



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Wednesday evening, June 16, 2021

Day 116

The Honourable Nathan M. Cooper, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 30th Legislature

Second Session

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

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

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

Party standings:

United Conservative: 60

New Democrat: 24

Independent: 3

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, QC, Clerk
Teri Cherkewich, Law Clerk

Trafton Koenig, Senior Parliamentary
Counsel

Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and
Director of House Services

Michael Kulicki, Clerk of Committees and
Research Services

Nancy Robert, Clerk of *Journals* and
Research Officer

Janet Schwegel, Director of Parliamentary
Programs

Amanda LeBlanc, Deputy Editor of *Alberta
Hansard*

Chris Caughell, Sergeant-at-Arms

Tom Bell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Paul Link, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

Jason Kenney	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Relations
Leela Aheer	Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women
Jason Copping	Minister of Labour and Immigration
Devin Dreesen	Minister of Agriculture and Forestry
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, Minister of Municipal Affairs
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
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. Rowswell

Eggen
Gray
Issik
Jones
Phillips
Singh
Yaseen

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Neudorf
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Barnes
Bilous
Irwin
Reid
Rosin
Rowswell
Sweet
van Dijken
Walker

Select Special Child and Youth Advocate Search Committee

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Jones

Fir
Goehring
Lovely
Nixon, Jeremy
Pancholi
Sabir
Smith

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goodridge
Deputy Chair: Ms Sigurdson

Amery
Carson
Glasgo
Gotfried
Loewen
Lovely
Pancholi
Rutherford
Sabir
Smith

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Schow
Deputy Chair: Mr. Sigurdson

Ceci
Lovely
Loyola
Rosin
Rutherford
Shepherd
Smith
Sweet
Yaseen

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Cooper
Deputy Chair: Mr. Ellis

Dang
Deol
Goehring
Goodridge
Long
Neudorf
Sabir
Sigurdson, R.J.
Williams

Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills

Chair: Mr. Ellis
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

Amery
Dang
Getson
Glasgo
Irwin
Nielsen
Rutherford
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
Ganley
Gotfried
Jones
Lovely
Loyola
Neudorf
Renaud
Williams

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Ms Phillips
Deputy Chair: Mr. Guthrie

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Lovely
Neudorf
Pancholi
Renaud
Rowswell
Schmidt
Singh
Turton
Walker

Select Special Committee on Real Property Rights

Chair: Mr. Sigurdson
Deputy Chair: Mr. Rutherford

Ganley
Glasgo
Goodridge
Hanson
Milliken
Nielsen
Orr
Rowswell
Schmidt
Sweet

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Hanson
Deputy Chair: Member Ceci

Dach
Feehan
Ganley
Getson
Guthrie
Issik
Rehn
Singh
Turton
Yaseen

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Wednesday, June 16, 2021

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

The Deputy Speaker: Good evening, hon. members. Please be seated.

Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

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

Bill 70 COVID-19 Related Measures Act

The Chair: We are on amendment A2. Are there members wishing to join the debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

Ms Pancholi: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. It's a pleasure to rise in Committee of the Whole to speak to Bill 70, the improperly, I would argue, named COVID-19 Related Measures Act, which seems to hide what is the actual intent of this bill. It's not about COVID-19 measures; it's actually about providing government-provided protection to negligent actors. That's what this bill is actually about. It is intended to protect negligent actors, which does not mean all actors. Not all.

You know, it applies to health facilities, and it applies to continuing care homes, which is of key concern on this issue. We also know that the wording of the bill allows for any other facility to be potentially named through regulations, so not through the transparent legislative process here in this Assembly, where we get to debate who is considered covered by this bill, but it will happen by regulation. This bill applies to all of these areas, but what it does is actually protect those providers in health care facilities, in continuing care homes who have been negligent. It provides them protection.

I fail to see that of all the lessons that we have learned as Albertans and, primarily, as we should have learned as part of this Assembly about COVID, the key lesson that this government seemed to take away is that we need to make sure that negligent actors are protected. I want to be clear about that, Madam Chair. What this does is that it only allows individuals, Albertans, to seek justice through the court system and to seek redress and reparation if the conduct of a health care facility, of a continuing care home provider has been grossly negligent.

Now, I had the opportunity to speak earlier, Madam Chair, about how high a standard gross negligence is. We don't actually have a lot of case law. There are not a lot of cases. There are not a lot of statutes. There are certainly not a lot of cases that actually have demonstrated what gross negligence means other than that it is an extremely high bar, that the departure of the care provider must be so marked a departure from what is reasonable that it reaches that level of gross negligence. Essentially, what that means is that it is nearly impossible for an individual to seek justice for care that has been provided unless it reaches that extraordinarily high standard.

When I say that this bill provides protection for negligent actors, that's exactly what this bill does. It does say that a provider in a health care facility, in a continuing care home, potentially in a meat-packing facility or any other facility may have acted negligently, and the government has chosen to say: we want to protect those

actors. When it comes to the families, to the individuals, even to the workers who may have been treated negligently, that is not a priority for this government to protect. Instead, they want to protect negligent actors. If any of these health care facilities, workplaces were not negligent, they don't need this protection. This is only here to protect those negligent actors.

I want to be clear about what that standard of negligence means. I mean, I won't get into the details about the legal standard of negligence other than to say that it exists where there is a duty of care owed by one individual, a provider, an organization to somebody else. Establishing a duty of care does not happen easily. It is that there is a relationship between two actors where there is a duty of care owed by one to another. We see that duty of care arise, of course, in settings like schools, in settings like hospitals, in employment relationships.

There are duties of care that are owed, and one of the actors who owes that duty of care to somebody has acted in such an unreasonable fashion, either intentionally or unintentionally, to have caused harm or risk of harm to an individual. That is negligence. This bill protects that kind of action. It protects health care facilities. It protects continuing care operators. It protects employers who have acted negligently. By the very purpose of bringing forward this bill, this government is saying: we don't want those people to be held accountable; instead, we're going to create such a high bar that needs to be met that very few, if any, Albertans will be able to meet it.

That is in the context of situations where we know that Albertans have lost their lives through COVID. This is retroactive to March 1, 2020, of course, around the same time where we all became aware of COVID. We didn't quite know exactly what the implications were going to be. Of course, we know that the standard of care and direction and guidance and health orders that came out over the past 16 months or so have evolved as we've understood more about the way COVID is transmitted, as we learned more about what protections are most effective, as we learned more about the availability of vaccines, and, of course, as we learned more about the implications of contracting COVID. So that process has been evolving.

I want to be really clear. I think there's some sort of perception out there that Bill 70 is somehow necessary because of that uncertainty, because there are things that have been changing. We want to protect providers who acted with due diligence, in good faith, who tried their best to meet the shifting evidence and the information. I believe that somehow this government is positioning this as saying: we want to protect those people; that's why we need Bill 70. I think that in law that is absolutely incorrect.

In law that standard of negligence, that reasonable care that is owed when there is a duty of care between two actors: that would have taken into consideration much of the uncertainty that we know existed with COVID. Absolutely, any court who would be considering whether or not a facility or an operator has been acting negligently will take into consideration the fact that things have shifted, the fact that our information has changed, the fact that we've learned more about transmission, about what is protective, what works, what doesn't. That would have been built into any standard of care that would have been applied in a negligence suit.

What I'm saying, Madam Chair, is that negligence would have protected those people who are acting in good faith. Accidents happen – there's no doubt about that – and mistakes are made. Negligence does not say that there can be no mistakes or accidents happen. We know that that happens all the time. Negligence is about saying that you've breached what a reasonable person would do, what a reasonable person would expect. That's why the standard

of negligence isn't as clearly defined, because it's very fact specific. It's very specific to the circumstance and the relationship and the time of a particular action that might have caused harm.

Keeping that standard of negligence, which at common law would have applied in these situations, a court would have absolutely taken into consideration that a good-faith actor such as a continuing care provider – if they were following the best information available at the time, they would not be found liable for negligence. Our standards, our common law understands that, takes into consideration those circumstances. This bill is not necessary to protect good-faith actors. Good-faith actors doing the best they could under the information they had at the time in the circumstances would have been protected at common law. They would not have been found liable for negligence.

Instead, what Bill 70 does is says that negligent action, unreasonable action, taking unreasonable risks that have caused harm is okay. It's saying that it is all right. Even if your continuing care provider to your family member – to your grandmother, your parent, your aunt, or your uncle – was negligent, if that happened: sorry; you have no right to seek justice. You are compelled to meet such an unbelievably high standard to get justice that you simply won't even try. That's essentially what's going to happen. We know that there have already been some actions that have been filed against certain continuing care providers, and they will not proceed. They will not proceed because the standard is too high to meet. I think it is such a – “disappointment” is not the right word. It is an injustice to say that those family members are not able to seek redress for their loved one's loss because of negligent action.

7:40

Of course, individuals have lost their lives. That does not mean that every individual who has lost their life during COVID has been the result of a negligent action. Absolutely not. But we do know, given the high concentration of deaths from COVID in continuing care settings, in particular in settings at particular continuing care homes, there were – we've heard the stories. We know, even with the knowledge that was available at the time, that certain continuing care providers were not meeting that standard. They were not following those directions, and people died.

I think it is remarkable that rather than focusing on taking all imaginable measures during COVID – in the early days, yes, we didn't know a lot, but we did know that seniors and the elderly were more likely to contract COVID. We knew that they were more likely to die. That was very clear right from the early stages. Rather than take measures to make sure that our family members, that Albertans' lives were protected in high-risk situations, the government has waited 16 months to actually simply say: “We won't take those steps. We won't make those investments. We won't require better care for your family members in continuing care homes. Rather, we'll wait 16 months, after thousands have died, and say that we want to protect the care providers. That is our priority.”

This government refused to put in a single-site staffing rule for quite a while. They delayed that. When they did finally put one in in December, long into the second wave of this pandemic, they provided so many exemptions from that single-site rule that they knew that they were placing more elderly and seniors at risk. Rather than ensuring that the staff who were working in those continuing care homes were safe, had access to paid leave, were well compensated so that perhaps they didn't have to work at multiple sites, rather than do any of that, the government chose to do none of it, and instead over 1,200 seniors have died from COVID in the last 16 months. Instead, many workers got ill, and now the government is taking action not to support those individuals, not to

support those families but to protect negligent continuing care providers.

I think that speaks volumes about what this government's priorities are, that rather than keep people safe from the beginning, they want to protect those who didn't, who did it negligently, and say: we're worried about their viability. I've heard that the government's position – I've heard the Minister of Health say this – is that the concern is that if these individuals or these providers, continuing care homes, are not given this protection, they may go under. Therefore, their incentive is to keep negligent continuing care operators going rather than to actually say: well, then, we've got to make sure that we're spending our dollars, that we're investing and that there are enough safe continuing care homes for Albertans.

They're acknowledging, to some extent, that many of these providers were negligent, but they'd rather keep them open than make sure that continuing care providers meet a reasonable standard of care, make sure that we are ensuring that any new continuing care provider meets better standards, provides better care. This is the approach. I would say that I'm shocked, but I have been repeatedly baffled by the choices that this government has made, who they've prioritized. This is perhaps the most craven example of it, if I may say, that we're meant to be fearful of losing continuing care spaces rather than the government stepping up and saying: “You know what? Maybe negligent continuing care providers should have troubles getting insurance. Maybe they shouldn't be operating anymore. Maybe we should make sure that we're opening safe ones.” They'd rather say: “We have to keep them open. We have to keep the negligent continuing care operators open.”

If they're not negligent, they won't be found liable for negligence. Let the families seek their justice. Let them take what they're rightfully entitled to, which is to seek justice through our court system. As I said before, this is not an easy process for any family to undertake. Going through the court system takes an enormous amount of resources: financial and emotional and time. These families were not facing an easy road to justice as it was even going to seek an action of negligence against some of these continuing care operators, but the government has shut even that door in their faces.

I have not heard the same level of commitment to making sure that our continuing care rises to a greater standard of care. I just haven't heard that same commitment. I refuse to accept that this is the way we should be responding to the challenges of the pandemic, to say, “Keep poor actors going,” rather than make the system better.

I've also heard the government and the Minister of Health say: well, they've brought in similar legislation in B.C. and Ontario. I've already given examples of where, if they wanted to emulate legislation and policies in other provinces – I've got many, many, many other examples that are much more positive. I think Albertans will hold our government to a moral standard here. I don't think we should be able to say that it's okay if we do something that is morally questionable, ethically questionable because other provinces have done it. That's not what I teach my children. I teach my children that they should be holding everybody in their community accountable. They should look to those people who are in positions of powers and decision-making to be ethical, to be moral. I would hope that each member of this Assembly would hold themselves to that standard. The legislation we're talking about today does not meet that standard.

It is shutting the door on families who have already lost someone they care deeply about, who are grieving, and it is protecting bad actors. Again, I want to be clear. I am not saying that all health care

facilities are bad actors; they're not. If they're not, then they would be fine, and they would not be held liable for negligence. But by raising that bar, raising that standard, this government is acknowledging that it wants to protect bad actors. That is their objective. That's the intent. I don't know how they could face Albertans who have lost a loved one and feel like they're doing the right thing. I know I will do my best, and I know my colleagues here in the Official Opposition will continue to speak for average Albertans who would say: we want to see our families, our values protected over the rights of a bad actor in a continuing care home.

I also want to highlight once again that we have to be clear that this is not necessarily the end of this story. The ability by regulation to name any facility as exempt from the normal standards of negligence and to have to meet this higher standard, this impossible standard of gross negligence, could easily be extended to any workplace, any facility, any organization who has also been a bad actor. We've mentioned the meat-packing plants, Cargill and JBS. I mean, we . . . [interjection] Yeah, absolutely. We are saying that potentially this bill will allow for those actors as well to not be held accountable. It's beginning to seem like not being held accountable is the hallmark of this government. I have to say that it's maybe not surprising. I mean, that's what's being modelled from the leadership right on down.

Madam Chair, in the most heartfelt, thoughtful way I would like to implore that the members of this Assembly think carefully about whether or not this is what they want to be the message to Albertans coming out of COVID, to protect – we know that many of these continuing care operators made significant profits during the pandemic – to look out for those actors rather than for Albertans and their families. I hope that all members take a pause and think about what kind of legacy they want to leave and if this is something where they can go to sleep at night feeling like they have done the best for average Albertans. I don't know, if I was on the government side, if I could sleep at night knowing that this was the kind of legislation that I thought was a priority right now.

Madam Chair, with that, I'll take my seat.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to join debate on amendment A2?

Seeing none, I will call the question on amendment A2 as moved by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A2 lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 7:50 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

For the motion:

Dang	Pancholi	Schmidt
Irwin	Renaud	Sigurdson, L.
Nielsen		

Against the motion:

Amery	Lovely	Schulz
Dreeshen	Luan	Schweitzer
Ellis	Madu	Shandro
Getson	Nicolaides	Sigurdson, R.J.
Glasgo	Nixon, Jeremy	Singh
Glubish	Orr	Stephan
Goodridge	Pon	Turton
Guthrie	Rosin	Walker

Hunter	Rowswell	Williams
Jones	Sawhney	Wilson
LaGrange	Schow	Yaseen
Long		

Totals: For – 7 Against – 34

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

The Chair: We're back on the main bill, Bill 70, in Committee of the Whole. Any members that are wishing to join the debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-South.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think that a number of my colleagues have much to say on this bill, and I look forward to hearing from them. I think that certainly there is some time to be had tonight, but I know that we are short on time, so I just want to say again how vehemently we in the Official Opposition believe this infringes on the rights of seniors and hurts them in such a significant way, and we oppose this in the strongest of terms, but I look forward to hearing from more of my colleagues.

8:10

The Chair: The hon. Member for Central Peace-Notley.

Mr. Loewen: Thank you, Madam Chair. My pleasure to speak tonight on Bill 70. Now, Bill 70 has quickly become an extremely controversial bill. A lot of Albertans are uncomfortable and, in fact, alarmed about the removal of the ability for the families of the citizens most negatively impacted by the pandemic to seek reasonable compensation for potential negligence in the death and suffering of their loved ones. It is a fundamental part of democracy to seek compensation when you or your family feel that you have been unjustly treated. As leaders in the province who are bringing forward this legislation, it is your obligation to take the time to fully explain your initiatives to Albertans. Raising the bar from negligence to gross negligence removes rights from Albertans and their future opportunities for justice. I want to give the minister an opportunity to answer the questions my constituents have about Bill 70.

I want to tell you, from the outside looking in, what this looks like. It looks like the government is protecting itself and others from Albertans. There's concern about lobbyists putting pressure on the government. It looks like some entities are now seeking legislation to protect themselves from Albertans. That is the current perception. I think that this perception might also be because this government hasn't tabled or provided any details about the costs associated with letting these negligent lawsuits go ahead and if there are other options to solve this issue.

I know that every single MLA in this room believes that care homes and seniors' facilities are important. I do not believe that there is a single rural MLA in this room that isn't worried about what would happen to seniors if, in a town without many options, their care home closed. Everyone understands that lawsuits that would jeopardize the viability of seniors facilities are concerning. Even the cost of defending against such lawsuits could be damaging, but it is also unclear to me, like it is to many other Albertans, why this government would make it appear as though this is the only way to protect these seniors' facilities and other entities. So the main question is: is there another way to protect these entities from catastrophic loss and still give Albertans the fair right to seek damages?

The Canadian legal system protects care systems in a way that other jurisdictions do not. There are already limits on what might need to be paid out in a liability lawsuit, so this already provides certain levels of protection that other places in the world do not

have. Now, under section 8 of this bill any other facility or persons could be added or taken away and have different terms and conditions. If we read in section 8(1), it says:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations

- (a) prescribing any other facility, person or class of persons for the purposes of section 2(d).

That identifies who else could be protected and who could be included in this act. It allows for that opportunity for other entities to be brought in and other groups of people to be brought into this act.

Section 8(1)(b) talks about

prescribing facilities, persons or classes of persons to whom section 4 does not apply.

Section 4 is the liability protection. This allows the Lieutenant Governor in Council and cabinet to decide which facilities, persons, or classes of persons are not protected by this liability protection.

In (c) it says:

imposing terms and conditions in respect of the application or non-application of section 4.

Again, this is about liability protection and imposing terms and conditions on those that may or may not have the liability protection.

And then in (d) it says:

respecting any other matter the Lieutenant Governor in Council considers necessary or advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

This basically opens it up to anything as far as what they may or may not do with this act and who they may or may not include or, you know, have exemptions for or bring into this.

And then, of course, it says in (2) that

a regulation made under subsection (1) may be made retroactive to a day not earlier than March 1, 2020.

This, obviously, makes it possible for all of these to be done retroactively, just like the entire bill can be retroactive.

I guess a couple of questions on, you know: what is the purpose of section 8? Who else is potentially going to be protected by this bill? Could it apply to restaurants or meat-packing plants? Is that the plan? I think that Albertans would just like to know: who else might this include, where is the government going, and in what direction are they going with section 8?

I think it's also worth considering whether the idea of changing negligence to gross negligence is something that the Premier is considering to be more widespread, and what would the social ramifications of that be?

Another thing. In the laws concerning the Crown's right of recovery for health service costs, it doesn't have the high standard of gross negligence. At least, I couldn't find that in those acts. I'm guessing there are other examples of the government not applying the high standard of gross negligence to itself when it files a lawsuit. I think that's something else that's maybe a little concerning, too. Again, we need to have an explanation why there are no other options but reducing the opportunities for justice.

Another thing that would be appreciated is seeing some of the costing and other options that are being considered or were considered and why they weren't able to work those out. I know that the families impacted would like more answers.

Albertans would like more communication, and I would encourage the government to answer these questions so Albertans know exactly the purposes of this bill and to be certain that this was the only option that could move forward. Thank you.

The Chair: Any other members wishing to join the debate? The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I'm very happy to be able to answer the hon. member and some of the misinformation as well that we heard from him. I'll start with the incorrect statement that was said, that this is removing an ability to seek compensation. That is not true. What is happening here is that folks will still be able to seek compensation if they've had a loved one who has suffered a loss related to COVID, but what is happening instead is that if a regulated health professional or if a health facility has made good efforts to be able to comply with the COVID-19 health measures and the infection prevention and control measures that happen within an AHS or other health facility, then those regulated health professionals and those health facilities would have this protection, but bad actors who did not make those good efforts would not have that protection.

There's still the ability to seek compensation, and unlike a province like Ontario, which did extinguish lawsuits and litigation, we did not go that route. Really, the only burden for the one law firm that's representing the lawsuits at this time is the burden of filing an amended statement of claim which would comply, then, with this legislation so that what is being pled in the statement of claim aligns with what is being directed here in Bill 70, that those who are health professionals or a health facility that has made those good efforts would have the protection, and the bad actors who did not make those good efforts – there could still be the families and loved ones who could still continue to seek compensation. Again, the member also used the phrase that this is removing the rights for those to seek justice: again false, for the same reasons, Madam Chair.

He also bizarrely made the claim that this is government protecting itself. I'll point out, Madam Chair, that what's happening here is – because this has been a false narrative that we've seen online. It's been sad to see some try to leverage Bill 70 to create this false narrative that – you know, there have been a lot of people who are anti-vaxxers, unfortunately. Thankfully, when we look at the province, it's only about 9 per cent of the province who seem to be indicating that they will not be looking to receive a COVID-19 vaccine. The good news is that 91 per cent seem interested or at least willing to accept a vaccine.

But for those who are perpetuating myths and false information about the vaccines, they've created this narrative that there is legislation called the Nuremberg Code, that I or Dr. Hinshaw are contravening. We've received a lot of death threats for daring to provide vaccines to Albertans, encouraging vaccines for Albertans. Dr. Hinshaw and I and the Premier have received those death threats. For people who've received this false information – and a group of these folks have created this false narrative that Bill 70 is some way of us trying to avoid jail time because we have contravened this Nuremberg Code, and these folks are waiting for us to be able to have our trials and be found guilty and go to jail. This is us protecting ourselves.

So it's very sad to see the hon. member being susceptible to this false narrative. I know that he is involved in a Facebook group that has been a part of this false narrative, Madam Chair, and it's . . .

8:20

The Chair: Hon. member, I perhaps might express some caution in casting aspersions on specific members of this House and encourage you to stick to the bill at hand instead of members in this particular place.

Mr. Shandro: Sure. I'm happy to answer the charge that this is government protecting itself. I know that the member is involved with folks that have been involved in creating this false narrative, Madam Chair, so it is unfortunate to see him doing that again today.

Mr. Loewen: Point of order.

The Chair: Point of order.

Point of Order

Language Creating Disorder

Mr. Loewen: Under 23(h), (i), and (j), likelihood to create disorder. The member is not responding, of course, with anything to do with my statement. He's making false accusations that I have something to do with some sort of underground group or something like that or some Facebook group, which is absolutely false. If he can provide proof of that, then maybe that's what he should be doing, but this kind of slander thing – I asked very reasonable questions, made a very reasonable statement. I'm asking for answers for those questions. If he wants to go on, to just carry on smear, then I'll just keep calling points of order under 23(h), (i), and (j).

The Chair: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, this is not a point of order; it's a matter of debate. The hon. member: it seems that he was referring to – he cited creating disorder in the Chamber as his citation within the standing orders and then accused the member of slander. It's just not – first of all, the standing order that he's referring to: it's not a point of order; it is a matter of debate. That said, we're in the last day of a very long session. I would just strongly encourage all sides of the House that we could get back to working on this hard legislation, that we have to deal with to get everybody home for the summer. That would be my suggestion. But this certainly is a matter of debate.

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

Mr. Shandro: Oh, am I done?

The Chair: No. Still dealing with the point of order.

Mr. Shandro: I see.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think that perhaps the minister needs to reread his standing orders. Certainly, I think that this is casting aspersions, and I think that if he had done this to any other member of this place, it would certainly be a point of order. That he is doing it to an independent member makes no difference in that regard, so I would encourage you to find this to be a point of order and that he should refrain and withdraw and apologize.

Thank you.

The Chair: I tend to agree with remarks made by the hon. Government House Leader in that we are so close to being out of here, hon. members, and there is a clear and close path for all of us. While I would also tend to agree that the cited standing order may not have been mentioned when the point of order was made, I would certainly strongly suggest that the hon. minister is in a territory which we should not further continue to explore in this Chamber.

I am certain that the hon. Minister of Health has lots to say on the matter at hand, which is Bill 70. For that, I will continue to give him the floor.

Debate Continued

Mr. Shandro: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think, suffice it to say, that anyone who is making the claim that this is government protecting itself is somebody who is saying something that is untrue. It's very clearly not the case in this situation. This is clearly

protection for our regulated health professionals, folks who have been on the front lines throughout the pandemic.

I'd point out as well that this is something that is supported by the Alberta Medical Association in supporting their 11,000 members, who've been on the front lines, whether it's in a health facility, AHS or otherwise, or whether it's in their offices, asking for this predictability, asking for this stability, as well as the many other regulated health professionals and health facilities.

Now, the member has asked, actually, made the point, you know, worrying about a long-term care facility closing, Madam Chair. I'll just point out that one of the reasons why he is aligned with the NDP in opposition to Bill 70 is because the NDP has never supported independent providers in the health care system, unfortunately has continued, even after they left government, to attack independent providers, in particular the independent providers who operate and work in long-term care and designated supportive living. Maybe I'll say: the facility-based continuing care system. The threat to them – they would love to see the opportunity for these operators to no longer be operating and for AHS, then, to have to step in and start operating all 354 of these facilities throughout the province.

So I would suggest that if the member wants to see AHS expand, wants to see them provide care for a hundred per cent of our facility-based continuing care system, all he has to do is vote against Bill 70 and align himself with the NDP, and we can have AHS providing more of the operations in long-term care, and the nonprofits and the faith-based groups that operate here: not provide them, along with the physicians and pharmacists and nurses, with the protections that are included in Bill 70, those facilities as well.

Now, he asked as well about whether there were other opportunities – for example, limiting payments that would be made if there was litigation involved – that were researched instead of Bill 70. That was the suggestion that he made: is there an opportunity instead to just limit the payments that could be made in litigation related to COVID? Well, I would say that if his worry is removing the ability to seek compensation, removing the rights for justice, this suggestion would be a significantly greater infringement on those who have suffered a loss related to COVID, because what he's suggesting here isn't just that those who have made good-faith efforts to comply with the COVID-19 health measures and the infection prevention and control measures that have been determined by Dr. Hinshaw and AHS – not just those good actors who make good-faith efforts should have protection, but what he's suggesting is that even the bad actors should be protected by having any of the compensation that would be owing to a family be limited even for a bad actor.

Yes, other opportunities, as he would know, because the members policy committee, the process that this bill went through in going through the members policy committee, the cabinet policy committee, and then to cabinet – he was aware that this was something that was spoken about within caucus, within cabinet as we looked at other opportunities.

But, in the end, what we did is align ourselves with other provinces because we've seen this question being dealt with by many other provinces. We can learn from what other provinces got right and what they got wrong, so we have aligned ourselves with Ontario, we've aligned ourselves with Saskatchewan, and we've aligned ourselves with the New Democratic Party government in B.C. as well, Madam Chair, in the fact that we are providing protection for these health professionals although these provinces actually provided this protection for all persons, not just for the health sector. But they also did it the same way, by providing that protection using a standard of gross negligence.

As well, when we look at what the other provinces got wrong: as I said, Ontario extinguishing lawsuits that were in place retroactively. Now, this bill, Bill 70, is retroactive, but what we're not doing is extinguishing lawsuits, the four of them that we know of that have already been commenced here in Alberta. Instead, what we're saying is that the standard is going to apply back to when Dr. Hinshaw's first orders began, in March, and the work was done by AHS to develop the COVID-19 health measures.

I think as well that the member asked a question, because he was confused, on: why gross negligence? As he's aware, because at the time he was in caucus when this was discussed, there were many, many times when we got to speak about this as a caucus, and I'm happy to reiterate what we talked about. Why was gross negligence used, other than the fact that it's a standard that's used by B.C. and Saskatchewan and Ontario, Madam Chair? Also, because it is a term that's often used in Alberta legislation: I point to the Municipal Government Act.

8:30

I would point as well to other health legislation, like the Emergency Medical Aid Act, and the directions to courts that are provided in legislation to be able to provide that predictability and stability for somebody, particularly, like, looking at other health legislation like the Emergency Medical Aid Act and being able to provide that direction to the courts that those who are trying to make good-faith efforts to be able to help someone in need would have that predictability and stability to know that if they intervene and want to help somebody when they're in an emergency and they need that medical aid, they know that there's going to be a direction of the court related to claims of negligence, that there's going to be the protection and the increased threshold to gross negligence.

The Chair: Hon. minister, I hesitate to interrupt, but pursuant to Government Motion 89, agreed to earlier today, I must now put the question.

[The voice vote indicated that the remaining clauses of Bill 70 were agreed to]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 8:31 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

For:

Dreeshen	Long	Sawhney
Ellis	Lovely	Schow
Getson	Luan	Schulz
Glasgo	Madu	Schweitzer
Glubish	McIver	Shandro
Goodridge	Neudorf	Sigurdson, R.J.
Gotfried	Nicolaides	Singh
Guthrie	Nixon, Jason	Turton
Hunter	Nixon, Jeremy	Walker
Issik	Orr	Williams
Jones	Pon	Wilson
Kenney	Rosin	Yaseen
LaGrange	Rowswell	

Against:

Dang	Notley	Schmidt
Irwin	Pancholi	Sigurdson, L.
Nielsen	Renaud	

Totals: For – 38 Against – 8

[The remaining clauses of Bill 70 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? Carried.

The hon. Government House Leader.

8:50

Mr. Jason Nixon: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that we rise and report Bill 70.

[Motion carried]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Brooks-Medicine Hat.

Ms Glasgo: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a certain bill. The committee reports the following bill: Bill 70. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

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

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Deputy Speaker: Any opposed, please say no. Carried.

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 70 COVID-19 Related Measures Act

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and move third reading of Bill 70, the COVID-19 Related Measures Act, on behalf of our colleague the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

COVID-19 has put an unprecedented strain on our entire health care system in terms of service delivery, which includes maintaining the health and safety of our most vulnerable citizens. Bill 70 addresses the current legislative gaps resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic by advancing this legislation. Civil liability protection specific to COVID-19 does not currently exist in the Public Health Act or other legislation in Alberta. It would provide the clarity and the guidance around COVID-19 civil liability protection for Alberta Health Services; for our regulated health professionals like our physicians, pharmacists, and nurses; and health service facilities, hospitals, continuing care facilities, and all the folks who work in these settings. Now, Bill 70 is strongly endorsed by many groups. I'll name a few. First, there's the Alberta Medical Association. There's also Covenant Health, the Alberta Continuing Care Association, the Christian Health Association of Alberta, and ASCHA, the Alberta Seniors Communities and Housing Association.

Now, as in many other jurisdictions, the Alberta government is taking a practical approach to putting legislation in place that would provide that clarity and that guidance, that stability and predictability that our regulated health professionals and health facilities are asking for around COVID-19 civil liability protection.

Now, regardless of political stripe, other provinces such as the New Democratic government in British Columbia as well as governments in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Ontario, and Saskatchewan have enacted COVID-19 liability protection legislation. As we've stated before, this protection is crucial to the sustainability of health service delivery in Alberta.

Now, this is not about protecting bad actors, Madam Speaker. Those who are grossly negligent can and should be held accountable for their actions. Bill 70 does not remove the right to initiate a civil action. It does not dismiss existing lawsuits. The legislation does not protect, as I was saying during Committee of the Whole, the government of Alberta from civil actions. The legislation does not include any special protections from civil actions for the government of Alberta, including me, the Premier, and Dr. Hinshaw or others. It would not provide any health care providers with blanket immunity from potential legal action.

Alberta is fortunate to have a health care system that is a mixed model in the continuing care spectrum in our health care sector. It includes public, independent providers, and, as well, other community not-for-profit facilities. Now, about 70 per cent of our long-term care spaces are operated by independent providers, and 94 per cent of DSL, or designated supportive living, spaces are delivered by independent and not-for-profit partners. Many continuing care operators in Alberta are community-based operations with limited means, and a single lawsuit could bankrupt many of these operators.

Madam Speaker, Albertans want to be assured that the health care system will continue to deliver health care services throughout the pandemic. The majority of Albertans understand that this legislation is needed to maintain the sustainability of our health care system. I ask for your support for third reading of Bill 70, the COVID-19 Related Measures Act.

Thank you.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Adjourn debate.

Mr. Shandro: I move to adjourn debate. Sorry.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Government Motions

Time Allocation on Bill 70

90. Mr. Jason Nixon moved:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 70, COVID-19 Related Measures Act, is resumed, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of the bill in third reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

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

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an unprecedented attack on our democracy. It is absolutely shameful that before a single opposition member has been able to speak in third reading to Bill 70, they would introduce time allocation, that they would bring in closure and end a debate and restrict only an hour of debate for a bill which has the province in arms. It is something that is unacceptable.

We know that this bill is something that attacks our seniors. It attacks Albertans. It takes away their rights. They're shutting down the very process of debate that is intended to protect Albertans. They're shutting down, using an abusive system where, essentially, this Legislature, the elected politicians, are unable to participate in democracy, are unable to participate in the process. Again, Madam

Speaker, not a single opposition MLA has had the opportunity to speak to Bill 70 in third reading. This is something that I don't think I've ever seen before in this place. It is completely unprecedented that they would move at such an alarming rate for such important legislation.

We know that there are current lawsuits in place that this minister is retroactively changing. We know that there are current lawsuits in place that are trying to protect seniors who have been unduly damaged due to this pandemic. It's a global pandemic, of course, but this COVID emergency – we owe these seniors their opportunity to defend against these companies, Madam Speaker. It is something that's simply shocking, that we continue to see this abuse of power from this government, that we continue to see this attack on our democracy, that we continue to see that this government uses procedural trickery and procedural tools to attack Albertans and to attack the very processes in which we work in this place. It is something that is stopping the work of the Legislature.

Madam Speaker, I know that the government members want to go home to their ridings. I know that the Premier doesn't want to have all of his caucus in Edmonton, where they are fighting amongst themselves. But the opposition is focused on the unjustified attacks the government is using against Albertans. The opposition is focused on looking outwards and making sure we are fighting in the best interests of Albertans during this pandemic.

But, instead of that, we have a government that is running to the hills, that instead of focusing on doing the work, took a three-week vacation in the middle of this pandemic when we should have been debating these bills, we should have been debating the important issues, and we should have been doing the work Albertans expected us to do and elected us to do, as this Premier told them he would be doing at the beginning of this pandemic, as this Premier bragged he was doing at the beginning of this pandemic. Instead, we see that without a single speaker against this bill in third reading, we now have time allocation. We now have these measures that are basically designed to shut down opposition, to shut down this place, to allow the government to hide, to allow the government to run away.

Madam Speaker, I can't blame them. I know that they are floundering in the polls. I know that they are focused internally on their fighting, that they're in a leadership struggle right now, but Albertans deserve better. Albertans deserve a government that is willing to focus on the legislation, that is willing to bring in policies that work and make life better for Albertans. Instead, we see a government that has decided to avoid this Legislature, that has decided to avoid this place and wants to shut down debate and in the cover of darkness here at 9 o'clock at night.

9:00

Really, it is something that Albertans will remember. Albertans will remember in the next election. Madam Speaker, it's something that is profoundly disappointing for all Albertans, that this government refuses to have the proper process, that this government refuses to engage in the democratic process. For a government that claims that they were focused on lives and livelihoods, instead it appears this government is focused on getting away from the Legislature. This government is focused on getting away from Edmonton. It's focused on getting away from the people that are holding them accountable, because they're scared.

Madam Speaker, again, that's not a surprise, but it's something that is an attack on our democracy. It's an attack on our process. It's something that is profoundly disappointing for all Albertans and for all people who are in this place. I cannot say it in strong enough terms how strongly the opposition opposes this, how we believe that this bill deserves proper debate, deserves proper engagement. This

government, obviously, has a track record of avoiding debate, avoiding engagement, avoiding consultation, and ignoring the concerns of Albertans. That's why we see these draconian measures being brought in today by this Government House Leader.

Thank you.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 90 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:01 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Dreeshen	Lovely	Sawhney
Ellis	Luan	Schow
Getson	Madu	Schulz
Glasgo	McIver	Schweitzer
Glubish	Neudorf	Shandro
Goodridge	Nicolaides	Sigurdson, R.J.
Guthrie	Nixon, Jason	Singh
Hunter	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Issik	Orr	Walker
Jones	Pon	Williams
Kenney	Rosin	Wilson
LaGrange	Rowswell	Yaseen
Long		

Against the motion:

Dang	Nielsen	Schmidt
Hoffman	Pancholi	Sweet
Irwin	Renaud	

Totals:	For – 37	Against – 8
---------	----------	-------------

[Government Motion 90 carried]

9:20 Government Bills and Orders
Third Reading
(continued)

Bill 58
Freedom to Care Act

[Debate adjourned June 16: Mr. Feehan speaking]

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. members, are there any members wishing to join debate on third reading of Bill 58? The hon. Member for St. Albert.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and speak in third reading of Bill 58, Freedom to Care Act. You know, it's quite interesting that when we just finished discussing, debating, Bill 70, which was just so interesting to me that the title is just about COVID statutes and there's no preamble, but in this one the government goes to great lengths in their preamble to talk about what this bill is. Of course, "freedom to care" sounds really terrific, but when you dig into this bill, there are a number of problems. I would like to point some of those things out.

Before I start, one of the things, Madam Speaker – as I've heard the government members talk about this bill, what they always sort of go back to is: but we're doing it for the nonprofits; but we're doing it for the volunteers. Well, you know, we hear the same examples over and over: "But what about churches and volunteers that want to feed the homeless?" or whatever. Those are great things, but there are far more volunteers than volunteers that simply

feed people that are hungry or work in the types of shelters that the members continuously point to. There are thousands and thousands of volunteers in this province, there are thousands and thousands of nonprofits in this province, and, sorry to say, there is a reason why there are regulations in this province. Sadly, not everybody that volunteers and not everybody that works within a nonprofit does so for the betterment of all Albertans. We all know examples of it. We've all seen horrible stories about things gone wrong with organizations that maybe lose their way and do things that they're not supposed to do, so for this government to continuously stand up and point to these simple examples about freedom to care – "That's why we're doing it" – I think that's just lazy because they're not digging into the problem.

Now, whether an organization is a nonprofit or a for-profit, if they choose to engage in a type of work, whether that is sheltering people that do not have homes, whether that is feeding people that are hungry, whether that is looking after or caring for people with disabilities, whether that is something to do with sports or entertainment, or whatever the case may be – maybe it's a Neighbourhood Watch; who knows? – there's still a responsibility to do the right thing, to do the work that you are entrusted to do. There's still a set of standards. I don't care if you're for-profit or nonprofit. If you don't follow the rules, you deserve the consequences of that. You know, I just wanted to point that out because that actually bothers me quite a bit. It bothered me when we talked about Bill 70 that this government is giving cover, and they stand up and say: well, we're really doing it because we want the nonprofits to survive. I'm sorry; if you get into that work, whether you're nonprofit or for-profit, and if your actions directly result in harm to Albertans, then you need to face the consequences, not be given cover.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the problems with this legislation. You know, my colleagues have said again and again that what this bill does is open the door to exemptions that could be problematic. Now, normally I think that I wouldn't be as skeptical, but what we've seen from this government is that you – I don't trust them, Madam Speaker, not one bit. They don't do what they say that they're going to do. They don't tell people what they're doing when they do it. Most Albertans – well, I don't know if it's about 90 per cent – have demonstrated, whether it's through polling, that they do not trust this government. So when I see a piece of legislation that gives them the ability to make rules that will impact people's lives, like exemptions to regulations that are there for a reason, that worries me.

It also worries me that almost – it doesn't matter what topic we're discussing; they point to their record on red tape reduction, which is fine. If you want to get rid of some old rules, great. You want to get rid of legislation that's outdated? Great. You want to do things that make sense, update rules? Great. But that seems to be the sole purpose, the sole thing that they pat themselves on the back for: we're making it easier for people to do things. Yet there is no follow-up for Albertans to see: "We cut this. We changed this. Here is the result. Here's how we made lives better." We don't see that with this government. We just see these percentages of their goals without any substance, which is very telling. So I'm very concerned that this bill gives this government more ability to do things behind closed doors.

Let me tell you the kinds of exemptions. I had a look at the list, actually, of the current exemptions. Now, I don't know the specific reason why an exemption was granted, but I can give you one example. I'd like to use this example because, again, I don't know the details of the exemption or why it was granted, but there is always another side to it. One of the exemptions was under Labour and Immigration, and it was to the Employment Standards Code

and employment standards regulation. This was about camp counsellors. It says: charitable camps for the handicapped – which is, you know, I don't know why we're still using that word. Anyway, there it was.

The exemptions were around hours of work, holiday pay, and minimum wage. Now, I think we all recognize that when camp is running, it's just different. The days are different. They're longer, they're up late, sometimes over the weekend. Very often it's over the holiday. So I do understand that. But minimum wage? An exemption to minimum wage and holiday pay? Because a person is choosing to be a camp counsellor under the auspices of working with the handicapped, suddenly this seems acceptable. But I'm sorry; whether you're a camp counsellor or working at Tim Hortons, you have the right to be paid fairly, and that includes holiday pay and that includes minimum wage if that's the case. That's already an existing exemption, so you can sort of see where I'm going with this, that more exemptions will be made behind closed doors for whatever reasons that the government chooses to make. They've already demonstrated that they're not accountable to Albertans. You know, sadly, I don't think that we'll ever get the full story.

There is one sector, obviously, that I am concerned about. A lot of nonprofits operate in that sector, and that's the disability sector. You know, I have said many times that there are a lot of regulations in that sector. Some are very frustrating, and some I actually worked hard with different governments – one was Conservative, one was New Democrat – to change some of the regulations. But we went through a process, and that process included consultation, not just with friends and insiders but the people who would actually be impacted by the change.

So those were to safety standards. Now, what that meant was that the Conservative government had decided that they knew best. They were going to bring in these standards so that any group home – and I'm using, you know, sort of quotes. That could actually be that two people living together with staff was a group home. They decided that these group homes needed to meet the same care standards as lodges and long-term care facilities. That meant fire suppression. That meant all kinds of different infection control protocols like labelling everybody's laundry, washing everything separately. Even if you had a garden, it had to be separated. It was very strange. I don't doubt that the Conservatives did that because they were reacting to different situations. There was one, in particular, where someone died. They died in a fire. I don't doubt that that was a reaction to that, but it was an overreaction.

We wanted the exemption, and we worked at it. There was a process. I think we spent about eight months. We had people that were fire suppression experts. We had people that were service-delivery experts. We had families. We had people with disabilities. We had all of the people that mattered talk to us about: what would a good exemption look like? That was the kind of work that we did. Now, those standards were changed, and that was very useful because what the disability sector strives to do – at least, it used to – is to do everything that it can to allow people with disabilities to live in their communities of choice, to be as independent as possible, to realize whatever goals that they have.

You know, that's just one example of exemptions, but, as I think about the other exemptions that this government could change, I could tell you what I've heard in terms of discussions from service providers. In the disability sector there are some companies that operate in Ontario, Alberta, British Columbia. Some of the biggest providers in Alberta operate in multiple provinces. They are huge companies that make a lot of profit. There's a reason that they make a lot of profit: they provide services, their costs are lower, they tend to pay staff less, and they tend to invest in programming in a

different way. Their business model is to make profit, and these are very large companies that lobby very hard about regulation because there are some regulations that have to do with staffing, about how you pay them. For example, if you call someone in, there are on-call systems, as you can imagine. Someone who's, you know, independent might need to know there's someone on call if there's an emergency. So you pay people. You pay them a flat rate, but if they go in, you pay them three hours. That's just the way it is. That's the minimum standard. Now, this is something this government can change. I have no doubt that they will change that.

9:30

These are all things that people lobby for. These are the kinds of regulations that people lobby for because it's about profit. So when this government stands up and says, "Trust us; we just want to make it better for, you know, the volunteer in a church to feed people," it's more than that. It is far more than that. There's a lot more to volunteers than just the nice church lady feeding people that are homeless. There is more to it than that. Organizations have a responsibility, whether that's to get a criminal records check, whether that's to do a credit check on someone that is going to sit on a board and make decisions about budgets. That is about doing reference checks for volunteers. That is about scheduling them properly. That's about mentoring. It's about monitoring, supervision. It's not about the nice church lady that wants to feed people. It is far more than that.

The nonprofit sector is sophisticated. It's profit driven in many ways, and it is very sophisticated. To suggest that this is . . . [interjections]. You know, it's kind of ridiculous that the government members find this entertaining.

Ms Pancholi: Why?

Ms Renaud: I don't know why. I guess it's funny.

Madam Speaker, what I'm saying is that, you know, it has been fairly insulting to listen to government members try to claim that the NDP is opposed to volunteers feeding people or churches opening their doors to house people. That is not it. We recognize that the nonprofit sector is sophisticated. We recognize that there are thousands and thousands of volunteers. There are a lot of regulations that need to be there, there are a lot of rules that need to be there, and, more than anything, we need transparency.

This isn't freedom to care. We're all free to care. This has nothing to do with freedom to care. This has a lot to do with freedom to do whatever you want without repercussions.

Madam Speaker, I will not be supporting this bill and not because I don't think the nonprofit sector is important. I do. I'm not going to support it because I think it's irresponsible.

Thank you.

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

Seeing none, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. How much time do we have left?

The Deputy Speaker: You have about six minutes.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you very much.

I'm pleased to rise in third reading of Bill 58. I'm disappointed that once again the government has brought in the undemocratic action – but it has also become a very common action of this government – to close time on debate on this bill. It's a very important bill. As we know, as my colleague the Member for St.

Albert was saying, you know, the nonprofit sector is absolutely critical to Alberta. There are apparently close to 26,000 nonprofits operating in Alberta. It employs 450,000 Albertans and contributes \$10 billion in GDP every year. More than 1.6 million Albertans also volunteer their time – I know that many of the people in this Assembly volunteer their time with nonprofits – up to 262 million volunteer hours from Albertans every year, Madam Speaker. So this is a huge sector.

What's remarkable about Bill 58 is that repeatedly what has been said in the news, what has been said clearly by the nonprofit sector is that this isn't a bill they asked for. This bill is not actually – there are many challenges, significant challenges facing the nonprofit sector, many of which revolve around the fact that their work is undervalued if not devalued completely by this government, that more and more responsibilities of government are being shifted onto the nonprofit sector, onto what they call civil society, which is really a downloading of responsibility to these organizations to deliver what are core functions, really, of government. Yet they are not funded appropriately. They're not funded regularly. They are not supported to do that work. They have to do it in a patchwork manner, often with volunteers.

But, also, they employ, as I mentioned, many thousands of Albertans. The pressing needs that they have experienced throughout this pandemic: this bill does not address them. It does not address the thousands of nonprofit workers who have been laid off and lost their jobs, who are underpaid. It certainly doesn't provide them with security going forward.

Some of the things that they specifically have been asking for have nothing to do with what's in Bill 58. They've been asking for things like regular funding and reliable, sustainable funding. They've been looking to make the reporting requirements easier, streamlined, sometimes, you know, being able to file electronically. These are the things that are important to them. Being exempted from numbers of pieces of legislation in an ad hoc manner was not at the top of the list of the nonprofit sector in Alberta. Apparently, it was on the top of the list for the UCP platform. But this is not what they are asking for.

Then not only do we get a bill that doesn't really serve the pressing needs of the nonprofit sector in Alberta, but we get a bill that gives far too much leeway, far too much discretion to a government that has proven that they cannot be trusted. We have highlighted in this Chamber a number of problems with Bill 58, one of which is that, for reasons that have yet to be explained in any coherent fashion, it allows for regulations to be passed to designate any entity as a nonprofit entity. Even an entity, as we point out, that is a for-profit entity can be, under this piece of legislation, designated as nonprofit, and the response that we've received from the government is: trust us; we're not going to do that. But when given the opportunity to change that, when an amendment was put forward to clarify, they defeated that amendment. Once again, there is no reason that Albertans can trust that this government is not going to use this bill to simply designate whoever they want as a nonprofit entity and then allow them to be exempted from key pieces of legislation.

We put forward amendments to say that there should not be exemptions allowed to health and safety protocols. In fact, the nonprofit sector has said that they're deeply concerned about safety and health protocol legislation, that volunteers and staff and people who use nonprofit services are entitled to have those same protections. This could be a fast track to exempt them. We've also put forward an amendment that would at least require that the volunteers in these nonprofit organizations should be told, should be made aware that the organization they are volunteering

for may be exempt from certain health and safety regulations, may be exempt from certain pieces of legislation that they may not even know, and again the government defeated that amendment as well.

We suggested that it be clear that there are certain types of legislation where there should not be any exemptions: employment-related legislation. No. The government struck that down as well.

I'm also deeply concerned that these exemptions are only being reported to cabinet, that the minister responsible for this piece of legislation, the Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women, reports to cabinet as to which organizations are exempted from key pieces of legislation. They don't report to Albertans, but that's not going to be made clear. There's now a haphazard website that was put together. But how will Albertans know about the organization they're dealing with? Why couldn't there be an annual report? That was not part of this legislation. It's only this internal – let me just say that I don't think many Albertans have much faith in the conversations that happen around that cabinet table.

I would also add that, you know, we also put forward amendments that would just simply make it clear that, for example, nursing homes, long-term care homes would not be able to be exempt. I mean, this follows on conversations we've just been having around all the protections that this government is rushing through in Bill 70 to allow for negligent actions to be protected. Now we're simply saying: let's make sure that there can't be exemptions for certain long-term care homes from key pieces of health and safety legislation. No, the government won't support that either.

This government seems to be assuming that Albertans can trust them, but if there's one thing that has been absolutely clear, it's that they don't trust this government. They don't even take thoughtful amendments to make this bill better, and for that reason I think we should all be deeply mistrustful about the intent of this government. It's not meeting the needs of the thousands of Albertans who partake in, who volunteer, who work in and use the services of nonprofit organizations. It does not meet the pressing needs that many of these organizations have been calling for repeatedly: stability in funding, long-term sustainability . . .

The Deputy Speaker: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt, but pursuant to Government Motion 93, agreed to earlier today, this concludes one hour of debate, and all questions must now be put.

The question is on third reading of Bill 58, the Freedom to Care Act.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:40 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Allard	Lovely	Schulz
Amery	Madu	Schweitzer
Dreeshen	McIver	Shandro
Ellis	Neudorf	Sigurdson, R.J.
Getson	Nicolaides	Singh
Glasgo	Nixon, Jason	Stephan
Glubish	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Guthrie	Orr	Walker
Hunter	Pon	Williams
Jones	Rosin	Wilson
Kenney	Rowswell	Yao

LaGrange	Sawhney	Yaseen
Long	Schow	
10:00		
Against the motion:		
Dang	Hoffman	Pancholi
Eggen	Irwin	Renaud
Feehan	Nielsen	Sabir
Goehring	Notley	Schmidt
Totals:	For – 38	Against – 12

[Motion carried; Bill 58 read a third time]

Bill 70
COVID-19 Related Measures Act
(continued)

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Health.

Mr. Shandro: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be able to rise again to speak a little bit more about Bill 70 here in third reading. I'd first like to begin by talking a little bit further about the approaches that other provinces have taken in being able to pass legislation similar to what Bill 70 is doing. Maybe I'll first talk about Ontario and their approach. This is what they call Bill 218 in Ontario. In Ontario they took a little bit of a different approach than we did in that where this, Bill 70, is related to just the health sector, our regulated health professions and our health facilities, in Ontario, like Saskatchewan and the New Democratic government in British Columbia, they applied it to all persons or any persons. It's a much broader scope. They weren't looking at just the health sector but for any persons to have the same type of liability protection in their legislation.

Now, New Brunswick took a little bit of a more narrow scope than Ontario and Saskatchewan and British Columbia. They applied it to what they have called essential services while Nova Scotia took a similar approach to what Bill 70 is proposing to do, which is – well, in Nova Scotia they applied it to what they called special care homes, a subset of their health care sector. What we're doing here in Bill 70 is looking at all of our health facilities, including what we would call, the equivalent in Alberta, facility-based continuing care as our health facilities but also our regulated health professionals.

Now, when it comes to retroactivity, in Ontario theirs is retroactive to March 17, 2020, similar to our approach in going retroactively to March 1, 2020. British Columbia: I can speak to this one as well. It is a broad scope as well and a long list of services that are being provided this protection in British Columbia, where the New Democratic government in British Columbia is looking to provide that protection to any persons, very similar to what we are doing in Bill 70 except for the scope aspect. I would also point out that in Saskatchewan as well, not only are they a broader scope, like British Columbia and Ontario, and retroactive as well, like Ontario and B.C., but they also have, like Ontario and B.C., that regulation-making authority provided in their legislation.

Now, I'd also like in this time, Mr. Speaker, to be able to speak to some of the incorrect information we heard from the members opposite throughout the debate, whether in second reading or Committee of the Whole. We've heard members of the caucus opposite try to claim that Bill 70 is stopping people from being able to commence litigation related to a loss related to COVID, which is not true, or that it's extinguishing lawsuits, which isn't true either, as I've said in second reading and Committee of the Whole. Now I'd like to just reiterate, as I'm sure we're going to hear from the

NDP, again repeating this incorrect information, these untruths, that this is somehow taking away someone's right to seek justice, someone's ability to seek compensation.

What Bill 70 is doing, like what is happening in Ontario and British Columbia and Saskatchewan, where the threshold is raised to gross negligence: what it means is that those who make good efforts to be able to comply with the public health measures, the infection prevention and control measures that have been determined by Dr. Hinshaw and AHS – if they make those good-faith efforts, then, yes, they can have that protection, including our hard-working health professionals, who've asked for this protection and have endorsed this protection. In particular, I'll point out the Alberta Medical Association, Mr. Speaker.

But those who don't make those good efforts, those who are the bad actors – those who have suffered a loss, whether somebody who has suffered from COVID or if it's a loved one of somebody who's been lost to COVID, they can still have the right to begin litigation. Those who have already started litigation – there are four lawsuits that we're aware of and one law firm representing them. The burden is really, Mr. Speaker, for that one law firm to be able to file an amended statement of claim, to change the claim to gross negligence. Not a heavy burden on that one law firm or for those to be able to continue with their litigation, unlike in Ontario, which extinguished litigation in their legislation.

Now, while we've heard that incorrect information, some inflammatory rhetoric from the NDP, Mr. Speaker, we did hear some thoughtful comments from the Member for Edmonton-North West. He said, thoughtfully, I thought: look, what we have to do is be able to take a moment and look at the continuing care sector in Alberta. I'm paraphrasing him, but what he essentially said is: let's take a moment to learn from COVID and be able to apply what we learned from COVID to make the continuing care sector better for all Albertans, for all these residents and all their families. I couldn't agree more.

That's why in 2019 we began a review of facility-based continuing care to be able to – and even before COVID had become a pandemic, we began this work because we knew that for four years the NDP had in particular ignored this part of the health care sector, and we saw some of the problems for residents: not being able to live with a spouse, not being able to age in place, concerns about the right staffing models and the right staffing mixes in some of these facilities, whether the number of care hours for these residents is the right amount. The NDP, like a bunch of the parts of the health care sector during their four years, totally ignored these issues, and we saw the outcomes for patients continue to decline under them. We saw that this was in particular a fantastic example of how the NDP, through their four years, completely failed Albertans when it came to the health care sector.

We began this review of facility-based continuing care, and thankfully it has recently been provided to us, and we made it public. One of the most fantastic parts about this review and its recommendations is that it's recommending that we change the facility-based continuing care system so it's focused on quality of life for residents. It's recommending that we – and it has, I think, 46 different recommendations on how we can aim to direct our continuing care system into being centred around residents, centred around the residents and having new models of care so that we can focus on the level of care that they need.

It was weird to hear the NDP slander this report, unfortunately, when it was released and make all sorts of claims that it was going to cut amounts to the continuing care sector, which couldn't be further from the truth. It's actually recommending that we increase the level of care hours for each of these residents. Right now there are 28,000 of them, Mr. Speaker, and it's recommending such an

increase in the level of care hours for each of these residents that by the year 2030 this report is estimating that the increased amount of budget would be almost \$500 million.

Now, why, Mr. Speaker? Because this government is focused on looking at solutions to try to improve the continuing care system, which includes a mixed model. We have a third of our beds being provided by AHS and their subsidiaries, publicly owned and publicly delivered, and the other two-thirds being provided by independent providers, half of that two-thirds being those who are the faith-based groups and the nonprofits and half being – this is the dreaded word for the NDP; I beg them to please cover their ears as they hear this – corporations.

That's the reason why the NDP is focused on opposing this legislation, because what the NDP wants is to, as they attacked through their four years in government these independent providers, not just in continuing care but independent providers all throughout the health care system – they attacked them and, now that they are no longer in government, continue their attack on independent providers, where we see, as this report confirms, the important role that independent providers provide our patients and provide these residents.

10:10

We see an opportunity here for us to work with those independent providers to improve the system, improve the monitoring, the inspections, the standards, and the enforcement mechanisms, the way that the system integrates with the health care system as a whole, the way that we can have a system that provides for resident choice so that residents can find the right level of care for them where they get it. This includes being able to expand the amount of home care that we provide to Albertans and provide that type of choice, looking at the ways that we fund – and that funding can be client directed for home care in some parts of the province but not all parts of the province – and how we can do that to expand the access to home care throughout the province and our staffing models and the staffing mixes in our workforce in these facilities.

Now, if we do all that work and, on top of that, learn from COVID – now, the NDP left us with a continuing care system where we still had ward rooms. Before this pandemic we were left with ward rooms where we had residents living three or four in one room, Mr. Speaker, and they did nothing about it for their four years. Well, I'm proud to say that in just a matter of days, by July 1, there will be no more ward rooms in this province. We're removing them. They will no longer be a part of our continuing care system at all. This is one of the things we learned from the pandemic and from COVID, the work that we can do to expand virtual care for residents and their families throughout these facilities.

The way that we can also learn from the pandemic and the difficulties that these residents and their family members suffered through during the pandemic – and one of the recommendations is improving the level of mental health supports for these residents so that they and their loved ones can make sure that they get that access to that care that they need. That's our focus.

I mean, I want to just point out again why I went down this road, because I was pointing out that Edmonton-North West helpfully pointed out that what we need is to look at improving the facility-based continuing care system. I agree, we agree, government agrees, and that's why we did the work that's now been published. Now we're working on an action plan on how these recommendations could be implemented, and we can come back and make them public in the fall.

On top of that, we have health care professionals and health facilities throughout the province that are asking for the predictability and the stability, for us to be able to say that if you

are a good actor, if you made a good-faith effort to be able to comply with what experts like our chief medical officer of health, the amazing MOHs throughout AHS – remember that the chief MOH is one of the employees that are in the ministry. There are 16 folks that work in her office, including the deputy chief MOH, Dr. André Corriveau. But throughout AHS the rest of our MOHs are embedded within AHS, including the senior MOH, Dr. Laura McDougall.

The expertise of those epidemiologists to be able to provide guidance to the health care sector, including our regulated health professionals, whether you were somebody like an allied health professional, like a chiropractor who in the spring of 2020 had to close but then, during relaunch in 2020, opened your office again to patients – you did your best to take care of your patients, your staff, to be able to follow that advice that was determined by the medical officers of health throughout the province when it comes to infection prevention and control. If you did that work and made good-faith efforts to comply with what they determined was the right and safe way for you to operate your office, you can have that predictability of knowing that you are being protected with Bill 70 and this liability protection, because we've seen throughout the pandemic, in our health facilities but also in the offices of our health care professionals, our doctors and other allied health professionals continuing to make sure the people got the care that they needed.

What we heard in particular – this is a quote that I heard from a member of the Alberta Medical Association when they spoke to me about the importance, when we talked about and were discussing: what could this liability protection piece be if we are going to focus it on the health care system and maybe look at what we could learn from a province like Nova Scotia, which focused on what they call special care homes, as I said? If we were to do that, what we were asked by the Alberta Medical Association and this member in particular is: "Look, we had your backs throughout the pandemic. We continued to see patients. Now you please have ours." That's why Bill 70 is proposing to include not just health facilities but also the regulated health professionals who have continued to make sure that their offices are open. They've done everything to protect their staff. They've done everything to protect their patients.

Now, we did also do work throughout the spring of 2020 to be able to work with the Alberta Medical Association to expand the ability for us to provide virtual codes. We started by changing a telephone code that was first implemented in 2009 related to H1N1 and expanding it so it could be used related to virtual care for COVID. We ended up expanding our virtual codes for physicians so they can continue to see patients, whether you are a family physician or a specialist, to be able to do that consulting in a remote way, in a virtual way so that you can do your best to try and protect your patients and your staff. But not everybody, not every patient has been able to do that throughout the pandemic in a virtual way.

I myself have had to see several physicians and other allied health professionals throughout the pandemic. Thank you to them, in particular my optometrist, who I actually just recently saw because I am developing some difficulties with one of my eyes. Watching them, watching their staff do everything that they could to make sure that as patients come into their office, everybody is going to come in in a safe way – they're making good-faith efforts to be able to comply with measures that were determined by those epidemiologists.

What I ask is for all members of this Legislature to heed the advice of those physicians. They had our backs as patients throughout the pandemic. Now it's our turn to have theirs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, are there others? The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms Notley: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to be the first opposition member to be able to rise to speak to this bill in third reading at a time when we have about 42 or 43 minutes left to speak at all. That is rather unprecedented, as our caucus House leader outlined. Obviously, closure is not unprecedented with this government. They've done it more in the last two years than the previous three governments did combined, but to do it before anyone had even risen to speak once on it is a new thing. Anyhoo, yes, we have about 45 minutes. I will try to cover as many things as I can but still give others the opportunity as well to participate in what little time is left.

This bill is a bill that will, contrary to what the Health minister just tried to claim, significantly limit the ability of family members and loved ones of people who have been injured by a broad range of players in Alberta society through infection with COVID throughout this pandemic as a result of the negligent actions of those operators. That's what the bill is. To be clear, it is not . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, but I might just ask that if members are hoping to have some side conversations, they can do that in the lobbies or other places. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor. I think that we should all be able to hear her uninterrupted.

Ms Notley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That is what they're doing although, of course, to be clear, now what will happen is that people will be able to sue successfully – well, they could unsuccessfully now – if they could show gross negligence and reckless disregard for the safety of the people who are in their care or under their employ or otherwise impacted by their activities.

To be clear, by going from negligence and/or what is characterized as unreasonable behaviour to gross negligence and reckless disregard, we have significantly limited the ability of people to sue where there has been malfeasance. That is a restriction in the rights of people and families who have lost loved ones throughout COVID. Make no mistake. Please do not believe when the Health minister says that that is not true, because that's exactly what it does. That's what the bill does, so we've got new standards there.

10:20

As well, the Health minister tried to suggest that this was a lighter touch because this only deals with continuing care. Let me be clear that that is also not correct. While other bills used in other provinces might specify other operators, this bill gives the cabinet the authority to also extend protection for operators to anybody, so it has the same legal impact as the other bills. To try to distinguish the two on that basis is disingenuous and, I would argue, not helpful to a reasonable conversation about what it is we are talking about today. That is the second point that I think is worth pointing out.

Then the question becomes: why are we dealing with this bill? Now, the Health minister will argue that the reason we are dealing with this bill isn't because they only listen to an association of long-term care providers and continuing care providers and, even more importantly, their insurance companies. No, no, no. They, in fact, are listening to the families and loved ones of people who reside in long-term and continuing care, and in fact they're even listening to those people who reside and live in long-term and continuing care, and this is all about helping them, and the way we're helping them, Mr. Speaker, is by making sure that their poor overwrought,

overtaxed, unprofitable continuing care operators don't go out of business. Okay. Well, that's an interesting argument. Let's explore that a little bit.

Where's the evidence for that? We've heard this broad assertion: if we didn't do this, people would be thrown out on the streets because all these continuing care places would go out of business and they couldn't possibly provide care, and, oh, my goodness, AHS might have to step in, and then these poor seniors would be subject to the care and attention of, oh, unionized workers, and that would be horrible, so absolutely we have to step in and ensure that this horrible disaster does not come to pass.

Let's explore. Again, typically when you make that kind of assertion, you come in with a little bit of evidence to back up said assertion. There has been no evidence. What we do have, however, Mr. Speaker, is some evidence to the contrary. We have, for instance, evidence that we've got a couple of different private-sector companies who received hundreds of millions of extra dollars from the federal government to top up wage supplements or wages and also to provide additional safety standards within their operations. They got hundreds of millions of dollars, and what happened? That money went to shareholders. Not all of it. I don't want to say that all of it did, but, say, for instance, with Revera, who's one of the groups that is applauding and met with this government and said, "Please, please save us from going out of business; listen to us, not the people we care for," they got about \$157 million from the federal government and then turned around and paid \$74 million out to their shareholders. That's not a sign of a company that is in financial trouble, my friends. Or Extencicare: they received \$82 million from the federal government and then turned around and gave \$30 million to their shareholders.

Now, in 2020, as we know, the predominant number of Canadians and Albertans who tragically passed away from COVID lived in continuing and long-term care. It was a very, very difficult time for those operators, and I don't for a moment think that it wasn't in many cases. But, just to be clear, if fiscal responsibility was the concern, the CEO of Extencicare got paid \$1.7 million in salary in 2020. That does not read, to me, like there's a fiscal crisis, and in fact what it does say to me is that they received hundreds of millions of dollars of support from government already.

The other thing that we know here is that while we were not provided evidence as to really show that the continuing care industry was in trouble, we also know that most of them already have insurance. Maybe what this was really about is the insurance companies. Well, you may be surprised how many things come down to the insurance companies, particularly with this government. What we know about the insurance companies is that although it would have cost them a fair amount of money to pay out had the standard remained the classic standard, which is negligence and the requirement for reasonable behaviour, what we know is that throughout the pandemic insurance companies have, generally speaking, increased their profits, and the reason for that is because people have been staying home, not doing the kinds of things that businesses and others insure against. Overall, payouts from insurance companies have gone down.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, for instance, we proposed to this government that they actually reduce premiums for small-business owners, for instance, because we knew that those small businesses weren't operating and they were empty. This idea that they were still paying the same insurance to the insurance companies that were making all this money made no sense. Anyway, they ignored that request, but that request was founded on research we had done that showed that the insurance industry was doing just fine, thank you very much.

If it is not the case that these companies, either the continuing care companies and insurance companies, are continuing to do quite well, as the evidence that I just outlined would suggest, then it is incumbent upon the UCP government to provide evidence to Albertans to suggest that this really was a problem and really was a crisis, to show the numbers. We are making a big decision here to significantly reduce the legal rights of some of Alberta's most vulnerable citizens and their loved ones and their surviving spouses and their children and their parents. We are reducing their rights, so we should take seriously the obligation to provide evidence – evidence; not wild assertions but evidence – that the industry was in trouble. We haven't seen that.

Let's talk as well, just before I go on to my next piece, about other bodies that would be impacted here. I just want to throw this out there, of course, because the government has given itself the permission to ensure that other groups are also benefiting from this protection. One of those groups, as you've heard us talk about already, is the meat-packing plants. The reason we are talking about the meat-packing plants is not that we somehow have some hate on for meat-packing plants; it's that because thousands of people got sick in the meat-packing plants and in particular in Alberta. We had the largest outbreak on the continent, and we continued, unlike in every other jurisdiction in this country, to allow them to operate and, in fact, to badger and hector their frightened, vulnerable employees into going to work when it was clear that it was not a safe place. This bill gives the government permission to extend the protection to them. So we asked this government in Committee of the Whole: "You know what? We get this thing that you've got going on with continuing care, but what happened in Alberta with meat-packing plants is unlike anything that happened anywhere else in the country, so please exempt the meat-packing plants from this." But they didn't, which says to me that, in fact, they, too, will be lining up to receive this protection.

10:30

Also, there's another issue here, Mr. Speaker, and the issue is this, that depending on the legal test that the beneficiaries of this legislation have to meet in order to avoid paying out compensation to the vulnerable Albertans and their loved ones arising from malfeasance in the carrying out of their duties, depending on the standard, what is considered in the deliberation with respect to that standard is different. If we were to have stayed with the previous standard – to be clear, there are many lawyers out there that already say that the court would absolutely have taken into account COVID. Had they been doing a regular negligence case, COVID would have factored in, and the courts would have made some allowances for these companies as a result of the unprecedented crisis that we were facing. Just to be clear, legal experts out there already say that that was going to happen.

Anyhow, notwithstanding that, what would have happened, because the standard was an easier one for the plaintiff to meet and because the standard was around what's reasonable and unreasonable, is that there would have been a much more rigorous evaluation of what the government's rules were. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I think this government was very, very nervous about because the legal analysis there would have drawn in the actions of this government as the pandemic unfolded and progressed. It is on that that I would argue, at least – you know, the members opposite keep talking about B.C. – that there is quite a bit of daylight between the way this government conducted itself in terms of keeping people safe versus how other governments and in particular B.C. conducted themselves in terms of keeping people safe.

We know that B.C. has a much older population and a much higher percentage of their population in continuing and long-term

care. We know that. Notwithstanding that, at the end of the day they were able, statistically speaking, as a percentage of those who were vulnerable, to significantly reduce the infection rate and subsequently the fatality rate as a percentage of that population, the seniors population, and as a percentage of the population in care. Part of the way they were able to do that was by immediately enacting the ban on site-to-site staffing, which is something that we talked about a lot here but that we never actually executed with tremendous precision. Why? Workers needed that money, and there was the delay in getting money out the door in terms of the supplementary income and other things, I'm sure, as well.

In any event, whether we're talking about B.C. or here or anywhere else, the reality is that an adjudication of reasonable standards would have put the whole safety regime around continuing care under a microscope and not just what happened under COVID but generally speaking. Now, the Health minister tried to argue that somehow, you know, everything going on in continuing care was the fault of our government and that he was well on the way to making things better. Now, to be clear, when you plan to fire 10,000 to 11,000 front-line health care workers, you have a significant impact on the quality of care received by people in continuing care and long-term care, either directly or indirectly. There are a lot of other things, and I'm not going to go through the budget and all the ways in which this government has rolled back funding that would have consequences to funding of continuing care.

What I will say, though, is that divorce by long-term care was a long-standing event that existed long before our government was ever elected. The shortage of long-term care in communities and rural communities and the shortage of beds existed long before our government ever came into office. It was a chronic problem that the previous Conservative governments had failed to address. Now, we ran on a commitment, a relatively modest one, of creating 2,000 new beds. We did that. We exceeded that. Could we have done more? Sure. Can this government do more? Absolutely. Can all governments across the country do more? Yes. But the way to get there is not to shut down the adjudication of what is reasonable and what is not reasonable.

We've called on this government to agree to a public inquiry into the handling of continuing care and long-term care in Alberta throughout the course of COVID. Quite honestly, if this bill had included that in it and even articulated that they would have been free from liability as a result of participating in it, you know, we actually potentially could have started to work with folks on this. At least we would have come up with recommendations for improvement. Listening to the Health minister touch on the ridiculous continuing care review that we saw released – I don't know – a couple of months ago, two or three months ago, let me be very clear. That is not the answer, what was outlined there.

I know the folks opposite are not big fans of evidence. However, the evidence is clear. And this has nothing to do with corporations or no corporations or unions or no unions. This has just to do with standards, resources, and evidence. The evidence is very clear that publicly funded and nonprofit continuing care and long-term care were more successful at caring for seniors over the course of COVID than the for-profit sector. I'm sorry, but that's just what the evidence shows, just like the evidence shows that the standard of care in the for-profit continuing care sector and long-term care sector is lower, and the amount of evidence that reinforces that is gargantuan.

The Health minister's alleged plan for fixing all of this and the continuing care report that was released recently ultimately is proposing more for-profit care. Hidden deep in it, of course, is the proposal in the sections on choice and choice around home care and

choice around certain types of care. I can't remember the exact phrase, but it's essentially client-funded care. Essentially, in that is the option to have seniors pay more out of pocket for continuing care and long-term care. To be very clear, that is not the solution to the crisis that we are facing across this country and the humane provision of long-term care and continuing care for citizens as they age or other citizens who suffer from lifelong disabilities and need a form of care throughout their life. All I'm saying is that this standard of care that has been pulled out and replaced with reckless disregard will mean that there will be much less review of what the effectiveness was of the government standards. Unfortunately, in some cases the government standards fell far short.

That, of course, brings me back to Cargill. We had the outrageous spectre of having the minister of agriculture get on the phone and tell vulnerable, racialized, new Canadian, temporary foreign, in some cases non-English speaking workers that they had to go to work and that it was safe. He did that two days before the place closed down. He did that when thousands of people had been infected and a whole section of the city of Calgary became a hotspot because, quite frankly, that's where many of those workers lived. That was happening.

10:40

You know, weeks before that we were begging for health and safety inspectors to go in there. Weeks before that we were describing how the way in which the meat plants were being inspected was not adequate to actually ensure that safe work processes would be in place and that safety would be provided, yet that was ignored. We go back to B.C., and everyone likes to go, "Oh, B.C. is an NDP government, and they have this kind of legislation, too," but you know what happened in B.C.? When they had infections in their meat-packing plants, they closed them. Two infections: they shut them down. Three infections: they shut them down. They did not wait for hundreds upon hundreds of people to get sick, but that's what happened here. It is a black mark on the record of how this was handled in Alberta, and it is a black mark in terms of how we treated some of our most vulnerable yet most necessary and most important and most critical front-line workers.

That is, obviously, the primary concern that we have here. What we should be doing instead of – oh, one thing I want to point out, though. Now, the members opposite are super pumped at the prospect of saying that we are interested in throwing working people under the bus. Again, if members opposite had come to us and suggested that they wanted to bring in legislation that would limit the liability of those heroic front-line health care workers and other workers, the meat-packing plant workers that I was just describing, the people in grocery stores, the doctors, the nurses, the nursing aides, the people who cleaned up and prepared meals in continuing care and hospitals and everywhere else, if we'd wanted to bring something in to make sure that under no circumstances would they be liable – now, in most cases the law is already in place that they would not ever be liable. Most people aren't liable from being at work, so they don't actually need this law. But if there was for some reason the thought that that was a problem, we would have been happy to work with that.

But the idea that there is no compensation for anyone who cannot prove gross negligence and reckless disregard is – you know, the standard thing is that you're using a sledgehammer to pound in a tack, or conversely you're doing something altogether different, which is protecting your friends in the private continuing care sector and even more so the insurance companies, with whom they already have economic relationships.

What we should be doing is talking about different standards of care. Now, yesterday I talked about the Freedom to Care Act, and I

talked about how that act, notwithstanding the lovely stories that the members opposite like to tell about how it was all about helping a lovely lady in the neighbourhood give food to her friends or neighbours or about people coming together in a church to provide immediate shelter in the middle of winter – it's a lovely story, but unfortunately that's not what the law says. It's not what the word says. It's not what the statute said. You know, we're bound and determined to actually read things that are put in front of us to make sure that they're doing what it is we're being told is happening. What that actually said, of course, is that it allowed for regulations to be removed and organizations to be exempted, by the stroke of a pen behind a closed door, from following certain standards.

To test it, to make sure that we weren't worried unnecessarily about how it would be applied, we asked that the nursing home standards be exempted from the exemption authority provided in the Freedom to Care Act. Those nursing home standards: I took a bit of time last night to walk through that regulation and then to walk through the standards that were referenced in that regulation and then to walk through the detailed list of actual rules that are there. Those, as I said before, are the heart and soul of how we ensure safety in our continuing care sector. The fact is that we actually have lower standards in many respects in Alberta than we do in other provinces. Ontario, for instance – again, everyone is loving to say, "Oh, well, Ontario is passing similar legislation, so we're just doing what they're doing," but Ontario has different standards. Again, this goes to my point about how this government is trying very hard to avoid having these standards actually discussed in any kind of systematic way.

Ontario requires four hours of care a day for residents in long-term care, in their law. In Alberta it's 1.9 hours a day. Why is that? Well, I don't know. Maybe seniors in Alberta don't need the care. Maybe they're less sick. I don't know. It doesn't seem to make sense to me, but that's an example of the difference in standards between the two provinces, the point being that those are one example of the ways in which we should be ensuring that we provide the proper care to those Albertans who are vulnerable and need it.

Now, the members opposite like to demonize us for talking about unionized workers because apparently when we talk about a union that would represent vulnerable workers – I don't know – it's kind of like a swear word to them. I'm not quite sure why. It's a little odd. Nonetheless, what those unions actually do – and I'm quite happy to say I'm a lifetime member of one of those unions that actually represents front-line health care workers in the continuing care sector, the steelworkers, interestingly. I bet you didn't know that, but they actually represent a number of front-line health care workers in the continuing care sector.

What they do is provide a slightly better wage, provide them with benefits, provide them with – here's one – paid sick days, you know, that thing that no one ever wanted to act on, provide them in some cases with modest pensions although that's kind of a hard one to negotiate. It doesn't really exist in most sectors anymore. It provides them with an adequate number of hours so that they don't have to actually be trying to work for four or five different private-sector employers to cobble together a living to keep food on the table for their family. They can actually be sure that they'll get 30, 40 hours a week. That's actually how you provide safety because you provide stability amongst the very hard working and typically very modestly paid workforce that still is providing fundamentally important care to the people that we love and care about in our families and in our communities.

One of the other things that happens when you have the mean, awful union in there is that those workers, because they have some semblance of employment security, are typically – one of the

things, and I don't know if the members opposite know, is that most unions that are in health care settings provide for what's referred to as professional responsibility committees. Those committees aren't about actually advocating for the rights of the workers. Those are committees that are typically built into most collective agreements for people, even modestly paid front-line nursing aides and folks like that. It provides them the opportunity to have an open conversation with their employer and their managers without fear of repercussion about the additional levels of care that are required and the quality of care that is required for the citizens, the seniors, the disabled people for whom they provide care.

In other places where you don't have that kind of employment security, folks are worried about raising those issues with their managers because they don't have employment security. Again, we've already talked about how they're bouncing from place to place to place, and there's no right to keep your job in the absence of wrongful conduct.

These are the kinds of simple things that provide stability and a stable workforce, the opportunity to learn more, to train more, to advocate for your clients more. These are things that are possible in the continuing care sector where you have a stable workforce, something that actually exists to a much higher degree in B.C., which allowed for them to more quickly stop the site-to-site transfers.

This is one thing; I mean, it's certainly not the only thing. Obviously, we have to be looking at more support, more funding, quite honestly, more capital investment in terms of the quality of the spaces. I absolutely agree with the Health minister that we should not have people double-bunking or triple-bunking in long-term or continuing care. That needs to stop. So that's good. But we also have to be providing more spaces because we are – I'm sure the members opposite know – probably 20,000 spaces behind where projections suggest we should be.

10:50

Home care is absolutely an excellent form of care. I think almost all of us would like to imagine that should we get to that point, we will be privileged enough to be able to rely on home care. But home care itself is something that needs to be provided with consistent standards that are overseen and with professional staff who are fairly paid and who are trained to be able to provide safe and fulsome care.

Again, these and so many other issues are the kinds of things that should be considered when you're talking about improving the quality of care in continuing care and long-term care and keeping people safe. That's what we should be talking about along with the many things that we've heard on the federal level. We've heard so many things on the federal level that have been very interesting. We've talked about, you know, bringing long-term care and continuing care under the coverage of the Canada Health Act. We've talked about different ways to – and potentially getting more federal financing responsibility there for that, all those kinds of things. I think that this is something we have to look at pragmatically across multiple jurisdictions.

That's what we should be doing. We should not be noodling away on how to privatize our continuing care and long-term care system, reduce the wages of the people who work there, and then work together with the insurance companies and the for-profit companies to limit the liability of the families and the loved ones and the vulnerable people themselves who may actually be parties to these claims.

It's, you know, a bit emblematic of the kinds of choices that are made by this UCP government. I mean, they came to power with the plan to be the voice for the regular people living in the small

communities all across the province, that they would stand up for them and be their voice, but once they got into power, they couldn't get into the backrooms with their friends in the insurance industry fast enough. Unfortunately, it's not what a lot of people thought they were voting for when they voted for the UCP. They thought they were voting for someone who actually would connect with citizens and their parents and grandparents on the street, in their town, when they went to the post office to pick up their mail, that those were the people that they were sending to Edmonton to stand up for them. Instead, that's not who this government is standing up for, and that's certainly not whose interests are being reflected through this legislation.

I think there may be a real issue here that needs to be addressed. We don't know because no evidence has been provided to us about it, just generalized claims. I think there are more precise, more strategic, more light touch ways in which those things could have been addressed if there was a problem. I think that there should be a much larger statutory commitment to reviewing the systematic failings of our long-term care and continuing care system. I absolutely do not believe that any of those solutions will come from the vague sort of "let's privatize it" plans that were rolled out in this UCP government's continuing care report a couple of months ago.

So we're on the wrong track. We're protecting the wrong people. We're not doing the hard work to protect the right people. This bill could have been a platform for setting in place the right protections while, at the same time, working on the best path forward to come up with the best strategies for representing and caring for aging Albertans and those Albertans with a significant lifelong disability, who we also know were remarkably vulnerable and negatively impacted through COVID as a result of a lot of, you know, failed safety standards in multiple settings.

With all that in mind, of course, not surprisingly, our caucus cannot support this bill. We think that this government needs to recommit itself to an open and transparent – probably this would actually be a good use for an independent judge-led inquiry into really figuring out all the barriers that are in place to providing safety for seniors throughout this province.

With that, Mr. Speaker – I'll even allow for an extra few minutes there – I will take my place and urge all members to reconsider moving ahead with this terribly, terribly unfortunate piece of legislation.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, are there others? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we don't go back and forth?

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

Ms Sigurdson: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to address some of the comments that were made by the Minister of Health in Committee of the Whole. He assured this Assembly that, you know, citizens of Alberta continue to have the right to sue private operators if they're concerned about care their loved ones had. He said that everything is fine; they can still go ahead and can do that. But what he didn't say and I want to say on the record is that the rules got changed significantly by Bill 70, this really horrible piece of legislation that robs Albertans of their rights.

Previously people had the right to sue if there was negligence, but now the bar is extremely high with gross negligence. Just for the record gross negligence is extreme indifference to a reckless disregard for the safety of others. More than simple carelessness or failure to act, it is wilful behaviour done with extreme disregard for the health and safety of others. It is conduct likely to cause

foreseeable harm. So this is an extremely high bar for people to have to prove in the court system. My colleague from Edmonton-Whitemud spoke extensively about this, and she indicated that there is not even very much case law on this because the expectation is usually negligence. So it does impede Albertans from being able to bring forward concerns about their loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I just want you to know that I've received hundreds of correspondence, e-mails, phone calls. I've had Zoom calls. People have stood with us in press conferences because of, really, pretty severe neglect of their loved ones and their family members who have passed on. This Bill 70 robs them of the right to ask for justice.

You know, there are a few things we can do in society to ask for justice. One is our court system, and this bill effectively takes that away from Albertans. Another thing is, you know, having public inquiries, and this is something that we have asked for repeatedly from this UCP government, and they continue to say no to that. So what recourse do Albertans have? This government is taking away all of their powers to actually have their issues addressed.

One of my big concerns is that this is protecting private, for-profit operators, and we know because there is this phenomenon happening in continuing care . . .

11:00

The Speaker: Hon. member, I hesitate to interrupt, but pursuant to Government Motion 90, agreed to earlier today, which states that after one hour of debate all questions must be decided to conclude third reading of debate on Bill 70, COVID-19 Related Measures Act, I now put the following questions to conclude debate.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion for third reading carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 11:01 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Dreeshen	Luan	Schow
Ellis	Madu	Schulz
Getson	McIver	Schweitzer
Glasgo	Neudorf	Shandro
Glubish	Nicolaides	Sigurdson, R.J.
Guthrie	Nixon, Jason	Singh
Hunter	Nixon, Jeremy	Toews
Issik	Orr	Turton
Jones	Pon	Walker
Kenney	Rehn	Williams
LaGrange	Rosin	Wilson
Long	Rowswell	Yaseen
Lovely	Sawhney	

11:20

Against the motion:

Bilous	Goehring	Pancholi
Ceci	Gray	Renaud
Dach	Hoffman	Sabir
Dang	Irwin	Schmidt
Deol	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan	Nielsen	Sigurdson, L.
Ganley	Notley	Sweet
Totals:	For – 38	Against – 21

[Motion carried; Bill 70 read a third time]

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Peace River.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 8 and Standing Order 9(1) in order to proceed immediately to second reading on Bill 217, Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders Second Reading

Bill 217 Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Peace River.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you. I rise today to speak to Bill 217. Lech Wałęsa said, “The fall of the Berlin Wall makes for [pretty] pictures. But it all started in the shipyards.” To understand this, we’ll have to look at the Polish people and understand why it was such an important thing. Indulge me, Mr. Speaker and the Chamber, for a short time as we participate together, both sides of the House, in passing what I believe is an important act of bipartisan support for Polish Canadians living in the province of Alberta and Canadians and Albertans of Polish heritage.

This history of Poland has been a difficult one. Through much of modern history it didn't exist. Going back to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, it was an empire, but there were times throughout much of European history where the country was wiped off the map. We know very well the history of Nazi Germany and its policy of Lebensraum in an attempt to grow its land in Europe so that it could push out other peoples, and victims of this were the Polish people, of course. As they attacked Poland unprovoked in 1939, the Polish people suffered greatly under Nazi Germany, as did freedoms across the world as we saw that tyranny grow.

It was during that war that we saw the First Canadian Army take into its ranks the 1st Polish Armoured Division. In doing so, we saw Canadians and Poles fighting side by side together, defending freedom, one country occupied, the other fighting for the freedoms of citizens across the world. It was a great hope and light to see countries coming together with shared values, fighting, with all sorts of victims falling and soldiers being injured in an attempt to fight for freedom.

Directly after the fall of the Nazi expansion we saw Poland be taken over by the Soviet empire, and this imperialism pushed in through all of Poland and imposed its tyrannical view onto the Polish people.

Now, this is where I want to pause the story and take a look at a particular moment in 1979, where we saw John Paul II, the first Polish Pope in history, coming to Poland, being warned not to insurrect anything, being warned, when he spoke on June 4, 1979, in victory square, that he should not be disrupting the peace. He spoke there, at what was victory square, also known as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. He said to the Poles gathered by the million-plus:

In how many places in our native land has that soldier fallen! In how many places in Europe and the world has he cried with his death that there can be no just Europe without the independence of Poland marked on its map! On how many battlefields has that soldier given witness to the rights of man, indelibly inscribed in the inviolable rights of the people, by falling for “our freedom and yours”!

He continued on, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to kneel before this tomb to venerate every seed that falls into the earth and dies and thus bears fruit. It may be the seed of the blood of a soldier shed on the battlefield, or the sacrifice of martyrdom in concentration camps or in prisons.

Mr. Speaker, he continues to talk about the sacrifices and the work done in Polish universities, libraries, places of national culture, in the workshops, in the mines, in the foundries, in the shipyards and the factories. Many of those workers became the Solidarity labour movement that was the vehicle through which freedom was provided in the June elections of 1989, that this bill recognizes.

He continued on.

It may be the seed of prayer, of service of the sick, the suffering, the abandoned – “all that of which Poland is made” . . .

All that – the history of the motherland shaped for a thousand years by the succession of the generations (among them the present generation and the coming generation) and by each son and daughter of the motherland, even if they are anonymous and unknown like the Soldier before whose tomb we are now.

All that – including the history of the peoples that have lived with us and among us, such as those who died in their hundreds of thousands within the walls of the Warsaw ghetto.

He continued, Mr. Speaker, with an emotional plea.

And I cry – I who am a Son of the land of Poland and who am also Pope John Paul II – I cry from . . . the depths of this Millennium, I cry on the vigil of Pentecost . . .

Come, Holy Spirit. This moment was almost precisely one decade to the day before the victory we saw in the first partially free elections, that this bill commemorates, on June 4, 1989, led by Lech Wałęsa, whose quote I read at the start.

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that that Polish culture that we saw is an ancient one. As George Grant says in his book *Lament for a Nation*, he has hope for the Polish people in comparison to Canada as he laments our future. He says that the Poles have an ancient culture which has shown strength in resisting the new changes, alluding to communism on their doorstep and Nazism before that. Little did Grant know that it was those seeds that would be transplanted into the Canadian prairie in Alberta, that would grow up and be grafted onto our culture and give new life and new hope to our province. Little did he know that like the Poles, the Mennonites, Ukrainians before, like Europeans of all descent, Africans, Asians, Australasians, South Americans, they will come and be grafted onto our culture and give our country new hope, a new growing. In Latin culture is *cultura*; it means growth.

We see this culture contribute to Canada, and the Poles deserve to be recognized for the great sacrifices they have made, the great sacrifices that we saw in Warsaw in 1979, witnessed by Pope John Paul II speaking in that moment of national unity to say: take heart in your culture because it is from that that you will find freedom. Take heart in your faith, which is buried in your culture; it is from that that you will be liberated. It is that that we gain here in Canada as a gift from Poland as those seeds planted by Poles for generations are now growing here in Alberta. Many Albertans are a product of that, myself included on my mother’s side. It is a beautiful gift, and I believe that that more than anything is why we must recognize the important contributions that all Albertans make and particularly today and particularly in commemoration of the second Sunday in June, commemorating those first partially free elections, the contribution of Polish-Canadians.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With that, I move second reading of Bill 217.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the hon. Member for Peace River has moved second reading of Bill 217.

I see that the hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore would like to provide additional comments.

11:30

Mr. Nielsen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It’s a great pleasure this evening, especially at this late hour, to be able to rise to add just some quick additional comments to Bill 217, recognizing Polish heritage here in Alberta. You know, as an MLA – and I think all my colleagues would agree – it’s such an incredible honour, it’s amazing fun to be able to interact with the different cultures that we represent within our ridings. I know Edmonton-Decore is incredibly diverse, with a very, very vibrant Polish community. I remember getting the opportunity to spend many hours – ice cream parties, things like that – over at the Polish veterans hall right across the street from my old office.

When we get the opportunity to celebrate the diversity that we have here in Alberta and, of course, largely in Canada, it does nothing but make us stronger, so getting the opportunity to provide a day of recognition for the contributions that the Polish peoples have brought to Alberta, have brought to Canada is never something that we should ever take for granted, and we should certainly celebrate that at every opportunity along with every other single culture that calls Alberta, Canada, home.

I’m very honoured to be able to stand to support this bill. It’s certainly something that I was working on in the 29th Legislature, getting the conversation going, so I’m happy to see that we’re here today to be able to move this forward, and I would urge all members of the Assembly to support this bill.

Hopefully, we can pass this swiftly this evening so that Polish-Canadians will have their opportunity to share more of their culture with us and, if I dare say, the food, which is incredible. I look forward to being able to participate in the celebrations.

The Speaker: Hon. members, are there others? Are there others that would like to join in the debate for second reading? I am prepared to call the question or ask the hon. member to close debate should there be no others.

Prior to doing that, I’d like to take two seconds of chair discretion to just make comment that at the table this evening is our very own Michael Kulicki, who is of Polish descent, so it’s a great pleasure for him to be able to join us at the table today, not that I would presuppose a decision of the Assembly. Well, perhaps there are great things in store.

The hon. Member for Peace River to close debate.

Mr. Williams: Waived.

[Motion carried; Bill 217 read a second time]

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Peace River.

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request unanimous consent to waive Standing Order 8 and Standing Order 9(1) to proceed immediately to Committee of the Whole on Bill 217, Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mrs. Pitt in the Chair]

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

Bill 217
Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act

The Chair: Are there any members that are wishing to join the debate?

Seeing none, I will call the question.

[The clauses of Bill 217 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? Carried.

The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that we rise and report Bill 217.

[Motion carried]

[The Speaker in the chair]

Mr. Rowswell: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a bill. The committee reports the following bill: Bill 217.

The Speaker: Hon. members, does the Assembly concur in the report? If so, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Speaker: Any opposed, please say no. In my opinion, the ayes have it. That motion is carried and so ordered.

The hon. Member for Peace River.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise again to request unanimous consent to waive Standing Order (8), Standing Order (9)(1), and Standing Order 77(1) in order to proceed immediately to third reading of Bill 217, Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act.

[Unanimous consent granted]

**Public Bills and Orders Other than
Government Bills and Orders
Third Reading**

Bill 217
Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Peace River.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I move third reading of Bill 217, I wish to just, first, provide a few thank yous to everyone who contributed. I'll start with the Polish community in Alberta, who has been working very hard, as the Member for Edmonton-Decore has said previously, on trying to achieve this bill. Happily, I believe tonight will be the night.

I want to thank the Canadian Polish Congress, particularly the Alberta branch, for their contributions in the idea and the drafting and the choosing of the date, the honorary consuls of Poland in Alberta for their contribution, and I want to particularly thank my government colleagues for granting their unanimous consent and their support of this and also the opposition benches, particularly the deputy House leader and also particularly the Member for Edmonton-Decore. I received a very warm welcome at the Private Bills Committee, and I believe that it's been a very good example

of collaboration on something that is meaningful to a number of Albertans. I want to thank all members of the House for their contributions in this bipartisan support.

With that, I'll move third reading and offer the debate.

The Speaker: The hon. the Premier.

Mr. Kenney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to commend the Member for Peace River for this bill and for his very eloquent speech. Members may be aware that the Member for Peace River recently lost his mother, Marianne Maykut, who was a proud daughter of Poland. I know she would be very proud of her son tonight in remembering her Polish heritage.

Mr. Speaker, Canada has been immensely enriched by the presence and contributions of over a million Canadians of Polish descent. We in Alberta have been especially blessed to have the second-largest population of Polonia, the Polish community, on a per capita basis, some 200,000 Albertans of Polish origin. The first Polish community in the province was established at a parish in the village of Skaro about 80 kilometres northeast of Edmonton, Our Lady of Good Counsel parish, that was established there at the turn of the last century.

Like so many other immigrants from eastern Europe they were people who came from what we would now regard as abject poverty but people of great strength, people of tremendous character, people of a bottomless faith that guided everything they did in life. They chose a new future in what was then the newest part of the new world in this enormous frontier of the great Canadian northwest on the prairies. Like so many other eastern European pioneers in the northern prairies they plowed virgin soil to create communities through nothing but their toil and their work ethic. Why? Because they were impelled to create a brighter future for their children in a land of freedom.

I say in a land of freedom because, as the Member for Peace River alluded to, the history of Poland is a tragic one. There are very few nations which more clearly represent the concept of nationhood than Poland, as the beautiful citation from St. John Paul II articulated.

11:40

Through much of history that nation was not a country with formal borders. It did not have control of its own sovereignty. That's particularly true of modern Poland. Modern Poland was born out of the Great War in 1918 at the Treaty of Versailles but only shortly thereafter was invaded in part by the Soviets, and eventually, of course, in 1938, that Poland, interwar Poland, which struggled for its survival, ultimately was torn apart as a result of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the infamous pact between Stalin and Hitler, which divided Poland in half. That Poland went on to live the horrors of the Nazi Reich and eastern Poland the atrocities of Stalinist communism.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, after the war, when Canadians and others fought so hard for the liberation of Europe, Poland was left behind the Iron Curtain, only to be liberated thanks to the revolution of hope and dignity led by the great St. John Paul II. That Pope, that great Polish Pope, the greatest Pole of the modern era, visited us here in Alberta, here in Edmonton, said Mass here in this community, visited St. Joseph's Basilica, not far from us.

We can see in our own country symbols of Poland intertwined in our own history. Just look at the Canadian flag, red on white. When Lord Wellington was leading the British Forces in the Napoleonic Wars, he was most profoundly impressed by the discipline and military effectiveness of his allies in the Polish hussars, who carried red and white banners. So he made red and white, in recognition of

them, the colours of the British Army, which is how red and white became the colours of the standard of the Royal Military College of Canada, founded in the 1870s. Fast-forward to the 1960s, when George Stanley, the principal at RMC, proposed the RMC flag as the model of the Canadian flag, and that was adopted by Parliament in 1965, a direct lineage between the colours of our flag and the colours of the Polish army.

Mr. Speaker, I personally have had the great privilege of visiting Poland on many occasions, representing Canada in Kraków, the great cultural and intellectual cradle of Poland, and in Gdańsk, the centre of the Solidarność movement, led by Lech Wałęsa, which ultimately led to the fall of the Iron Curtain and the liberation of hundreds of millions across Europe. I visited the museum of Polish Jewry to see the magnificent but also tragic history of the Jewish people in Poland. I visited the museum of the Polish uprising and saw there a recovered Royal Canadian Air Force Halifax bomber that was dropping supplies to support the freedom fighters rising up against the Nazis. Unforgettably, I've had the opportunity of visiting what they call the Polish Golgotha, the Nazi German death and concentration camp at Auschwitz-Birkenau.

Mr. Speaker, those places represent the pathos of modern Polish history, and we just say thank you to all of those Poles who've chosen Canada as their new home, who've helped us to build this magnificent, pluralistic democracy. I want to thank the member for this motion. Let me say, in closing, [Remarks in Polish], long live Poland, and vive le Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me thank you, all of the table officers, the pages, members of our security team, and all members, on both sides of the House, for their diligence and hard work in making democracy happen during the trying circumstances of this pandemic.

The Speaker: Are there others?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call on the hon. the Member for Peace River to close debate.

[Motion carried; Bill 217 read a third time]

The Speaker: Hon. members, prior to calling on the hon. Government House Leader, on behalf of your Speaker let me just say thank you so much for a very productive session, some 116 days long, and who knows what the future holds with respect to longer sessions?

I would like to say a very special thank you to our table officers, our pages, many of which are retiring – this will be their last legislative session with us – certainly *Hansard*, who is with us at all hours of the day and night, our LASS team, and, of course, each and every one of you. It has continued to be the greatest honour of my life to be able to serve you, and I look forward to all of the things that the fall has in store for us.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me just, through you to all members of the Chamber, your office, the LAO, and the entire team that it takes to make the Legislature work, express my thanks for what has been a very long session but a successful session for all members of the House: the government caucus, the opposition caucus, and the independent members. Thank you for all your hard work. Travel safe as you go home, and have a great summer break.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to advise the Assembly that pursuant to Government Motion 77 the business of the 2021 spring sitting is now concluded.

[The Assembly adjourned at 11:46 p.m. pursuant to Government Motion 77]

Bill Status Report for the 30th Legislature - 2nd Session (2020-2021)

Activity to Wednesday, June 16, 2021

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

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

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

Bill 1 — Critical Infrastructure Defence Act (Kenney)

First Reading — 4 (*Feb. 25, 2020 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 12-18 (*Feb. 26, 2020 morn.*), 96-98 (*Mar. 2, 2020 aft.*), 791-98 (*May 27, 2020 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 859-91 (*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 (S) (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*)
Committee of the Whole — 3834 (*Dec. 7, 2020 eve.*), 3886-92 (*Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Third Reading — 3900 (*Dec. 8, 2020 eve.*), 3903-09 (*Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2020, with certain sections having effect on various dates; SA 2020 c40]

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)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 cG-5.5]

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)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2020 c30]

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)

Third Reading — 3611-14 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020, with exceptions, and with section 6 taking effect January 1, 2021; SA 2020 c37]

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)

Third Reading — 3685 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force February 1, 2021; SA 2020 c31]

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)

Third Reading — 3606-11 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force May 1, 2021, with exceptions; SA 2020 c34]

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)

Committee of the Whole — 3679-85 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 3700-07 (Dec. 2, 2020 morn.), 3753-58 (Dec. 2, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020, except part of section 3, which has effect January 1, 2022; SA 2020 c36]

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)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 cN-3.6]

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)

Committee of the Whole — 3594-3605 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve.), 3687-3700 (Dec. 2, 2020 morn.), 3721-33 (Dec. 2, 2020 aft.), 3751-53 (Dec. 2, 2020 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 3784-88 (Dec. 3, 2020 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 cF-13.5]

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)

Committee of the Whole — 3591-93 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 3685 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 c33]

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.), 3654-65 (Dec. 1, 2020 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 3685 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force January 1, 2021; SA 2020 c38]

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.), 3614-22 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve.), 3675-76 (Dec. 1, 2020 aft.), 3788-93 (Dec. 3, 2020 aft., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 3823-34 (Dec. 7, 2020 eve.), 3853-60 (Dec. 8, 2020 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 3869 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve.), 3872-79 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020, with exceptions; SA 2020 c35]

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

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

Second Reading — 3192-206 (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.), 3622-28 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve.), 3630-42 (Dec. 1, 2020 morn.), 3743-51 (Dec. 2, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 3763-70 (Dec. 3, 2020 morn.), 3893-3900 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Third Reading — 3901-02 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve.), 3910-16 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2020 c32]

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)

Committee of the Whole — 3665-75 (Dec. 1, 2020 aft.), 3733-40 (Dec. 2, 2020 aft.), 3759-62 (Dec. 2, 2020 eve.), 3834-36 (Dec. 7, 2020 eve.), 3861-68 (Dec. 8, 2020 aft., passed on division)

Third Reading — 3869-70 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve.), 3879-86 (Dec. 8, 2020 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on December 9, 2020, with exceptions; SA 2020 c39]

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)

Committee of the Whole — 3587-91 (Nov. 30, 2020 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 3677-79 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve.), 3685 (Dec. 1, 2020 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 c29]

Bill 51* — Citizen Initiative Act (Madu)

First Reading — 4058 (*Mar. 16, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4340-41 (*Apr. 7, 2021 aft.*), 4567-73 (*Apr. 14, 2021 eve.*), 4690-97 (*Apr. 20, 2021 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 5159-86 (*Jun. 2, 2021 eve., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 5398-5401 (*Jun. 9, 2021 aft., passed*)

Bill 52 — Recall Act (Madu)

First Reading — 4028-29 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4633-42 (*Apr. 19, 2021 eve.*), 4846-58 (*May 25, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5403-24 (*Jun. 9, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 5542-48 (*Jun. 15, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 53 — Service Alberta Statutes (Virtual Meetings) Amendment Act, 2021 (Glubish)

First Reading — 3971 (*Mar. 9, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4043-44 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4129-30 (*Mar. 18, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4245-49 (*Mar. 24, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 4252-53 (*Mar. 24, 2021 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 26, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force August 15, 2020, except for section 5, which comes into force March 26, 2021; SA 2021 c3]

Bill 54 — Irrigation Districts Amendment Act, 2021 (Dreeshen)

First Reading — 3992 (*Mar. 10, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4212-14 (*Mar. 24, 2021 aft.*), 4291-4302 (*Apr. 6, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4361-66 (*Apr. 7, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 4396-99 (*Apr. 8, 2021 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force April 22, 2021; SA 2021 c5]

Bill 55 — College of Alberta School Superintendents Act (LaGrange)

First Reading — 3979 (*Mar. 9, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4044-45 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4107-10 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft.*), 4302-08 (*Apr. 6, 2021 aft.*), 4453-56 (*Apr. 12, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4594-601 (*Apr. 15, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 4788-93 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cC-18.8]

Bill 56 — Local Measures Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (McIver)

First Reading — 4005 (*Mar. 11, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4045 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4309-17 (*Apr. 6, 2021 eve.*), 4342-60 (*Apr. 7, 2021 aft.*), 4367-82 (*Apr. 7, 2021 eve.*), 4400-04 (*Apr. 8, 2021 aft.*), 4435-53 (*Apr. 12, 2021 eve.*), 4657-63 (*Apr. 19, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4877-83 (*May 25, 2021 eve.*), 4953-58 (*May 26, 2021 eve.*), 4970 (*May 27, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 5186-87 (*Jun. 2, 2021 eve.*), 5297-5302 (*Jun. 8, 2021 morn.*), 5439-41 (*Jun. 10, 2021 morn.*), 5579-85 (*Jun. 16, 2021 morn., passed on division*)

Bill 57* — Metis Settlements Amendment Act, 2021 (Wilson)

First Reading — 4005 (*Mar. 11, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4045-46 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4501-12 (*Apr. 13, 2021 eve.*), 4573-80 (*Apr. 14, 2021 eve., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 4743-52 (*Apr. 21, 2021 aft.*), 4883-88 (*May 25, 2021 eve.*), 4971-77 (*May 27, 2021 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)
Third Reading — 5189-95 (*Jun. 3, 2021 morn.*), 5222 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 58 — Freedom to Care Act (Aheer)

First Reading — 4180 (*Mar. 23, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4214-15 (*Mar. 24, 2021 aft.*), 4456 (*Apr. 12, 2021 eve.*), 4560-67 (*Apr. 14, 2021 eve.*), 4682-90 (*Apr. 20, 2021 aft.*), 4726-27 (*Apr. 20, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5343-52 (*Jun. 8, 2021 eve.*), 5496-5507 (*Jun. 14, 2021 eve.*), 5549-60 (*Jun. 15, 2021 eve.*), 5585 (*Jun. 16, 2021 morn.*), 5599-5603 (*Jun. 16, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 5603-08 (*Jun. 16, 2021 aft.*), 5609-13 (*Jun. 16, 2021 aft.*), 5622-25 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 59 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2021 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 4083 (*Mar. 16, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4099-4102 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft.*), 4110-15 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4130-38 (*Mar. 18, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 4215-20 (*Mar. 24, 2021 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 26, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force March 26, 2021; SA 2021 c2]

Bill 60 — Appropriation Act, 2021 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 4099 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4180-99 (*Mar. 23, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4220-33 (*Mar. 24, 2021 aft.*), 4249-52 (*Mar. 24, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 4268-76 (*Mar. 25, 2021 aft., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 26, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force March 26, 2021; SA 2021 c1]

Bill 61 — Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 2021 (Glubish)

First Reading — 4150 (*Mar. 22, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4341-42 (*Apr. 7, 2021 aft.*), 4512-13 (*Apr. 13, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 4752-59 (*Apr. 21, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 4793-94 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force April 22, 2021, with sections 2(a), 5, 9 and 10 coming into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c7]

Bill 62 — Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (Hunter)

First Reading — 4393-94 (*Apr. 8, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4675-82 (*Apr. 20, 2021 aft.*), 4760-61 (*Apr. 21, 2021 aft.*), 4759 (*Apr. 21, 2021 aft.*), 5011-19 (*May 31, 2021 eve.*), 5106-11 (*Jun. 1, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5124-31 (*Jun. 2, 2021 morn.*), 5199-207 (*Jun. 3, 2021 morn., passed*)
Third Reading — 5222-23 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft.*), 5291-97 (*Jun. 8, 2021 morn.*), 5367-74 (*Jun. 9, 2021 morn.*), 5430-33 (*Jun. 10, 2021 morn., passed*)

Bill 63 — Police (Street Checks and Carding) Amendment Act, 2021 (Madu)

First Reading — 4340 (*Apr. 7, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4699-704 (*Apr. 20, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5074-81 (*Jun. 1, 2021 aft.*), 5083 (*Jun. 1, 2021 eve.*), 5144-54 (*Jun. 2, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 5456-59 (*Jun. 10, 2021 aft., passed*)

Bill 64 — Public Lands Amendment Act, 2021 (Nixon, JJ)

First Reading — 4416 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4475-87 (*Apr. 13, 2021 aft.*), 4547-60 (*Apr. 14, 2021 eve.*), 4642-57 (*Apr. 19, 2021 eve.*), 4821-32 (*May 25, 2021 morn.*), 4858-62 (*May 25, 2021 aft.*), 4864-71 (*May 25, 2021 eve., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 4871-77 (*May 25, 2021 eve.*), 4890-4900 (*May 26, 2021 morn.*), 4931-34 (*May 26, 2021 aft.*), 4935-37 (*May 26, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 4938-44 (*May 26, 2021 eve.*), 4946-53 (*May 26, 2021 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*May 27, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force May 27, 2021; SA 2021 c8]

Bill 65 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (Shandro)

First Reading — 4394 (*Apr. 8, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4526-35 (*Apr. 14, 2021 aft.*), 4759-60 (*Apr. 21, 2021 aft.*), 4766-79 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve.*), 4809-17 (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5064-74 (*Jun. 1, 2021 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 5283-88 (*Jun. 7, 2021 eve.*), 5257 (*Jun. 7, 2021 eve.*), 5363-67 (*Jun. 9, 2021 morn., passed*)

Bill 66 — Public Health Amendment Act, 2021 (Shandro)

First Reading — 4416 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 4487-88 (*Apr. 13, 2021 aft.*), 4489-501 (*Apr. 13, 2021 eve.*), 4535-46 (*Apr. 14, 2021 aft.*), 4704-19 (*Apr. 20, 2021 eve.*), 4779-88 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve.*), 4900-4904 (*May 26, 2021 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5083-97 (*Jun. 1, 2021 eve.*), 5338-43 (*Jun. 8, 2021 eve.*), 5507 (*Jun. 14, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 5570-75 (*Jun. 15, 2021 eve., passed*)

Bill 67 — Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship Education Act (Nicolaides)

First Reading — 4468 (*Apr. 13, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 4593-94 (*Apr. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4719-26 (*Apr. 20, 2021 eve.*), 5097-5106 (*Jun. 1, 2021 eve.*), 5113-24 (*Jun. 2, 2021 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 5272-83 (*Jun. 7, 2021 eve.*), 5386-98 (*Jun. 9, 2021 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 5433-39 (*Jun. 10, 2021 morn.*), 5459 (*Jun. 10, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 68 — Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (Madu)

First Reading — 4614 (*Apr. 19, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 4808 (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*), 5019-32 (*May 31, 2021 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 5154-57 (*Jun. 2, 2021 aft.*), 5159 (*Jun. 2, 2021 eve, passed*)

Third Reading — 5195-99 (*Jun. 3, 2021 morn.*), 5222 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 69 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (Nixon, JJ)

First Reading — 4592 (*Apr. 15, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5288-89 (*Jun. 15, 2021 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 5424 (*Jun. 9, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 5424 (*Jun. 9, 2021 eve., passed*)

Bill 70 — COVID-19 Related Measures Act (Gotfried)

First Reading — 4806 (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5331-38 (*Jun. 8, 2021 eve.*), 5357-63 (*Jun. 9, 2021 morn.*), 5425-30 (*Jun. 10, 2021 morn.*), 5485-96 (*Jun. 14, 2021 eve.*), 5516-22 (*Jun. 15, 2021 morn.*), 5536-42 (*Jun. 15, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 5560-64 (*Jun. 15, 2021 eve.*), 5568-70 (*Jun. 15, 2021 eve.*), 5615-20 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 5620-21 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve.*), 5625-31 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 71 — Employment Standards (COVID-19 Vaccination Leave) Amendment Act, 2021 (Copping)

First Reading — 4763 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)

Second Reading — 4763-64 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 4764-65 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 4766 (*Apr. 21, 2021 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force April 21, 2021; SA 2021 c4]

Bill 72 — Preserving Canada's Economic Prosperity Act (Savage)

First Reading — 4844 (*May 25, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 4916-29 (*May 26, 2021 aft.*), 5032-37 (*May 31, 2021 eve.*), 5046-51 (*Jun. 1, 2021 morn.*), 5039-45 (*Jun. 1, 2021 morn.*), 5189 (*Jun. 3, 2021 morn.*), 5221-22 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 5352-56 (*Jun. 8, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 5455-56 (*Jun. 10, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Bill 201 — Strategic Aviation Advisory Council Act (Gotfried)

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

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., Committee recommendation that Bill not proceed reported to Assembly*), 1156 (*Jun. 8, 2020 aft., debate on concurrence motion; 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; proceeded with*)

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*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 c41]

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; proceeded with*)

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

Committee of the Whole — 3813-14 (*Dec. 7, 2020 aft.*), 3948-59 (*Mar. 8, 2021 aft.*), 4036-37 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 4158-64 (*Mar. 22, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 26, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force January 1, 2021; SA 2021 cG-5.4]

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; proceeded with*)

Second Reading — 3314-21 (*Nov. 23, 2020 aft.*), 4037-42 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft.*), 4417-19 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft., passed on division*), 4419 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft., referred to Select Special Committee on Real Property Rights*)

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*), 3719 (*Dec. 2, 2020 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Second Reading — 4419-29 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft.*), 4616-20 (*Apr. 19, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 5476-79 (*Jun. 14, 2021 aft., adjourned; amendments introduced*)

Bill 208 — Alberta Investment Management Corporation Amendment Act, 2020 (Phillips)

First Reading — 3782 (*Dec. 3, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 4005 (*Mar. 11, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 4029-36 (*Mar. 15, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; not proceeded with on division*)

Bill 209 — Cost of Public Services Transparency Act (Stephan)

First Reading — 3806-07 (*Dec. 7, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 4005 (*Mar. 11, 2021 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Second Reading — 4620 (*Apr. 19, 2021 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 211* — Municipal Government (Firearms) Amendment Act, 2020 (Glasgo)

First Reading — 3849 (*Dec. 8, 2020 aft., passed*), 3930 (*Feb. 25, 2021 aft., moved to Government Bills and Orders*)

Second Reading — 4006-15 (*Mar. 11, 2021 aft.*), 4102-07 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 4326-28 (*Apr. 6, 2021 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 4399-4400 (*Apr. 8, 2021 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c6]

Bill 212 — Official Sport of Alberta Act (Yaseen)

First Reading — 3849 (*Dec. 8, 2020 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 4088 (*Mar. 17, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 4151-58 (*Mar. 22, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with on division*)

Bill 213 — Traffic Safety (Maximum Speed Limit for Provincial Freeways) Amendment Act, 2021 (Turton)

First Reading — 3992 (*Mar. 10, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 4179 (*Mar. 23, 2021 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Bill 214 — Eastern Slopes Protection Act (Notley)

First Reading — 4340 (*Apr. 7, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Public Members' Private Bills*), 4667 (*Apr. 20, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 5242-49 (*Jun. 7, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with*)

Bill 215 — Seniors Advocate Act (Sigurdson, L)

First Reading — 4592 (*Apr. 15, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Public Members' Private Bills*), 4806 (*Apr. 22, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 5249-51 (*Jun. 7, 2021 aft.*), 5471-73 (*Jun. 14, 2021 aft., adjourned debate on concurrence motion*)

Bill 216 — Fire Prevention and Fire Services Recognition Act (Lovely)

First Reading — 4592 (*Apr. 15, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Public Members' Private Bills*), 4843 (*May 25, 2021 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Bill 217 — Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act (Williams)

First Reading — 4969-70 (*May 27, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 5220 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)
Second Reading — 5631-32 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5633 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 5633-34 (*Jun. 16, 2021 eve., passed*)

Bill 218 — Provincial Parks (Protecting Park Boundaries) Amendment Act, 2021 (Schmidt)

First Reading — 4970 (*May 27, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 5237 (*Jun. 7, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 5473-74 (*Jun. 14, 2021 aft., adjourned debate on concurrence motion*)

Bill 219 — Workers' Compensation (Expanding Presumptive Coverage) Amendment Act, 2021 (Sweet)

First Reading — 5220 (*Jun. 3, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Public Members' Public Bills*), 5454 (*Jun. 10, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly*), 5474-76 (*Jun. 14, 2021 aft., adjourned debate on concurrence motion*)

Bill 220 — Employment Standards (Expanding Bereavement Leave) Amendment Act, 2021 (Walker)

First Reading — 5534 (*Jun. 15, 2021 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; proceeded with*)
Second Reading — 3629-30 (*Dec. 1, 2020 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3740 (*Dec. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 3740-41 (*Dec. 2, 2020 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 9, 2020 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 9, 2020; SA 2020 c42]

Bill Pr2 — The United Church of Canada Amendment Act, 2021 (Phillips)

First Reading — 4416-17 (*Apr. 12, 2021 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), 4843-44 (*May 25, 2021 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)
Second Reading — 5045 (*Jun. 1, 2021 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 5045 (*Jun. 1, 2021 morn., passed*)
Third Reading — 5045-46 (*Jun. 1, 2021 morn., passed*)

Table of Contents

Government Bills and Orders	
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 70 COVID-19 Related Measures Act	5615
Division	5617
Division	5620
Third Reading	
Bill 70 COVID-19 Related Measures Act	5620
Bill 58 Freedom to Care Act	5622
Division	5624
Bill 70 COVID-19 Related Measures Act	5625
Division	5631
Government Motions	
Time Allocation on Bill 70	5621
Division	5622
Public Bills and Orders Other than Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 217 Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act	5631
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 217 Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act	5633
Third Reading	
Bill 217 Polish-Canadian Heritage Day Act	5633

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