fears of rural Albertans who live proximate to our forests. Their desires went unheard once again.

The \$1.4 million that it would have cost on an annual basis: 18 years' worth of that money, \$25 million, is being requested during these supply estimates. When you look at that decision to kill that \$1.4 million program, you wonder about the logic of it. It really doesn't make any sense, so I'm going to keep up the pressure on the

government to consider the reinstatement of this rap attack team, and you'll hear more from me in future on that matter.

However, I will turn my attention now to a secondary part of the supply estimates request on page 16, once again with respect to Agriculture and Forestry, Madam Speaker. Of course, the supplementary amount of \$72,608,000 total is requested, and under that in the bullet points you'll see on page 16 that there's \$3,411,000 for federal COVID-19 support in the forestry industry. Let me repeat that again: \$3,411,000 for federal COVID-19 support in the forestry industry. Now, that in and of itself is well and good, but what this implies is that the provincial government is involved in a matching fund program with the federal government wherein they are providing \$3,411,000 of provincial money to somehow dovetail with federal money to obtain federal COVID support money in the forestry industry.

Now, of course, over the years the provincial government has been known to participate in matching programs with the federal government. It's a fairly common practice in Canada and many other jurisdictions for one jurisdiction of government to do a matching fund, shared-cost program, yet we heard today, earlier in question period, the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, from the ND opposition, speak about \$300 million sitting on the table in Ottawa, all because the provincial government, our provincial government, the Alberta government, has so far failed to reach an agreement to engage in a matching fund agreement with the federal government for this wage top-up, wage supports for public servants. As a result, we have roughly \$300 million that is sitting in Ottawa that could have been in the pockets of Alberta public servants, who are entitled to it, provided that the provincial government antes up with their portion of it, presumably about \$100 million.

For what purpose? Why would you leave \$300 million on the table when it is the practice, the long-standing practice of the provincial government, as is shown on page 16, to participate in matching programs with the federal government to obtain federal money for certain specific programs? Yet with this particular wage support program, the wage top-up that the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods brought to light in question period this afternoon, we had \$300 million sitting in Ottawa when it should be here in Alberta in the pockets of public servants who could be spending it at local businesses at a time when they're begging for business.

It's unbelievable that this government would leave that. The explanation that we heard from – I think it was the Premier. It might have been the Finance minister. No, it was the Finance minister, Madam Speaker, now that I recall, who suggested that they were still arranging. They hadn't finalized the arrangements with Ottawa.

4:10

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, Standing Order 29(2)(a) is available. I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

Mr. Feehan: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to spend a few minutes reflecting on some of the things that have just been said by the previous speaker from Edmonton-McClung. I appreciate the fact that his concern is that this government is not taking the appropriate steps to act on behalf of members of this province who are essential workers and who are people that many describe as heroes at this time of COVID.

I know that this government has really depended on the federal government to provide funds for citizens in Alberta. They have done very little themselves, and it's interesting that in this supplementary

supply there's very little that is done to, you know, enhance the well-being of the workers who have been devastated by COVID. I mean, in fact, this government has used this time to attack front-line workers, to disparage them by making comments about them taking money out of the economy, which simply shows that they have a very poor understanding of how our economy works and, in this particular case, has not brought into the province \$300 million that they could easily have brought into this province. For every \$1 spent, they could be giving \$4 to front-line workers, and I think it is very problematic that this government would leave that kind of money on the table. I don't know why.

They've certainly relied on the federal government in every other way. They've relied on the federal government to provide CERB to workers, to provide rent subsidy programs to businesses. They've relied on the federal government to send extra money for the well reclamation, which they seem to be very proud about, but it's really a lot of federal money that's gone into this right now. Yet when it came time to actually give a chance for front-line workers to benefit from dollars that are sitting there on the table, as the Member for Edmonton-McClung has mentioned, they've just left those dollars to sit there and have failed to look at a way to put \$100 million up to get \$400 million back into the hands of workers in this province. I'm very discouraged that this government would neglect to do this kind of thing at a time when we certainly could use those extra dollars in this province. We certainly have a lot of people who would benefit from \$400 million circulating around in our economy, going to the local shops, keeping the small mom-and-pop operations open during this difficult time, doing the kinds of things that are good for this economy.

They're more than happy to give \$4.7 billion to foreign corporations that take the money and move their headquarters out of Calgary into places in the States, take all those jobs with them, literally pay them to fire people and move out of the country. It's very discouraging that they would do that. Then they had the chance to somehow balance that off in some minor way by helping out front-line workers. Don't forget: that money was available for people, including people who are working for minimum wage. They would have gotten a top-up had this government simply made a decision to apply for those monies from the federal government. It would have helped all those people who, you know, because of the low income that they presently have, would not be spending it on going to foreign lands like the big oil companies have been doing or buying back shares but, rather, going down to the local pizza parlour, going down to the local dress shop.

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. member, I hate to interrupt, but in accordance with Standing Order 64(3) the chair is required to put the question to the Assembly on the appropriation bill on the Order Paper for second reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 50 read a second time]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate all the members of the Assembly with their debate and their contributions today.

At this point I would move that the Assembly adjourn until 1:30 p.m. on Monday, November 30, 2020.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 4:16 p.m.]

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

Activity to Thursday, November 26, 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 Sitzings.

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 — 859-91 (*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 with amendments*)

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

Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force 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 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 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 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 on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 12, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force 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 on division*)

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 on division*)

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*)

Committee of the Whole — 1983-99 (*Jul. 14, 2020 aft.*), 2071-74 (*Jul. 15, 2020 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2264-68 (*Jul. 21, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2020 cP-30.8]

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.*), 1939-57 (*Jul. 13, 2020 eve.*), 1965-66 (*Jul. 13, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2050-51 (*Jul. 15, 2020 aft.*), 2053-59 (*Jul. 15, 2020 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c25]

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*)

Third Reading — 2181-83 (*Jul. 20, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force July 23, 2020, with certain sections taking effect March 17, 2020; SA 2020 cC-19.5]

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, with certain sections taking 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.*), 2031-32 (*Jul. 14, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c24]

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*)

Committee of the Whole — 1964-65 (*Jul. 13, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2081-86 (*Jul. 15, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force July 23, 2020; SA 2020 c20]

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*)

Committee of the Whole — 1999-2001 (*Jul. 14, 2020 aft.*), 2074-76 (*Jul. 15, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2076-81 (*Jul. 15, 2020 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force July 23, 2020; SA 2020 c19]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force July 23, 2020; SA 2020 c26]

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.*), 1962-63 (*Jul. 13, 2020 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2163-81 (*Jul. 20, 2020 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 2239-64 (*Jul. 21, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force September 1, 2020; SA 2020 c22]

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

First Reading — 1695 (*Jul. 6, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1783-84 (*Jul. 7, 2020 eve.*), 2032-37 (*Jul. 14, 2020 eve.*), 2086-2103 (*Jul. 15, 2020 eve.*), 2189-97 (*Jul. 20, 2020 eve.*), 2210-27 (*Jul. 21, 2020 aft.*), 2289-96 (*Jul. 22, 2020 aft.*), 2313-28 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve.*), 2360-61 (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 2432-475 (*Jul. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2512-20 (*Jul. 28, 2020 aft.*), 2523-31 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 2539-61 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve.*), 2562-69 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 29, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force July 29, 2020, with exceptions; SA 2020 c27]

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.*), 2023-31 (*Jul. 14, 2020 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2233-39 (*Jul. 21, 2020 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 2309-12 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force July 23, 2020; SA 2020 c21]

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.*), 2003-23 (*Jul. 14, 2020 eve.*), 2051-53 (*Jul. 15, 2020 aft.*), 2059-69 (*Jul. 15, 2020 aft.*), 2147-62 (*Jul. 20, 2020 aft.*), 2268-73 (*Jul. 21, 2020 eve.*), 2296-307 (*Jul. 22, 2020 aft.*), 2328-40 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve.*), 2361-63 (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 2404-32 (*Jul. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2475-85 (*Jul. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2502-12 (*Jul. 28, 2020 aft.*), 2531-39 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 2569-78 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve.*), 2579-86 (*Jul. 28, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 29, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c28]

Bill 33* — Alberta Investment Attraction Act (Fir)

First Reading — 1760-61 (*Jul. 7, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1807-19 (*Jul. 8, 2020 morn.*), 1927-37 (*Jul. 13, 2020 aft.*), 2117-27 (*Jul. 16, 2020 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2227-31 (*Jul. 21, 2020 aft.*), 2233 (*Jul. 21, 2020 eve.*), 2340-44 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve.*), 2312-13 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve.*), 2363-65 (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 2401-04 (*Jul. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2485-88 (*Jul. 27, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 29, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 cA-26.4]

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

First Reading — 1839 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1966-69 (*Jul. 13, 2020 eve.*), 2116-17 (*Jul. 16, 2020 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2117 (*Jul. 16, 2020 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 2312 (*Jul. 22, 2020 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Jul. 23, 2020 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2020 c23]

Bill 35 — Tax Statutes (Creating Jobs and Driving Innovation) Amendment Act, 2020 (Toews)

First Reading — 2616 (*Oct. 20, 2020 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2666-81 (*Oct. 21, 2020 aft.*), 2741-55 (*Oct. 26, 2020 eve.*), 2803-15 (*Oct. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2841-47 (*Oct. 28, 2020 aft.*), 2860-69 (*Oct. 28, 2020 eve.*), 2940-43 (*Nov. 2, 2020 eve.*), 2986-94 (*Nov. 3, 2020 eve.*), 3072-83 (*Nov. 5, 2020 aft.*), 3126-36 (*Nov. 16, 2020 eve.*), 3208-12 (*Nov. 17, 2020 eve.*), 3265-72 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve.*), 3361-65 (*Nov. 23, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 36 — Geothermal Resource Development Act (Savage)

First Reading — 2616 (*Oct. 20, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2696-2706 (*Oct. 22, 2020 aft.*), 2755-60 (*Oct. 26, 2020 eve.*), 2925-29 (*Nov. 2, 2020 eve.*), 2974-78 (*Nov. 3, 2020 aft.*), 3121-24 (*Nov. 16, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3224-32 (*Nov. 18, 2020 aft.*), 3292-94 (*Nov. 19, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 3336-42 (*Nov. 23, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 37* — Builders' Lien (Prompt Payment) Amendment Act, 2020 (Glubish)

First Reading — 2665 (*Oct. 21, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2774-84 (*Oct. 27, 2020 aft.*), 2828-38 (*Oct. 28, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3024-29 (*Nov. 4, 2020 aft.*), 3031-48 (*Nov. 4, 2020 eve.*), (*Nov. 24, 2020*), 3398-3401 (*Nov. 24, 2020 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 3529-30 (*Nov. 25, 2020 eve.*), 3544-45 (*Nov. 26, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 38 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Madu)

First Reading — 2665-66 (*Oct. 21, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2795-2800 (*Oct. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2838-41 (*Oct. 28, 2020 aft.*), 2884-93 (*Oct. 29, 2020 aft.*), 2960-65 (*Nov. 3, 2020 aft.*), 3124-26 (*Nov. 16, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3232-36 (*Nov. 18, 2020 aft.*), 3419-24 (*Nov. 24, 2020 eve.*), 3503-13 (*Nov. 25, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 39* — Child Care Licensing (Early Learning and Child Care) Amendment Act, 2020 (Schulz)

First Reading — 2827 (*Oct. 28, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2883-84 (*Oct. 29, 2020 aft.*), 2929-40 (*Nov. 2, 2020 eve.*), 2979-86 (*Nov. 3, 2020 eve.*), 3206-08 (*Nov. 17, 2020 eve.*), 3272-76 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3357-61 (*Nov. 23, 2020 eve.*), 3401-09 (*Nov. 24, 2020 aft.*), 3411-19 (*Nov. 24, 2020 eve.*), 3513-25 (*Nov. 25, 2020 eve., passed with amendments*)

Bill 40 — Forests (Growing Alberta's Forest Sector) Amendment Act, 2020 (Dreeshen)

First Reading — 2696 (*Oct. 22, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2784-93 (*Oct. 27, 2020 aft.*), 2800-03 (*Oct. 27, 2020 eve.*), 2849-59 (*Oct. 28, 2020 eve.*), 2965-74 (*Nov. 3, 2020 aft.*), 3136-38 (*Nov. 16, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3424-27 (*Nov. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 41 — Insurance (Enhancing Driver Affordability and Care) Amendment Act, 2020 (Toews)

First Reading — 2882 (*Oct. 29, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2915-24 (*Nov. 2, 2020 eve.*), 3011-23 (*Nov. 4, 2020 aft.*), 3051-58 (*Nov. 4, 2020 eve.*), 3164-73 (*Nov. 17, 2020 aft.*), 3255-65 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve.*), 3276 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 42 — North Saskatchewan River Basin Water Authorization Act (Nixon, JJ)

First Reading — 2907 (*Nov. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3009-11 (*Nov. 4, 2020 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3048-51 (*Nov. 4, 2020 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 3072 (*Nov. 5, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 43 — Financing Alberta's Strategic Transportation Act (McIver)

First Reading — 2956 (*Nov. 3, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3150-64 (*Nov. 17, 2020 aft.*), 3276-80 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 44 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Toews)

First Reading — 2956 (*Nov. 3, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3115-21 (*Nov. 16, 2020 eve.*), 3354-57 (*Nov. 23, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 45 — Local Authorities Election Amendment Act, 2020 (No. 2) (Allard)

First Reading — 3006 (*Nov. 4, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3175-79 (*Nov. 17, 2020 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3525-29 (*Nov. 25, 2020 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 46 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (No. 2) (Shandro)

First Reading — 3071 (*Nov. 5, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3176-92 (*Nov. 17, 2020 eve.*), 3342-54 (*Nov. 23, 2020 eve.*), 3459-65 (*Nov. 25, 2020 morn., adjourned on amendment*)

Bill 47 — Ensuring Safety and Cutting Red Tape Act, 2020 (\$) (Copping)

First Reading — 3070-71 (*Nov. 5, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3192-3206 (*Nov. 17, 2020 eve.*), 3236-45 (*Nov. 18, 2020 aft.*), 3367-73 (*Nov. 24, 2020 morn.*), 3427-41 (*Nov. 24, 2020 eve.*) , 3445-59 (*Nov. 25, 2020 morn., adjourned on amendment*)

Bill 48 — Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2020 (No. 2) (Hunter)

First Reading — 3096 (*Nov. 16, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3247-55 (*Nov. 18, 2020 eve.*), 3387-98 (*Nov. 24, 2020 aft.*), 3441-43 (*Nov. 24, 2020 eve., passed*)

Bill 50 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 3502 (*Nov. 25, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3545-52 (*Nov. 26, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 201 — Strategic Aviation Advisory Council Act (Gottfried)

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*), 1839 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly; not proceeded with*)

Bill 204 — Voluntary Blood Donations Repeal Act (Yao)

First Reading — 1839 (*Jul. 8, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 2288 (*Jul. 22, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly*)

Second Reading — 2379-93 (*Jul. 27, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2720-33 (*Oct. 26, 2020 aft.*), 2908-09 (*Nov. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 3096-3103 (*Nov. 16, 2020 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 205 — Genocide Remembrance, Condemnation and Prevention Month Act (Singh)

First Reading — 2718 (*Oct. 26, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 3070 (*Nov. 5, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly*)

Second Reading — 3103-08 (*Nov. 16, 2020 aft.*), 3307-14 (*Nov. 23, 2020 aft., passed*)

Bill 206 — Property Rights Statutes Amendment Act, 2020 (Glasgo)

First Reading — 2827 (*Oct. 28, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 3223-24 (*Nov. 18, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly*)

Second Reading — 3314-21 (*Nov. 23, 2020 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 207 — Reservists' Recognition Day Act (Rutherford)

First Reading — 3224 (*Nov. 18, 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; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 3292 (*Nov. 19, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly*)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Prayers | 3531 |
| Members' Statements | |
| COVID-19 Related Decision-making and Leadership..... | 3531 |
| Official Opposition Remarks on COVID-19 | 3531 |
| Provincial Parks..... | 3531 |
| Canada Emergency Commercial Rent Assistance Program..... | 3532 |
| COVID-19 Protective Measures..... | 3532 |
| Disability Caseload Growth Review..... | 3532 |
| Rural High-speed Internet | 3533 |
| COVID-19 and Seniors | 3533 |
| Opioid Addiction Treatment..... | 3533 |
| Oral Question Period | |
| COVID-19 Response Decision-making..... | 3533, 3544, 3538 |
| COVID-19 Testing and Case Increases | 3535 |
| Mask Policies | 3535 |
| Adoption Services | 3536 |
| Essential Service Provider Wage Supplements | 3536 |
| COVID-19 Response..... | 3537 |
| Agricultural Research and Development..... | 3538 |
| Energy Industry Jobs | 3539 |
| COVID-19 and Children's Programs and Activities | 3539 |
| School Attendance and Funding..... | 3540 |
| Arts and Culture Grant Programs | 3540 |
| Heroes Fund | 3541 |
| Notices of Motions | 3542 |
| Tabling Returns and Reports | 3542 |
| Orders of the Day | 3544 |
| Government Bills and Orders | |
| Third Reading | |
| Bill 37 Builders' Lien (Prompt Payment) Amendment Act, 2020..... | 3544 |
| Second Reading | |
| Bill 50 Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020 | 3545 |

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