



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature  
Second Session

# Alberta Hansard

Tuesday evening, December 7, 2021

Day 138

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, 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, Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UC)  
Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (NDP),  
Official Opposition Whip  
Ellis, Hon. Mike, Calgary-West (UC)  
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)  
Fir, Hon. Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UC)  
Frey (formerly Glasgo), Michaela L., Brooks-Medicine Hat (UC)  
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)  
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UC)  
Glubish, Hon. Nate, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UC)  
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)  
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, Hon. Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UC)  
Hunter, Grant R., Taber-Warner (UC)  
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),  
Official Opposition Deputy Whip  
Issik, Hon. Whitney, Calgary-Glenmore (UC),  
Government Whip  
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)  
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (UC)  
Nally, Hon. Dale, Morinville-St. Albert (UC)  
Neudorf, Nathan T., Lethbridge-East (UC)  
Nicolaides, 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, Hon. 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 (UC)  
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),  
Deputy Government Whip  
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP),  
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader  
Savage, Hon. Sonya, Calgary-North West (UC)  
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, Calgary-North East (UC)  
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)  
Schow, Joseph R., Cardston-Siksika (UC),  
Deputy Government House Leader  
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, Calgary-Shaw (UC)  
Schweitzer, Hon. Doug, QC, Calgary-Elbow (UC)  
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, Hon. Muhammad, Calgary-North (UC)  
Vacant, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche

## Party standings:

United Conservative: 20

New Democrat: 24

Independent: 2

Vacant: 1

## Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

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

## **Executive Council**

Jason Kenney	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental Relations
Jason Copping	Minister of Health
Mike Ellis	Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions
Tanya Fir	Associate Minister of Red Tape Reduction
Nate Glubish	Minister of Service Alberta
Nate Horner	Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Economic Development
Whitney Issik	Associate Minister of Status of Women
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Education
Jason Luan	Minister of Community and Social Services
Kaycee Madu	Minister of Justice and Solicitor General
Ric McIver	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
Ronald Orr	Minister of Culture
Prasad Panda	Minister of Infrastructure
Josephine Pon	Minister of Seniors and Housing
Sonya Savage	Minister of Energy
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Transportation
Rebecca Schulz	Minister of Children's Services
Doug Schweitzer	Minister of Jobs, Economy and Innovation
Tyler Shandro	Minister of Labour and Immigration
Travis Toews	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Rick Wilson	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Muhammad Yaseen	Associate Minister of Immigration and Multiculturalism

## **Parliamentary Secretaries**

Martin Long	Parliamentary Secretary for Small Business and Tourism
Jackie Lovely	Parliamentary Secretary to the Associate Minister of Status of Women
Nathan Neudorf	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Parks for Water Stewardship
Jeremy Nixon	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Community and Social Services for Civil Society
Searle Turton	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy
Dan Williams	Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Culture and for la Francophonie

**STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

**Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund**

Chair: Mr. Rowswell  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Jones

Allard  
Eggen  
Gray  
Hunter  
Phillips  
Rehn  
Singh

**Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future**

Chair: Mr. Neudorf  
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Armstrong-Homeniuk  
Barnes  
Bilous  
Frey (formerly Glasgo)  
Irwin  
Rosin  
Rowswell  
Sweet  
van Dijken  
Walker

**Select Special Child and Youth Advocate Search Committee**

Chair: Mr. Schow  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Jones

Goehring  
Lovely  
Nixon, Jeremy  
Pancholi  
Sabir  
Smith  
Turton

**Select Special Committee to Examine Safe Supply**

Chair: Mr. Jeremy Nixon  
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Allard

Amery  
Frey  
Ganley  
Irwin  
Milliken  
Rosin  
Shepherd  
Sigurdson, L.  
Stephan  
Yao

**Standing Committee on Families and Communities**

Chair: Ms Lovely  
Deputy Chair: Ms Sigurdson

Amery  
Carson  
Frey (formerly Glasgo)  
Gotfried  
Hunter  
Loewen  
Pancholi  
Reid  
Sabir  
Smith

**Select Special Information and Privacy Commissioner Search Committee**

Chair: Mr. Walker  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Turton

Allard  
Carson  
Dang  
Dreeshen  
Ganley  
Long  
Stephan

**Standing Committee on Legislative Offices**

Chair: Mr. Rutherford  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Milliken

Allard  
Ceci  
Long  
Loyola  
Rosin  
Shepherd  
Smith  
Sweet  
van Dijken

**Special Standing Committee on Members' Services**

Chair: Mr. Cooper  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

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

**Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills**

Chair: Mr. Rutherford  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Jeremy Nixon

Amery  
Dang  
Frey (formerly Glasgo)  
Irwin  
Long  
Nielsen  
Rehn  
Rosin  
Sigurdson, L.

**Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing**

Chair: Mr. Smith  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Reid

Aheer  
Armstrong-Homeniuk  
Deol  
Ganley  
Gotfried  
Loyola  
Neudorf  
Renaud  
Stephan  
Williams

**Standing Committee on Public Accounts**

Chair: Ms Phillips  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Reid

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

**Select Special Committee on Real Property Rights**

Chair: Mr. Sigurdson  
Deputy Chair: Mr. Rutherford

Frey (formerly Glasgo)  
Ganley  
Hanson  
Milliken  
Nielsen  
Rowswell  
Schmidt  
Sweet  
van Dijken  
Yao

**Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship**

Chair: Mr. Hanson  
Deputy Chair: Member Ceci

Dach  
Feehan  
Ganley  
Getson  
Guthrie  
Lovely  
Rehn  
Singh  
Turton  
Yao

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Tuesday, December 7, 2021

[The Speaker in the chair]

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, it is indeed the most wonderful time of the year.

Please be seated.

### Government Bills and Orders

#### Third Reading

#### Bill 80

#### Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2)

[Adjourned debate December 7: Ms Fir]

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, before the Assembly is Bill 80. Teamwork can in fact make the dream work.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre has the call.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do believe that I have been called dreamy on occasion.

It's a pleasure to rise tonight and speak to Bill 80, the Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2). This bill, of course, as all of the red tape reduction bills do, has many different changes which it's bringing forward, but we do have concerns with a particular change that is being proposed in this bill and the potential implications for Albertans on income support. Now, I know that one of my colleagues brought forth an amendment on this to attempt to make a change, and that was rejected by the government members who were in the Chamber at the time, but the concern we continue to have is that we do not need more changes to income support from this government. We have already had many conversations in this House and indeed with the current Minister of Community and Social Services about the concerns around changes this government has made.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that my office has heard from several people here in our community who were facing eviction because they had had their additional shelter benefit taken away, by decision of this government, and were left then without enough income to be able to afford to pay for a place to live.

Now, the minister continues to insist that no such change has been made, but the facts on the ground are quite clear, Mr. Speaker, and I will assure the minister that those are real Albertans, despite his attempts to dismiss them earlier today when we brought their voices to question period.

We've seen other changes, in particular, around the area of advanced education, which this bill is proposing to make changes to. Now, of course, the government is claiming at this time that they're merely taking it out of one section of the legislation and they're going to move it towards regulation, but, again, we've had this conversation many times, Mr. Speaker, about this government's propensity for putting more and more power in the hands of its ministers, regulation that's crafted behind closed doors, out of the eyes of this House, and, again, given the track record of this government and particularly on things like AISH and income support, where they have consistently made things more difficult for a number of Albertans, I am loath to trust them on this one.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we look back to a story we highlighted this past summer, back in July, when we called on this government to reverse a damaging policy that forces Albertans to give up on postsecondary education and career aspirations. The Alberta learner income support and the skills investment bursary both help adult

learners to pay for their basic education, upgrading, or English as a second language. Now, of course, this government talks about its desire to see more Albertans have more opportunities to access better jobs, to access better education.

You know, historically that funding has not been considered a reportable benefit for income tax purposes, but for tax year 2020 this government decided to make a sudden change. They decided that they would issue the T5007 income tax form, statement of benefits, to Albertans who had accessed those supports. They had accessed the supports already, Mr. Speaker, and they hadn't had any warning that this was coming. Suddenly they get the T5007, and they have to report this as reported income when it comes to tax time. That means that for the tax year 2021 low-income Albertans who had accessed those critical learning supports now no longer qualify for other important government benefits like the GST credit or the Alberta child benefit. So this decision of this government is actually making them no longer qualify for other federal benefits. Again, an example of this government making life more difficult for Albertans.

Indeed, there was one particular Albertan that stood with us, Asila Ashmawi, who is a Syrian refugee, a mother of three, forced to cancel her ESL program at Columbia College because, as a result of this government's policy change, she would have been forced to report thousands in additional income, which would have meant she no longer qualified for the Alberta child benefit. In her words, "I was forced to decide between my career, my dreams or caring for my three children."

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for this government to be forcing Albertans into this kind of impossible choice. It benefits no one. For whatever paltry savings this government might realize, it has enormous costs for this particular family, for this particular woman in terms of her opportunity to improve her education, to improve her economic opportunity, which is a net benefit for everybody, including the government. But what we have seen, unfortunately repeatedly, is this sort of short-sighted decision, such as a I mentioned, knocking thousands of Albertans off being able to access the additional shelter benefit, which does no value for the paltry savings the government realizes when they have no plan B in place to assist those Albertans. Having them on the street costs more for everybody, not to mention the very real impact it has for those real Albertans.

So if, in fact, this government was not planning to cut funding from income support – further funding, Mr. Speaker. We should be clear they have cut funding from these programs already; \$83 million from employment and income support in Budget 2021. So if it is not the intent of this government to cut further funding from income support, then there is no need to move forward with this particular change. There was no need to vote down the amendment that we brought forward, because, frankly, newcomers, adult learners, those who are dependent on these supports and these opportunities to improve their lot here in the province of Alberta so that they can make larger contributions and enjoy that quality of life that this government likes to brag about so much – then there is not the need to make this change and put that in danger. But, as I said, this government voted down that amendment. They insist on moving forward with this change.

Now, the claim from the government is that this will be replaced under regulation in Advanced Education. The regulation is currently part of the section titled Foundational Assistance Learning Program. They're claiming that the new program will streamline the processes and expand eligibility. We have seen this trick with this government before, Mr. Speaker, where they combine and consolidate, they rename, and then put in less and deliver less than was there for Albertans before. Again, this is a

government that seems to be focused on nickel and diming Albertans in so many different ways rather than finding ways that we can support more Albertans and lift a wider number of Albertans up.

This, of course, is a government that also campaigned on not deindexing income support and other benefits like AISH. That was a promise, Mr. Speaker, in their election platform, a promise they pretty much immediately broke when they brought forward a budget. Yet we're being asked to trust them today that this change they are going to make in regulation, behind closed doors, out of sight of Albertans, is not going to do the same, is not going to undermine even more Albertans who are simply trying to improve their opportunities, who are trying to make a change for the better for themselves and for their families.

**7:40**

We do not need this government making more hidden changes to the income support program through changes that are tucked away in the midst of a piece of omnibus legislation. Albertans in need of government assistance, Mr. Speaker, Albertans who are trying to access postsecondary education, who are trying to put themselves in a better position to look after themselves and their families: they are not red tape. They do not deserve to have their lives impacted by these changes buried in the middle of an omnibus bill. But, unfortunately, that is the level of disregard, lack of care, that we have seen from this government towards so many Albertans who face these kinds of challenges.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we will be watching closely or as closely as we can given, again, that this is a government that resists transparency and scrutiny at every turn. We will certainly be doing our best as the opposition and as folks who indeed represent many of the individuals who have been affected by this government's changes so far and may be affected by these changes as well. We will be watching carefully to see the impact this has on those individuals and to continue to stand up and speak out for those real Albertans. For however much the government wants to deny the impacts they are having, we see them and we hear about them every day here in Edmonton, where we've seen our homeless population double, people who lack housing. That is in part because of decisions that have been made by this government that will choose to nickel and dime some of the most vulnerable Albertans while giving away billions in corporate giveaways.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we will watch closely. Albertans are watching closely. We will continue to advocate for and stand up for those who have been harmed by this government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, the hon. deputy government whip.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask for unanimous consent to go to one-minute bells for the remainder of the evening, including the first bell of Committee of the Whole.

[Unanimous consent granted]

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

**Ms Hoffman:** What a delightful idea, Mr. Speaker. I wish I could say the same about the bill that's under consideration. I appreciate a few of the components that are within it. Given the hour and the stage we're at in this session, I think I'm going to focus on a couple of areas that are still of concern to me.

As my colleague from Edmonton-City Centre rightfully highlighted, the adult learning stream for income support is a

significant concern for us. We know that there are students across the province who rely on this funding to be able to advance their own education, take the opportunity to enhance their English skills, and that is certainly under threat in this legislation as it is currently structured.

We know that opportunities for postsecondary advancement are already difficult for many families, particularly low- and middle-income families, to access as research has well documented that folks who are low- and middle-income are more hesitant when it comes to taking on personal or collective debt but especially personal debt. We know that taking away opportunities for people to further their education and at the same time be able to provide for themselves and their families will definitely not lead our province in a way that's collaborative, forward-thinking, or create greater opportunities for us all. I want to thank my colleague from Edmonton-City Centre for rearticulating some of the concerns that we've raised in that regard.

I also want to take a few minutes to reflect on some of the discussion that we've heard from the Minister of Finance as of late. He's definitely been making the rounds on talk radio shows. The Premier likes to come in here and say all sorts of disrespectful things about the CBC, but I heard the Minister of Finance on the CBC. Interestingly, they like to use that opportunity to get their message out and then use the opportunity in this place to disparage the messages that they espouse on those shows themselves.

The Minister of Finance was on the CBC morning show late last week and spent a considerable amount of time talking about the number of people who are fleeing the province, and particularly young Albertans were of conversation in that area. The Minister of Finance was straight out asked about personal income taxes and dodged the question, was incredibly evasive when it came to questions of bringing in a PST in this province. It shouldn't take a lot of backbone to be able to say to a reporter on a morning show that you don't have any time to consider a PST, but that definitely wasn't the message delivered by the Minister of Finance.

One of the other big topics that he's been asked about as of late is around health care premiums. This, of course, relates to this bill. This is creating an opportunity through Bill 80 to consolidate Alberta health care insurance plans into one piece of legislation.

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. Order. Okay. If members would like to continue conversations, private conversations, they're welcome to do so in the back.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora has the call.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Of course, Bill 80 consolidates health care insurance plan rules into one piece of legislation, and it repeals the health insurance act, which many have asserted creates an opportunity for health care premiums to ride into Albertans' bank books and into our bank accounts. We've seen, when past Conservative governments in this province tried to ram through health care premiums, how Albertans responded to that, but here we go, an omnibus piece of legislation trying to create all of these opportunities for new fees and burdens to be added to working families.

I can't help but remember the now Minister of Municipal Affairs, then an opposition private member in the PC caucus, when the legalization of cannabis was coming into force here in the province of Alberta, about four years ago right now. The now minister, the then private Member for Calgary-Hays, was talking about how ridiculous it was that – he said that only the NDP could create a system for pot legalization that wouldn't make money.

Of course, across Canada jurisdictions were working to get rid of the illicit market. With that, it meant that there had to be aggressive,

competitive pricing in the legal market so that people would choose to purchase their products legally instead of illegally, and – guess what – it didn't take long to start making money. In fact, this last year AGLC made about \$200,000, and it has made money pretty much every year through the online sale of cannabis at, you know, competitive prices to folks across this province.

The government is taking this piece of legislation to get rid of that. I know that \$200,000 isn't a huge line item, especially for the government, but that's, you know, the amount of money that we make that pays for two teachers to help kids learn in a classroom or pays for about four educational assistants, five in many parts of this province. It would pay for a handful of LPNs to work in long-term care centres and help seniors.

The government, in this bill, is deciding that they're going to forego that income, and they're going to pass it on to corporate entities, friends, and insiders, it seems, through the dissolution of AGLC in terms of the online cannabis sales. You know, the now minister, former private Member for Calgary-Hays, was talking about the NDP not making much money selling pot, and then here we go. Now we've got the current Conservative government deciding to give all that money away to private entities.

7:50

According to AGLC online sales were only about 1, 1 and a half per cent of the total cannabis sales per year, so, you know, it wasn't like there was a huge amount that was being sold publicly, but this was one little piece that was being done through AGLC, and the government has decided through this bill that they're going to take that away.

Again, probably the most hurtful and I'd say wrong-headed piece is around taking away the opportunities for people to receive their compensation while furthering their postsecondary studies, including English language acquisition. I think that for a Premier who claims to care a lot about newcomers, taking away these income streams from newcomer families is definitely a test of one's actual character when it comes to determining whether or not they will put their collective money where their mouth is. This is something that I think will have long-term negative consequences for the people of Alberta.

Yeah. Just to take another minute or two, there are some pieces in it that aren't a huge concern to me, but the few areas that are, I think, are of significant concern. Rather than the government continuing to bring in large, omnibus pieces of legislation that impact many, many bills all at once and then trying to give them a flashy title, it would be great if the government came into this place with clear amendments act by act. I think that some of these pieces we could absolutely get behind. However, the ones that are problematic are very problematic. For those reasons, I'm encouraging my colleagues to oppose this piece of legislation, not because it's all bad but because the pieces that are bad, I think, are really bad.

I especially want to highlight again my concerns around the Finance minister failing to commit to no PST and failing to commit to no health care premiums. Then, of course, at the same time we see a bill coming to this House that creates an opening for health care premiums to be downloaded onto everyday working people.

Those are some of my biggest concerns at this point and at this stage. It seems that this session is coming to a close and that the government is keen to move forward on these nonetheless, but I do want to say to the people of this province who are going to feel the negative impacts that we are fighting back and that we are standing up for a more fair and just Alberta, one where people can continue to receive the income support they need and further themselves educationally, one where they can receive the health care they need

without fear that they're going to be stuck with a bill at the end of the day or forced premiums onto working families, when we know times have been made ever so tough by COVID and by the decisions of the current government to further download pressures onto everyday families.

Those are the main pieces I want to leave my colleagues with here tonight, with, again, an urgency to oppose this legislation as the harm it does in those areas, I think, is too great for us to come in with a vote of support.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there others who would like to join in the debate? The Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

**Member Loyola:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to rise and contribute to the debate on Bill 80, Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2). Of course, this piece of legislation makes changes to the following acts, as we all know: the Alberta Health Care Insurance Act, the Alberta Human Rights Act, the Credit Union Act, the Ensuring Fiscal Sustainability Act, the Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Act, the Income and Employment Supports Act, the Insurance Act, the Loan and Trust Corporations Act, and the Mines and Minerals Act.

Of course, the substantial change that my colleagues and I are most concerned about is the fact that they're removing the adult learner stream from income support. I wanted to perhaps just contribute a little bit to the debate on how this impacts racialized people. In Edmonton-Ellerslie, as the members may recall from previous interjections that I've made in the House, 50 per cent of the electorate happens to be ethnically diverse. A lot of the people that come into my office and are trying to access income supports are also from these communities.

A lot of the times it seems that in order to get the support that they need, there are certain conditions that have to be met. Of course, a lot of the times they're just shy of having one prerequisite in order to actually get the funding for what they need. It's saddening to me that they're making this change, Mr. Speaker, because it's a program that benefits quite a substantial number of people. I know that the members on the opposite side have made arguments that it will help those going into postsecondary, but of course that is not the majority of the people that are actually accessing this particular type of program.

Now, I ask myself: is it due to the fact that the members on the other side of the House just do not come into contact with more marginalized Albertans? Why is it that they think that they can make a move like this, which will actually detrimentally impact families? You know, I ask myself – we're here to govern for all Albertans. Now, I can understand that you may be an affluent individual. You can live a life of privilege. You may not come into contact with certain groups of people because of the lifestyle that you live, but that doesn't mean that those people don't exist, Mr. Speaker. It's like the argument that, well, if you don't see lobsters crawling through the streets, lobsters don't exist. Of course, we know they exist. They happen to exist in the ocean. We know that they're there. Some affluent people like to eat lobster, right?

**An Hon. Member:** Everybody likes to eat lobster.

**Member Loyola:** You know, I'm not that big of a fan of lobster; I never have been. Not that I would discourage people from eating lobster by any means, Mr. Speaker, but I just happen to be more of a prawns and salmon kind of guy. I've actually taken it upon myself to turn towards a more vegan diet of late, to stop eating as much meat right now. I know that many of the members on the other side

are thinking: “Oh, what sacrilege is this? You’re not going to eat meat?”

Of course, you know, we go through and we learn different things at different times through our life when we come into contact with people who have diverse opinions. When we come into contact with people who have diverse opinions, Mr. Speaker, we can learn a thing or two about a thing or two. As I once heard from a good conservative friend of mine, back when I was in university days – we would have these debates, and he would always tell me: I know a thing or two about a thing or two. That’s the beauty of coming into contact with people from other backgrounds. I’m not just speaking of ethnically. I’m also speaking of people who just live a completely different lifestyle than you.

The question that often runs through my head – as I see pieces of legislation or bills, you know, proposed legislation, come across the floor in this House, I ask myself: well, I wonder if the members on the other side have actually had an opportunity to walk a mile in the shoes of someone that actually has to access income support. Have they asked questions of these individuals? It’s not the same to be like – okay. I’ve heard people say, “Well, I have a next-door neighbour who is” – I don’t know; pick whatever ethnicity you want. You think that you kind of know what their life is like.

8:00

The truth is that unless you actually delve deeper into the reality that that person is living, you’re not going to have a clue about life’s challenges that they go through, their actual experiences. This is why, especially when it comes to this particular bill, I ask myself: have any of the members on the other side of the House actually had the opportunity? Maybe they have, but the piece of legislation that we have here before us doesn’t reflect that, in my humble opinion.

If they did, then they know how difficult it is, number one, just to access income support: all the conditions that have to be met in order for you to access it and, in particular, this program that they now want to take away from an already marginalized group of people that are having fewer and fewer opportunities to improve themselves. You see, this is what the crazy thing is. You know, these Conservatives like to talk about pulling yourself up by your bootstraps, making yourself better, and here we have individuals that are trying to do exactly that through this government program.

Now, I get it. For some of the members on the other side and, heck, even on this side of the House sometimes, we have family to rely on. We have good friends that can, you know, offer us that loan that eventually we’ll pay back. Or, you know, some of us may have family that are, like: “Hey, just take this money and take the course that you need to take. Don’t worry about paying me back. It’s okay. It’s fine.” But a lot of times marginalized people don’t have those same resources, those same family connections, those friends that happen to be a little bit more affluent, that can provide a loan so that you can go and better yourself and get some education. The only opportunity they have, then, is to recur to a government program.

A lot of times racialized people here in the province of Alberta – I’m not saying all of them because, you know, a lot of them do have extended family that they can rely on – don’t have those same resources and family members that actually call Alberta home, as they do, and can actually access, through different channels, an opportunity to really better themselves. You know, I’ve made the argument that as much as a lot of my Conservative friends on the other side of the House like to state that they pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps, a lot of times they relied on family. Perhaps they even relied on a family inheritance or something to that effect. I’m not saying all of them, because I know not everybody lives that life of affluence.

But help always comes in different forms. At the end of the day, there are community members that actually end up helping other community members. I’m hoping that the members on the other side would contemplate that, when it comes to Albertans that don’t have the same connections, the family connections, the friends that can actually help you out, they have nothing left but to recur to a government program such as this one, which the members think it’s perfectly fine to just cut out. It’s quite unfortunate, actually. I wish that they would consider that when it actually comes to the changes that they’re proposing for this bill.

Of course, the Income and Employment Supports Act currently provides support for both training benefits and income support and benefits. The bill actually removes access to this training benefit if a person is not accepted in a training program that commences before April 1, 2022. Now, you remember, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about, you know, that they have to meet certain requirements. Here it is, right?

I’m wondering if any of the members on the other side can actually tell me why the date of April 1, 2022, was selected. Why? This means that the government is essentially sunseting the training benefit for the people who need it most. It does this by amending sections 6, 10, and 11 of the Income and Employment Supports Act to require that for members of a household to be eligible for income and employment supports as full- and part-time learners, they must be accepted into an approved training program that commences before April 1, 2022. This means that the full-time learner stream of income support will no longer exist.

Now, the members on the other side, or, better stated, the cabinet, claim that full-time learner income support is no longer needed because changes made to the Student Financial Assistance Act achieved the same end. However, the changes made in the regulation give the minister complete power to decide who receives funding and how much of the funding they get. Section 3 of the regulation states that the minister “may provide foundational learning assistance only if money is available for . . . assistance.” This is substantially weaker than legislative requirements and is arbitrary and states no criteria for who receives funding. As I’ve argued many times in this House, Mr. Speaker, here again we have a piece of legislation that puts more power into the hands of the minister to decide something so important for someone who is actually applying for this kind of funding.

Of course, the members on the other side made changes to support for low-income postsecondary students earlier in the year, and they changed the Alberta learner income support and the skills investment bursary for part-time students, which helps adult learners pay for basic education, upgrading, or English as a second language, to no longer be considered a reportable benefit on income taxes. Why would you do this? Like, I just don’t understand why you would do this and actually make life more difficult for people who are already having a challenging time, especially for racialized people. You know, the Minister of Justice likes to get up in this House and say that he’s done so much to help racialized people here in the province of Alberta, yet here we have a piece of legislation that’s actually making it more difficult. I would really hope that all members on that side of the House would take a second look at this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** That concludes the time allotted for those particular remarks.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford has risen.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I’m happy to take a few moments to speak to Bill 80, the Red Tape Reduction Implementation



Act, 2021. Of course, as the speakers before me, I certainly have some deep concerns with this particular act as I know the phrase “red tape” itself is actually just a euphemism. It doesn’t actually mean anything. There is no actual tape of the colour red in anything.

8:10

In this particular case, these kinds of phrases are used to cover up the reality that is underlying the statement being made to make it less transparent, to ensure that only people with the time and the ability to investigate more deeply will actually understand what is happening. Of course, if the government were to be completely transparent around these kinds of actions, they would certainly be raising substantial concern by members of our proud province, and it’s not something that they would like very much.

You know, I want to give you an example of just an experience that I even had today that, really, is an example of what happens when things are said to be red tape reduction and said to be minor changes that do not affect people substantively in their lives in any kind of negative way, yet the reality is that most often, when the Conservatives use “red tape,” they mean they’re going to give a swift kick to someone who is of low income. It seems to be their perennial, cruel turn of the screw that we see in this House all the time.

I just want to give an example of a conversation I had this morning. I was on what my office calls my tour of seniors’ residences, in which I bring sort of flowers to all the seniors’ residences, wish them Merry Christmas, often share some, you know, chocolates or Tim Hortons or something like that. I always bring poinsettias, so it’s called my poinsettia tour in my office. It’s something I really enjoy, and in fact I enjoyed it even more this year because I had to miss it completely last year. Most of the institutions that I go to visit would just simply not allow me to enter into the building given COVID, and, you know, while I did send things, it just wasn’t the same. The conversations are what’s really important here.

I happened to have an opportunity today in my poinsettia tour to go to a residence in my constituency that’s part of the Good Samaritan Society’s set of institutions and homes for people for various reasons. This one particularly is called Wedman House, which is a lovely seniors’ residence south of my constituency that has a main lodge and then, of course, a number of small buildings where people can live in groups of just three at a time, so as much as possible it reflects living in the community. It really is a very well-designed institution, but it’s more than an institution. It is a home, and it’s a home for the people that have lived there, many of them for significant parts of their life. The vast majority of them, of course, are seniors, but some are there because of disability that has brought them into the residence at a much earlier stage in their life and therefore sometimes see 20 or 30 years of residence in these kinds of institutions.

Today I just had a delightful conversation with members of Wedman House, and about a dozen of us sat around enjoying some Tim Hortons Timbits and telling stories. I had the opportunity to hear a little bit about how many of them felt about Grant Notley, a quite revered MLA in this House for many years, and how they enjoyed him and the work that he did and how that reflected so well in terms of the great work that his daughter has been doing since she became an MLA and, of course, in her role as Premier.

I also had an opportunity to have delightful conversations about my own grandfather’s experiences after World War I, returning back to Canada just at the time that the Winnipeg General Strike was going on and not being able to go back to his family farm because there was no way to get there and there was no way to contact them. Anyways, it turned out that when he finally did make

the journey out into the wilderness to find his family farm, the family had moved while he was off fighting the war in Europe, and as a result he had to come back into town. It took him three days to find his family in Winnipeg. So we had these delightful conversations.

But then past all the, you know, positive chit-chat and coffee time that we had, there were certainly a number of things that they were very concerned about. Number one was health care, and I heard a lot about health care and the deep fear of these women, all women, by the way, most of whom have outlived their husbands. Very concerned about the moves by this government, they really feel, to take apart our public health care system.

But within that there was also another specific conversation that they wanted me to pass on here. In one of these red tape reduction – yes, I’m getting back to the bill – events of the past a decision was made by this government to reduce a laundry services allowance for these people by \$60 a month. The whole allowance, by the way, which was \$60 a month, was removed. I sat and listened to this 90-year-old woman, who was in a wheelchair and had been living in this house, well, at least for the last six and a half years since I’ve been visiting, tell me that while she was sure that \$60 was not meaningful to this government, with a \$50 billion plus budget, \$60 every month was significant to her and did make a difference in terms of the choices that she had available, and she understood that from this government’s perspective it was simply red tape reduction: we’re getting rid of a small line in a budget somewhere along the way.

But in the conversation we were having at Wedman House this morning, there was a lot of conversation about the fact that they understood right now that they were taking from the money that was available in society and not being able to contribute back into it, but they were very clear that they had contributed throughout their whole lives into these budget lines and that being 90 years of age, having lived in Alberta her whole life, she certainly had contributed substantially to this province and felt that for the province then to return the work that she had given on behalf of herself and her family to the well-being of all the rest of Albertans, to return that kind of gift from her by taking away from her a \$60-a-month laundry services budget just felt like a degrading and reprehensible move from her part.

I just want the government to realize and to remember that there are real people who are affected by these real decisions.

Again, we have a concern here in this debate regarding Bill 80, the Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, where again the government is making decisions that appear to be minor or small from a government that deals with \$50 billion, but it is significant and substantive to individuals who have to suffer the consequence of these choices.

Just one example that I want to pull out, from the many things that we could complain about in this bill, is the removal of the adult learning stream from income support. I’m very concerned about this because it sounds like a small thing to do. It sounds like it’s not going to affect a lot of people, but I want to actually pay some attention to who it is going to affect, because what adult learning really is about is it’s about second chances. It’s about people that did not have the opportunity, for one reason or another, to take advantage of advanced education when they were younger for a variety of reasons, primarily for reasons outside of their own control. They may be, for example, immigrants or refugees coming from another country where life did not treat them with great fairness, and they had to make the very difficult decision to leave family and friends to come to Canada to try to start again and to try to provide a positive and hopeful future for their children.

8:20

These are the people of second chance. We know that when immigrants are given that opportunity when they come into Canada, they very quickly move from being people who are asking for services, in order to get themselves established, to people who contribute well beyond the average in a short period of time. In fact, most of the studies I've read indicate that it takes somewhere around, on average, five years or less for immigrants to become net contributors to a country. I mean, that's a very short period of time in someone's life that they have to ask for services, whether it might be public assistance or it might be educational or some other kinds of service. Then very quickly for the next 50 years of their life they're going to be contributors, substantive contributors, to the well-being of all of us here in the province. And they can only do that if they're given a second chance.

One of those second chances has always been adult learning, a chance to come and learn a new language, to learn a new trade, to learn any of a set of a variety of skills or knowledges that will help them to move from being people that are requesting assistance to people that are providing assistance to others. Those are the people that we are going after. Those are the people that we are taking out here.

Other people who experience second chances and who need second chances are people who have grown up in families of great dysfunction – for example, whose families in one way were neglectful or abusive – and who, as a result of the implications that are inherent in those kind of awful family structures, themselves ended up in difficult positions, perhaps with homelessness or perhaps with addictions or any other number of consequences of behaviour that really originated outside of themselves and were not about their own free choice. These are the kinds of people who somehow, in spite of all the pulls and the pressures to go down the wrong road, the road to perdition, have made a decision that they themselves do not want to follow through with the push that society and fortune and fate have given them to head in a bad direction and are trying to take a second chance to go back to school, to right themselves in the course of their life, and to become positive net contributors in this province of Alberta.

And now when they choose to do that, we have a government that's making the choice not to be there for them, not to provide that opportunity for a second chance to make a transition which is positive and in many ways wonderful, to actually overcome the barriers that have been systematically placed in their way and to override the tendency to allow life and fate to direct how you are in the world, to choose in a way that they have never had a chance to choose before. That's the kind of thing that's being taken away when we go after programs like the adult learning stream. In the same way as I spoke about the laundry services, I feel the same way here. Please do not hurt vulnerable people.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Are there others? The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo. There are approximately seven minutes remaining.

**Member Ceci:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for that time check as well. You know, I have looked through the bill, of course, and have had the opportunity to debate it several times, and I want to say that there is one thing that I can stand behind and appreciate in this bill – just one thing – and that is with regard to the treatment of municipalities around the whole entertainment district. It's in the AGLC changes that are before us here. It says that municipalities that have passed bylaws can establish entertainment districts, and that's really the first time I've seen this UCP government look at municipal councils and councillors as fully capable, grown-up, able

orders of government. The rest of the time – the rest of the time – I think this government is guilty of treating local councils as, you know, people who don't know what they're doing, councils who don't know what they're doing; the provincial government in this UCP government knows better than local councils. That's, of course, not anywhere close to true.

Local councils have been doing – for instance, Calgary is over 1.2 million people. A council of 15 there operates to address the needs of their citizens every day. Edmonton council: 13 councillors there, and they are fully capable of deciding what the needs are and addressing the needs of their citizenry. This Bill 80, surprisingly, treats local councils in this regard, entertainment districts, as capable of setting their own municipal bylaws to address the needs of their citizens. That's great.

The rest of this bill disappoints. My colleague just focused on an area that I want to spend some time on. I think the whole area of the adult learning stream in the Income and Employment Supports Act and the downgrading of what was a statutory requirement to be addressed by the government, no matter which government, has been downgraded to be a regulation now, a regulation that – as I understand it, if there's budget monies for that adult learning benefit, there will be support for those adult learners.

If there's no budget monies, then the subsequent learners that come towards that and want to get the support to, as my colleagues were saying, you know, better their situation, make sure that they're going back to school – they're getting a second chance, as my colleague was saying. People who come to that program, as a result of Bill 80 and if the budget monies are exhausted for that and it's no longer a statutory requirement, the government doesn't have to provide that person any support. The government can say, basically: "The cupboard's bare. You have to go somewhere else, do something else. Don't go back to school. You don't qualify for any supports under the adult learning stream."

Everybody knows that a statutory requirement is better than one that's in regulation. Everybody knows that. People fight for that all across this country, for statutory supports, but this government is downgrading. It means that the government also would decide how much funding goes to that, and they can lowball the need. That will be something that's problematic not only for the adult learners and their families, but as people on this side were saying, it's problematic for the growing of capacity of skilled learners in this province that will assist in lifting this province back to, you know, the high level it was for many, many years in terms of GDP growth, in terms of the highest incomes per capita, all of those things we've been at in the past.

Programs like that, that were statutory, assisted in that regard. It assisted the people who needed that support. With Bill 80 we're seeing a degrading of all of those things. We're seeing an omnibus bill come before us, and we know that it will degrade the ability of future governments to help out Albertans under programs that have long been supportive of the education needs of Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, the total number of changes, of course, to this bill – and you would think that they would . . .

8:30

**The Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, but Government Motion 112, agreed to earlier today, states that after one hour of debate all questions must be decided to conclude the debate on Bill 80, Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2).

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

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

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	LaGrange	Rowswell
Amery	Luan	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Madu	Schweitzer
Copping	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Dreeshen	Nally	Singh
Fir	Nicolaides	Smith
Frey	Nixon, Jason	Stephan
Getson	Nixon, Jeremy	Toews
Gotfried	Orr	Toor
Hanson	Panda	Turton
Horner	Pitt	van Dijken
Hunter	Pon	Walker
Issik	Reid	Wilson
Jones	Rosin	Yaseen

Against the motion:

Ceci	Hoffman	Sabir
Dach	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan		

Totals: For – 42 Against – 7

[Motion carried; Bill 80 read a third time]

## Government Motions

### Oil and Gas Pipeline Opposition

104. Mr. Jason Nixon moved:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly

- condemn David Suzuki's comments on pipelines as reported by the *National Post*,
- condemn any comments made calling for the intentional destruction of energy infrastructure, and
- unequivocally condemn incitements of violent eco terrorism.

Mr. Turton moved that Government Motion 104 be amended by (a) striking out “and” at the end of section 2 and (b) adding the following immediately after section 3:

- express solidarity with the 20 First Nations band councils and their communities situated along the approved route of the Coastal GasLink pipeline project, including those representing Wet'suwet'en people, in their negotiations for project agreements that would support those communities,
- express its support for the Coastal GasLink pipeline project and the LNG Canada project, and
- express its opposition to illegal activities that seek to disrupt the construction of the Coastal GasLink pipeline project.

[Adjourned debate on the amendment December 2: Mrs. Frey]

**The Speaker:** Are there others wishing to join in the debate?

**Some Hon. Members:** Question.

**The Speaker:** Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question. [interjections] Order.

**Mr. Sabir:** Government Motion 104?

**The Speaker:** That is what I have said.

**Mr. Sabir:** Okay. Then I want to speak.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall, in the most generous way possible from the Speaker.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me, for your indulgence, for your generosity. With that, I will be moving an amendment as well. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. Order.

If the page can go grab the amendment, I will get a copy of that to the table. I will allow members to disperse, and then we'll get back to the business of the day. [interjections] Order. Hon. members, this is a subamendment to amendment A1. This will be referred to as amendment SA1.

The hon. member has the call.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will make some brief remarks about the government amendment to their own Motion 104.

**The Speaker:** Sorry. And then you're going to read it into the record, or are you going to read it into the record and then make remarks?

**Mr. Sabir:** If you want me to read it into the record . . .

**The Speaker:** Why don't you go ahead and read it into the record, and then you can make your remarks.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

**Mr. Sabir:** The Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall moves that amendment A1 to Government Motion 104 be amended in clause (b) as follows: (a) in section 4 (i) by striking out “express solidarity with the 20 First Nations Band Councils and their communities situated along” and substituting “express support for those First Nations and Indigenous peoples that hold constitutional rights in the lands along and surrounding” and (ii) by striking out “in their negotiation for project agreements” and substituting “as they continue to seek solutions”; and (b) by adding the following immediately after section 4:

- acknowledge and express its support for the memorandum of understanding, agreed to in February 2020 between the government of Canada, the government of British Columbia, and Wet'suwet'en Nation and as signed by the Wet'suwet'en hereditary chiefs, that established the terms by which the parties agreed to engage in a constructive dialogue to achieve meaningful solutions that respectfully address the rights of all parties,
- express its support for an approach to resource projects that relies on negotiations along with proportionate regulatory enforcement, being the best means for the parties to achieve meaningful and predictable progress on these projects while similarly upholding entrenched constitutional principles and rights such as the rule of law and Indigenous rights,
- acknowledge that Indigenous rights, which include the rights of First Nations' hereditary chiefs, are legally complex and have been judicially considered in the Supreme Court of Canada's decisions in *Delgamuukw* versus British Columbia, *Haida Nation* versus British Columbia, and *Tsilhqot'in Nation* versus British Columbia.

**8:40**

Madam Speaker, I will make brief remarks about the government's amendment to their own Motion 104, and then I will make some remarks about the subamendment that I am proposing.

But before I do, some context. While it may be rare to find common ground across the floor of this Legislature, last week the whole caucus rose in the Legislative Assembly here to speak in favour of Government Motion 104, and we spoke to condemn the words of David Suzuki and moreover to condemn violence and incitement to violence in any form. In a civil and democratic society, we said, violent acts and threats must never be normalized under any circumstances. We recognized and supported unequivocally everyone's right to protest, including civil disobedience, but, Madam Speaker, violence is not a legitimate form of protest. We supported Government Motion 104, and we continue to support the notion that was introduced and debated last week.

Madam Speaker, with its amendments the government is attempting to rewrite their own motion and to change the intent of the motion significantly. I would like to formally say on the record that procedurally we do not believe that the amendment under discussion is in order. The government amendment alters the substance of the original motion, the debate, and the shared expression of condemnation that occurred in this Legislature on the government's original Motion 104. However, if we consider the content of the government amendment as proposed, we nevertheless believe there is common ground to be achieved in this Assembly to recognize the economic potential of this project for so many communities and also to recognize the constitutional requirement to work in a careful and considered way with Indigenous rights holders.

But, in our view, we must reasonably amend the government amendment to ensure that we do not risk creating additional conflict that will jeopardize the project. We must keep our eyes focused on the outcome we are all trying to achieve. Those outcomes include getting our products to market, diversifying our economy, lowering overall GHG emissions with cleaner natural gas, and, of course, furthering our collective responsibility towards reconciliation. To find this common ground, we are proposing simple and factual amendments. We urge the government caucus to support these amendments in the interest of this project, in the interest of economic diversification, and, above all, in the interest of reconciliation.

Madam Speaker, as you know, we have advocated for a stable investment climate in Alberta that puts the rule of law at the heart of that stability. The rule of law, as we know, includes clear regulatory processes for project proponents and also requirements to consult and work together with First Nations and Indigenous rights holders under both treaty and section 35 of the Constitution of Canada.

A real commitment to the rule of law, Madam Speaker, is how our government ultimately advanced and achieved the construction of the TMX pipeline. We would therefore urge the members opposite to support our subamendment to recognize the existing constitutional law and rights of Indigenous people, to support negotiations and proportionate enforcement, and, perhaps most importantly, to endorse and express support for constructive dialogue under the tripartite memorandum of understanding agreed to by the government of Canada, the government of British Columbia, and the Wet'suwet'en Nation, as signed by the Wet'suwet'en Nation hereditary chiefs.

Madam Speaker, we invite the members opposite to join in recognizing the rights of First Nations and all Indigenous rights holders and to support the hard work to find solutions with respect to the Coastal GasLink project. Let us focus on the best way to move this very important project forward in a way that respects the rule of law and Indigenous rights. That is what this subamendment does. Let's not drive wedges. Let's build bridges. Let's build

pipelines. As we help do that, let's also be focused on facts and the rule of law. To do it otherwise serves to put both the Coastal GasLink project and Indigenous reconciliation at additional risk.

When Government Motion 104 first came to the floor, we had a united expression of solidarity from this Legislature. In that same spirit I hope members will accept this subamendment so that we can continue to have a united expression of solidarity. This project and Indigenous reconciliation are too important to be subject to any form of political games. Nobody wants games. People want investment. They want diversification. They want us to respect the rule of law. They want us to respect Indigenous rights, treaty rights, their section 35 constitutional rights. Let us focus on those priorities and speak as one voice in this Legislature.

I urge all members of this House to support this subamendment. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Well, Madam Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to rise on this subamendment. It's quite shocking to continue to see the Official Opposition not just take a simple step of following, frankly, David Suzuki's lead and apologizing for the horrendous position of their party. Mr. Suzuki calling for or in any way implying that there would be violence towards infrastructure, towards pipelines was wrong, which is why his foundation condemned his remarks and which is why he finally apologized for his remarks, which is why, in the end, there's an amendment on the floor to adjust this motion slightly to recognize David Suzuki apologizing for it. What he has said about our oil and gas industry is outrageous. Nevertheless, I think that we should recognize that he did apologize for his remarks.

8:50

The NDP still have not apologized for their actions when it comes to pipelines. First, let's start off with, Madam Speaker, the fact that the policy wing of their party just a few short weeks ago, with 85 per cent support, passed a motion, supported by members of the Official Opposition, members of this Chamber, calling on people to break the law and block pipelines legally being built inside B.C. Shame on them for still not condemning that. We're now several days into this debate, and all they can do is bring forward another amendment trying to water down a very important motion, have the nerve to stand up in this place and call on people to follow the rule of the law when their party is passing motions not to follow the law.

They are so desperate to try to hide their hatred for the energy industry and for the men and women who work in it, but, Madam Speaker, at the end of the day their record speaks for themselves. The Leader of the Official Opposition, when she was Premier, did not fight for Keystone, refused to fight for Keystone. In fact, she said to the CBC Radio in 2015, when asked about Keystone: we are against it. Against it. It's not that they don't want to pursue it; they're against it. Further on there were efforts, and then she made it very clear that she would abandon efforts to get Keystone built. Shortly after that she called home Rob Merrifield, Alberta's representative inside Washington, and told him to down tools on fighting for pipelines. That's their record, so you should not be shocked today to see the Deputy Opposition House Leader rise and pass a motion trying to water down a motion that simply calls on people to follow the law.

Now, Northern Gateway: abandoned. No effort from the then Premier, now the leader of the NDP, to fight for Northern Gateway. Zero effort, Madam Speaker. When it came to Keystone, a critical component for the future of this province, the NDP did a wine ban for about 30 days, and then they removed the wine ban and put a bill into this House to be able to shut down the taps, an idea that came from the then Official Opposition party, the United

Conservative Party at that time. It was polling so well that the NDP had to put a bill into this place, which passed, but they would not implement that legislation. They were so dedicated to their antipipeline rhetoric and their true goal of destroying the energy industry inside this country and in this province that they would symbolically try to do something in here but then not go all the way.

Premier Horgan at the time – and remember that the Leader of the Official Opposition used to work for Premier Horgan. They're in the same party. They're both from the NDP Party. Then the Premier of Alberta – I want you to think about this; some of you were not in the 29th Legislature – flew down to Victoria to have a meeting with the Premier of B.C. while illegal activity was taking place, plus several court issues, to stop TMX from being built, absolutely critical to the future of the province.

They have a bilateral meeting, Madam Speaker, and we are all eagerly waiting here to find out what the then Premier of Alberta would do, the NDP, to be able to get the pipeline built. They come out. The Premier heads back home to answer questions to us in question period shortly after that. Premier Horgan, the Premier of B.C., comes out and is asked by reporters, "What did the Premier do?" the now Leader of the Opposition, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona. They say to the Premier: what did she raise with you? Do you know what Premier Horgan said? Remember that this is a friend of hers. He said: she never even raised it with me. Never even raised it with him.

They will not fight for pipelines in this province, Madam Speaker. There are people sitting across from us right now, in this House, who have stood on the steps of this Legislature and chanted: no more pipelines. They can't have it both ways. The hon. member wanted to rise and water down an amendment that simply says this: follow the law and respect the First Nations' rights inside B.C. That's his choice. Is he going to rise inside this Chamber and condemn the policy wing of his party, who is calling on people to break the law? That's the choice before this Chamber right now. We certainly will not – I certainly will not, and I suspect that all of my colleagues will agree with me – support an amendment from the NDP that says anything less than we expect the rule of law to be followed and we expect the First Nation communities of B.C., who are depending on this pipeline for their prosperity, to be respected. Their rights, I should say. That's the choice before the NDP.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of us to vote down this ridiculous subamendment, pass our amendment, making it clear that we expect the rule of law to be followed. Let's have a vote and find out if the NDP stand with people breaking the law or if they are actually going to stand up for Albertans right now and demand that our energy infrastructure gets built inside this country. That's the choice before them, that simple.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any other speakers to the subamendment?

Seeing none, I will call the question.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on subamendment SA1 lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 8:55 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Ceci	Hoffman	Sabir
Dach	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan		

9:00

Against the motion:

Aheer	Jones	Rosin
Amery	LaGrange	Rowswell
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Loewen	Rutherford
Barnes	Luan	Schweitzer
Copping	Madu	Sigurdson, R.J.
Dreeshen	McIver	Singh
Ellis	Nally	Smith
Fir	Nicolaides	Stephan
Frey	Nixon, Jason	Toews
Getson	Nixon, Jeremy	Toor
Gotfried	Orr	Turton
Guthrie	Panda	van Dijken
Hanson	Pon	Walker
Horner	Rehn	Wilson
Hunter	Reid	Yaseen
Issik		

Totals: For – 7 Against – 46

[Motion on subamendment SA1 lost]

**The Deputy Speaker:** We are back on the amendment, amendment A1. Any members wishing to join the debate?

Seeing none, I will call the question on amendment A1 as moved by the hon. Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A1 carried]

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

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Jones	Rosin
Amery	Kenney	Rowswell
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Rutherford
Barnes	Loewen	Schweitzer
Copping	Luan	Sigurdson, R.J.
Dreeshen	Madu	Singh
Ellis	McIver	Smith
Fir	Nally	Stephan
Frey	Nicolaides	Toews
Getson	Nixon, Jason	Toor
Gotfried	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Guthrie	Orr	van Dijken
Hanson	Panda	Walker
Horner	Pon	Wilson
Hunter	Rehn	Yaseen
Issik	Reid	

Against the motion:

Ceci	Hoffman	Sabir
Dach	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan		

Totals: For – 47 Against – 7

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hold on. That's just the amendment. Let's deal with the motion, Government Motion 104.

Are there any members wishing to join the debate as amended? Hon. Government House Leader, are you closing debate?

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** I am joining the debate.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Are you closing the debate?

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Yeah, I'd like to close debate. Absolutely, Madam Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Okay. Good. Sorry.

Are there any other speakers wishing to speak before the hon. minister closes debate?

Seeing none, the hon. minister.

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Well, Madam Speaker, I'll be brief. There's a lot of work before the Chamber tonight. But I just want it to be clear, Madam Speaker, through you to all members of the Assembly, that the option here in a moment is to vote – to abstain is the same as supporting people that are trying to illegally block pipelines – to support First Nation communities in B.C. that are depending on this important piece of infrastructure to get built. There's no way around that. You don't get to hide from your responsibility in that. You're either for it, or you're against it.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 104 as amended carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:06 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Jones	Rosin
Amery	Kenney	Rowswell
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Rutherford
Barnes	Loewen	Schweitzer
Copping	Luan	Sigurdson, R.J.
Dreeshen	Madu	Singh
Ellis	McIver	Smith
Fir	Nally	Stephan
Frey	Nicolaides	Toews
Getson	Nixon, Jason	Toor
Gotfried	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Guthrie	Orr	van Dijken
Hanson	Panda	Walker
Horner	Pon	Wilson
Hunter	Rehn	Yaseen
Issik	Reid	

9:10

Against the motion:

Ceci	Hoffman	Sabir
Dach	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan		

Totals: For – 47 Against – 7

[Government Motion 104 as amended carried]

### Select Special Committee to Examine Safe Supply

115. Mr. Jason Nixon moved:

Be it resolved that:

1. A Select Special Committee to Examine Safe Supply be established and consist of the following members: Mr. Jeremy Nixon, chair; Mrs. Allard, deputy chair; Mr. Amery; Mr. Feehan; Mrs. Frey; Ms Goehring; Mr. Milliken; Ms Rosin; Ms Sigurdson; Mr. Stephan; Ms Sweet; and Mr. Yao.
2. The committee's mandate is limited to the consideration of the following matters:
  - (a) examine the concept of "safe supply," defined as the provision of pharmaceutical opioids, heroin, crystal methamphetamine, cocaine, or other substances to people who are addicted to or dependent on these substances;
  - (b) whether there is evidence that a proposed "safe supply" would have an impact on fatal or nonfatal overdose, drug diversion, or associated health and community impacts;
  - (c) whether there is evidence that a proposed "safe supply" would be accompanied by increased risks to individuals, the community, other entities or jurisdictions;
  - (d) examine historical evidence regarding the overprescribing of opioids; and
  - (e) whether there is evidence that a proposed "safe supply" would be accompanied by any other benefits or consequences;
3. During the course of its review the committee
  - (a) continues despite a prorogation of a session of the 30th Legislature, and
  - (b) may, without leave of the Assembly, meet during a period when the Assembly is prorogued;
4. The committee may, subject to the chair's approval, pay any reasonable costs necessary for the effective conduct of its responsibilities, specifically the costs of advertising, staff assistance, equipment and supplies, rent, travel, and other similar costs;
5. The committee may, during the course of its review, utilize the services of any of the following:
  - (a) Legislative Assembly Office employees, or
  - (b) subject to the approval of the head of a department or an office of the Legislature, the public service employees of that department or office;
6. No later than April 30, 2022, the committee must submit a report to the Assembly that sets out its recommendations, if any;
7. If the Assembly is not sitting on the day that the committee completes its report, the chair of the committee must, as soon as practicable,
  - (a) deposit the report with the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 38.1, and
  - (b) provide a copy of the report to each Member of the Legislative Assembly.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, this is a debatable motion. Are there any members wishing to speak? The hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be quick. I would just like to move an amendment to Government Motion 115 if I could. I would like to move that . . .

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hold on, hon. member. Please wait till I have a copy.

Hon. member, please proceed.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will continue now. I move that Government Motion 115 be amended in section 1: (a) by striking out “Feehan” and substituting “Irwin,” (b) by striking out “Goehring” and substituting “Ganley,” and (c) by striking out “Sweet” and substituting “Shepherd.” That’s a pretty straightforward amendment. I will leave it at that.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any members to speak to the amendment?

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any speakers to the main motion, Motion 115? The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you to the member for moving the amendment. I certainly look forward, should it be the will of the House to approve this motion, to participating in this committee. However, I would like to move an amendment.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Hon. members, this will be A2.

Hon. member, please proceed.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I’ll read this amendment into the record, that Government Motion 115 be amended as follows: (a) by striking out paragraph 2(a) and substituting the following:

- (a) examine the concept of safe supply, defined as the provision of safe, legal and regulated pharmaceutical alternatives to toxic street drugs as a means to protect the lives of individuals who meet legally prescribed medical criteria such as having attempted recovery from their addiction multiple times and being subject to an extremely high risk of death resulting from a poisoned drug supply;

and (b) striking out the quotation marks in respect of “safe supply” wherever they occur.

A relatively straightforward amendment, Madam Speaker, that will make the definition of safe supply accurate to how this policy is practised across the country and will allow the committee to focus on the need to save lives.

Madam Speaker, I have spoken in favour of moving forward with this form of a safe supply. The current definition that is put forward in the amendment includes many things that I and no member of the opposition have any interest in seeing implemented in the province of Alberta and certainly are not practised anywhere in Canada by any provincial government.

Now, I do not want to think, Madam Speaker, that there are any cynical intentions with this committee. Indeed, as noted in the *Edmonton Journal* today, on Monday the Mental Health and Addictions associate minister told reporters that the committee’s aim is to get the facts and hear from experts on both sides and stated that “as a former law enforcement officer, I want to look at objective evidence.” I absolutely agree. That is precisely what we wish to do with this committee. However, while this government and members of this government have discussed safe supply, they have made some, I believe, inaccurate and egregious claims that do not represent the policies that are actually currently in practice by governments in Canada.

In June we called for many different things, including, and I quote, providing safe, legal, and regulated pharmaceutical alternatives for Albertans who use highly toxic street drugs. Since that press conference, the UCP has misrepresented that policy. Indeed, the *Edmonton Journal* article goes on to note that after the minister made that statement in question period, he “referred to safe supply as a ‘tax-payer funded supply of drugs’ and questioned how such policies benefit those struggling with substance use and addiction.”

We saw at the UCP AGM the Premier speaking about the intent of this call to be driving drugs to people’s homes. The Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions has compared it to simply spreading OxyContin on the streets and referred to it as so-called safe supply. That is not objective, Madam Speaker, and we support moving forward with an objective consideration on this committee of policies that are actually in practice and have been proposed by members in this Chamber.

In reality, safe supply, as it is practised in Canada, is a technique that is reserved for people who have failed at recovery. There are about 17 safe supply programs across the country in five different provinces currently serving fewer than 500 people. If the government indeed wants this committee to genuinely study a policy accurately, I believe it should be defined accurately. If this committee is a way to study the impacts of a policy that could prevent deaths from a dangerous and lethal toxic drug supply, then I believe it makes sense to reference a toxic drug supply in this definition.

Madam Speaker, four people are dying a day from drug poisoning related deaths, and the committee mandate should be genuine in studying a policy that could prevent these deaths.

9:20

Now, the second part of this amendment simply takes out the use of quotation marks around “safe supply.” They are not necessary grammatically, and stylistically they would suggest an attempt to delegitimize the policy; again, not the sort of objectivity that the minister has stated he wishes to have. If this committee is meant to indeed be objective in its study, its mandate should not have these kinds of scare quotes around the topic it is meant to study.

We have an opportunity here, Madam Speaker, to do good work, not presupposing whatever the decision of this committee might be, what its recommendations might be, but I would hope that we can establish this committee based on realistic terms of actually functional policy of what is actually being considered and proposed and that we can have a motion that does not attempt to disparage the concept before it has even been considered or heard.

I put forward this amendment to the Assembly. I look forward to hearing from members on it.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any speakers to amendment A2? The hon. Associate Minister of Mental Health and Addictions.

**Mr. Ellis:** Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I’d like to thank the member for his comments. Certainly, a couple of things are concerning to me about this amendment. I mean, first of all, he does indicate that there’s no practice anywhere in Canada by any province but then also goes on to say that there are 15 programs operating across the country, so a little bit of inconsistency, I would say. At least that’s what was heard.

I would also have some concerns that this is dramatically changing or at least maybe changing, I would say, the scope of the committee, which is something that we do not want to do. We want to examine safe supply. Also, certainly, the concern that I have as

well is that we do not want to prejudge the outcome of the work of the committee. I want to encourage all members on both sides to bring in experts, and those experts will provide evidence, and the committee expectation that I believe that this Chamber will have is that the evidence will be examined and will be then thoroughly discussed, at which point I'm hoping that a report will be given to this Chamber whereby we will, you know, hear what evidence was examined at that particular committee.

With that, Madam Speaker, I certainly have some concerns in regard to this amendment. I will not be supporting this amendment, and I encourage all members of this House not to support the amendment.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any members to join the debate on amendment A2? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be brief in my remarks, but I certainly stand in support of the amendment brought forward by the Member for Edmonton-City Centre. As mentioned, of course, we've had a horrendous number of people in our province die of drug poisoning over the last number of years, and yearly it seems to be increasing. Of course, I've mentioned in the House before that my nephew was one of these individuals a little over two years ago. Indeed, examining the concept of safe supply should be properly defined for this committee so indeed it does delve into it in a meaningful way, it doesn't gloss over it, and it ensures that safe supply is a topic that's covered in depth in committee and really looks to examine not only the government's preferred methodology of attacking this problem, that of simply looking at recovery options, but looks at the concept of safe supply in a realistic and honest and forthright manner so that indeed the evidence can be brought forward into committee showing that a multifaceted approach, including safe supply, is part of government policy as it spearheads the movement towards this plague upon our province.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Madu:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know, this is one of those amendments that further illustrates the difference between members on this side and the members opposite. The amendment that has been put forward by the Member for Edmonton-City Centre would essentially say to the committee: this is the definition you must go with in terms of what constitutes safe supply. He is essentially asking the committee members, "No, no, no, you can't probe into the doctrine of safe supply" whereas the motion moved by the Government House Leader on the concept of safe supply does not prejudge what that means, and that is the way it should be.

Oftentimes I have often stood on the floor of this Assembly to say that the members opposite are not interested in actually looking at the substance of the issues before them; they are only interested in the politics of it, and this is a classic example, a definition of safe supply that would be, according to their motion, "defined as the provision of safe, legal and regulated pharmaceutical alternatives." What else is the committee to do with that particular doctrine? Nothing. They've already been given the definition as opposed to the definition given in the original motion, that says, "examine the concept of 'safe supply,' defined as the provision of pharmaceutical opioids, heroin, crystal" and on and on. The original motion as moved by the Government House Leader has not tied the hands of the committee members in terms of what constitutes safe supply.

Second, subsection (b), striking out the quotation marks in respect of "safe supply" wherever they occur. The original motion is asking the committee to look into that. That is why it is in

quotation marks, because there's a committee that is charged with the responsibility to deal with that particular issue. You know, it would be beneficial to the members of this particular House, all of us, for the members opposite to really focus on the issues and the substance of the issues before us rather than the politics of it.

Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that there's no way that we could support this amendment, and I urge all members to vote it down.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Any other speakers to amendment A2?

Seeing none, I will call the question.

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

**The Deputy Speaker:** We're back on the main motion as amended. Any members wishing to join the debate?

If not, would the hon. Government House Leader like to close the debate?

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Waive.

[Government Motion 115 as amended carried]

### Time Allocation on Bill 81

113. Mr. Jason Nixon moved:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), is resumed, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

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

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I do rise to move Government Motion 113. We've had dozens of hours on this piece of legislation already with more work to come, two stages to come, but it's time for the House to start to make some decisions on this piece of legislation. I encourage everybody to get to work in the Committee of the Whole portion. I look forward to the rest of the debate as we work through the third reading of this.

We cannot have legislation parked for weeks blocking other work of this Assembly. It's an important bill; important work that needs to take place when it comes to amendments, Madam Speaker. I would encourage all members of the House, but particularly the Official Opposition, to stop filibustering as they try to stop and make sure that the AFL loophole can remain and instead get to work with the time that they have inside the Chamber.

9:30

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have seen that we have arrived at the time when the government can no longer tolerate their own impatience with regard to other people who might disagree with them on a topic, including all Albertans. I know I was amused to hear earlier today the Government House Leader actually suggesting that they could no longer follow arguments after 15 minutes, and that was the motivation for his desire to see debate curtailed. I just want to suggest that Albertans are not so easily put off or easily fatigued and would like to have an opportunity to hear fulsome discussion on a bill that is so important to democracy here in the province of Alberta, you know, the core and the centre of that which we do here in the House. They'd like an opportunity to make sure the government understands that they as Albertans believe the government is on the wrong track.



I mean, they've certainly been trying ways to let the government know. For example, the polls that have been done on favour with political parties for well over a year have indicated that this government is very low in the polls, and reviews of leadership have had the leadership of the government down as low as 20 per cent. My understanding is that, even within their own party, 29 EDAs have requested an early leadership review. What we're seeing is Albertans, in the ways that they can, reaching out and asking that we actually spend time preserving democracy in this province. Now we have a government stepping forward and trying to intrude on that democracy through Bill 81.

When we stand up to protect democracy, they now want to prevent us from exercising the utmost caution and care in amending that democracy here in the House by allocating time to a limit of one hour. This is really unacceptable. It's not acceptable on the face of it and really should be unacceptable for a government in a western democracy that, you know, should be preserving that which we have been handed by generations of people who have fought for democracy over the years, including people like my grandfather.

I just want to point out that we were currently just on an amendment, and we anticipate other amendments. If we can't have a chance to even change the act before it is ultimately passed because there's not enough time to bring forward all the amendments – and we haven't even heard the arguments, so the Government House Leader couldn't possibly become fatigued by them – I just would like an opportunity to speak to that which is important to all of us here, not only in Alberta but across Canada and around the world, where we are trying to support democracy and not allow it to fall into disuse because it's at the convenience of a government.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** My apologies. Only the Official Opposition may speak on this particular motion.

I will call the question.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 113 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:34 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Jones	Rosin
Amery	Kenney	Rowswell
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Rutherford
Copping	Lovely	Schow
Dreeshen	Luan	Schweitzer
Ellis	Madu	Sigurdson, R.J.
Fir	McIver	Singh
Frey	Nally	Smith
Getson	Nicolaides	Toews
Gotfried	Nixon, Jason	Toor
Guthrie	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Hanson	Orr	van Dijken
Horner	Pon	Walker
Hunter	Rehn	Wilson
Issik	Reid	Yaseen

Against the motion:

Barnes	Feehan	Loyola
--------	--------	--------

Ceci	Hoffman	Sabir
Dach	Loewen	Shepherd
Totals:	For – 45	Against – 9

[Government Motion 113 carried]

### Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

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

#### Bill 81

#### Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2)

**The Chair:** We are on amendment A2. The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Madu:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I wanted to, you know, begin the conversation on this amendment in Committee of the Whole this evening in order to highlight once again the purpose of Bill 81, a commitment that we made to the people of Alberta in 2019 that if given the mandate to govern our province, we would remove big money and foreign money from Alberta politics.

We also committed, Madam Chair, that we would do everything we can to ensure that we close the AFL loophole, created by the NDP, that allowed Gil McGowan and the Alberta Federation of Labour and their allies, as enshrined in section 7 of the NDP constitution, to pour millions, tens of millions of dollars, into funding the NDP campaign.

**9:40**

Madam Chair, since that loophole was created, tens of millions of dollars – and, you know, what is so disturbing about the role that the AFL plays in the NDP is this: section 7 of the constitution of the NDP creates what they call a Provincial Council. That Provincial Council is made up of all kinds of people, including the Alberta Federation of Labour, that holds a voting power, a voting right in whatever decision is taken by the Alberta Provincial Council of the NDP.

But, Madam Chair, it doesn't just stop with the AFL holding a voting right. It also extends. It allows at least two affiliates of the AFL to also be able to vote.

**The Chair:** Hon. minister, I hesitate to interrupt. Just a reminder: we're on amendment A2. Speak to the amendment.

Thank you.

**Mr. Madu:** Absolutely, Madam Chair.

You know, Madam Chair, at the end of the day, that is part of the commitment that we made to the people of our province to make sure that those multimillions of dollars have no role to play in our politics. Here we have an amendment that absolutely has got nothing to do with Bill 81 before us. Bill 81 ensures that we keep those commitments. Bill 81 will ensure that only the people of Alberta can impact the outcome of our elections. That is what we have tonight, and unless someone can stand before the floor of this particular Assembly and point to how this amendment would improve Bill 81, I haven't seen that in this amendment. There is nothing in this amendment that would confirm that Bill 81 would be improved.

Madam Chair, what I have done: I have been carefully listening to the concerns raised by the members of this Assembly with respect to some aspect of Bill 81 that they consider to be

problematic, and we have put forward an amendment that addresses each of those concerns. You know, one of the concerns that was addressed is quite simple, a cap on individual contributions to nomination contestants. I heard that as currently drafted in Bill 81, it would lead to the contribution of unlimited donations to nomination contestants. I have taken onboard that concern. We have provided an amendment that seeks to address that particular issue. We now have a cap of \$4,000 – a cap of \$4,000 – a global \$4,000.

Madam Chair, the second concern that we heard . . .

**The Chair:** Hon. minister, I hesitate to interrupt again. Just a reminder: we're on amendment A2. I'm happy to get a copy to you and allow you to speak at a later date if that is at all helpful. Perhaps we could go from there.

**Mr. Madu:** Madam Chair, again, the amendment A2 before us seeks to amend section 25 by striking out "An annual membership fee paid for" and substituting "An annual membership fee paid by a person for the person's own." Now, what I was alluding to before were the concerns that I heard in the course of the debate. We have tabled an amendment that addresses those concerns. There is nothing in this amendment that would strengthen the current act itself, the EFCDA, section 25 of the act. This amendment would seek to introduce something that is not currently in the current provisions of the EFCDA. In Bill 81 on page 123 we included the request by the Chief Electoral Officer to clarify the current interpretation of section 25. This amendment would, then, seem to suggest that there is a prohibition in the EFCDA on the content of this amendment. That is not true. That is not true.

Section 35 of the act talks about prohibitory contributions. Section 25 talks about how you pay for the membership and when the payment constitutes a contribution and when it does not constitute a contribution. This amendment would essentially strike out "An annual membership fee paid for" and substitute it with "An annual membership fee paid by a person for the person's own."

Madam Chair, you know, I would not support this amendment. It's that simple because I am of the belief that the amendment that we made in Bill 81 conforms with the request by the Chief Electoral Officer. This amendment would essentially seek to prohibit what is currently now prohibitory in the current EFCDA. I have not sought to change that in the current bill before this Assembly. Unless anyone before the floor of this Assembly can stand up and point to where that prohibition is, then perhaps I would consider that. But so far in listening to all of the contributions and commentary on section 25 as contained in Bill 81, I have not heard a single person make the argument that there is a prohibition. No one.

Madam Chair, I recognize that some of the folks have pointed to bulletin No. 6, that was published on November 19 by Elections Alberta. I am obviously of the view that – and I do have the bulletin right here – while I can't speak to the interpretation offered by Elections Alberta, what I do know is that I've got the capacity to interpret statutory provisions.

9:50

Elections Alberta on page 2 under purchasing memberships wrote: "An interpretation of section 25 that would enable an individual to pay for an annual membership on behalf of others would be inconsistent with section 34." That is the interpretation being offered by Elections Alberta. Madam Chair, I reject that. I do think that Elections Alberta on this particular interpretation is mistaken because there is no prohibition in the current EFCDA, an interpretation that has already been upheld by the actions of Elections Alberta. To date in their actions Elections Alberta have

not taken a contrary view in their actions, in their interpretation, in their application of section 25.

Madam Chair, to be clear, for our viewers back home, again I'm going to read section 25 of the current EFCDA. It states:

An annual membership fee paid for membership in a political party or in a constituency association of that party, or in both, is not a contribution for the purposes of this Act if:

- (a) the fee or, when a fee is paid to the party and to a constituency association of that party, the total of those fees, does not exceed \$50 . . .

In other words, if that fee does not exceed \$50, if you spend \$50 in purchasing a membership, there is nothing there that says that you have to spend \$50 in buying a membership for yourself. That's not in there. It refers to the purchase of memberships. If it's not more than \$50, then it is not a contribution.

The same section 25 in (b) says, however, if it "exceeds \$50, the amount of the excess shall be considered as a contribution." In other words, if you spend \$55, \$5 would be deemed as a contribution. There seems to be a confusion by some in a combined interpretation of sections 25, 34, and section 41.4. Some have relied on the combined reading of those three provisions to say that it is prohibited for anyone to buy a membership for someone else. That is not correct because, Madam Chair, the reality is that if the drafters of the EFCDA had intended to do so, they would have written that in the act, just like they did in section 35.

In section 35 of the act, Madam Chair, it talks about – remember we are talking about a payment for membership that would lead to a contribution, when that would be deemed to be a contribution, and who can pay for that contribution. Those are the legal questions and the legal issues before us here. Section 35 of the EFCDA – and, mind you, section 35 comes way after section 25 and section 34 – the heading of section 35 is titled Prohibited Contributions. The drafters of the EFCDA and the Legislature at the time, in their wisdom, decided to identify what contributions are to be prohibited and what are not to be prohibited. As I said, if it is not prohibited when you are dealing with the performance of an action, the doing of it, then you can't import that into the legislation. You can't do that. There has to be an expert's authority for you to be able to infer that into the act. You can't impute what you cannot impute.

You know, Madam Chair, as a young law student one of the judges that had a profound impact on my legal mind is one of the United Kingdom's most accomplished jurists, Lord Denning. Lord Denning was the master of the rolls in England. The master of the rolls is the equivalent of the Court of Appeal here. Whilst at the Court of Appeal as the master of the rolls he had one of the most profound impacts on the United Kingdom's legal system. If you pick up any of his judgments, the moment you read the very first sentence, you will not drop that particular judgment until you finish it, even if it is 2,000 pages. That is how profound Lord Denning was to law students and judges.

Lord Denning was then elevated to the House of Lords in England. That is the dream of any judge, the judges or justices. That is the height of their judicial career, elevated to the House of Lords. You know, Lord Denning didn't spend so much time at the House of Lords. Lord Denning was of the view that the members of the House of Lords were boring. Here is a man who had a first class in mathematics and then went on to study law. You can imagine how sharp his mind was.

While at the Court of Appeal he had the most profound impact of any judges in the United Kingdom. As a consequence, he was elevated to the highest court of that particular land, but he deemed that particular court to be boring. Why? Because he was of the view that you cannot – the approach to judicial statutory interpretation has to conform with the intentions of the drafters, that there is no

room for judicial activism. If you are looking for the origin in the United Kingdom of the doctrine against judicial activism, you are looking at the man Lord Denning. It's a lesson that must be learned by any lawyer. Law students across the globe are taught that. Your responsibility in the interpretation of the law is to stick to the intentions of the drafters of the law.

Madam Chair, the EFCDA does not provide a prohibition on membership purchase by someone else. The Chief Electoral Officer says to provide a clarification, and we've done so. Therefore, I urge all members to vote against the amendment.

**The Chair:** Any other members wishing to speak to amendment A2?

Seeing none, I will call the question.

**Mr. McIver:** No. I'm on my feet.

**The Chair:** Oh, sorry. I did not see you. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**Mr. McIver:** Thank you, Madam Chair. The lawyer at the table beside you is a little taller than you, and I can understand how you couldn't see me, although I think you're a little taller than I am, too.

Madam Chair, thank you for this opportunity to speak to this amendment. Now, as we just heard from the hon. Justice minister, it's not my opinion or, as I understand it, the Justice minister's opinion that this particular amendment will improve the legislation as it stands. Now, of course, during the debate the opposition pointed out what they thought were a number of changes in the legislation, and that's their job, to do that. I respect that. They stood in the House and pointed to a whole number of things. Then they spent a lot of time doing it, which is fair. It's their right to do that and kind of a bit of a testament to how many hours this legislation has been in the House since it started.

**10:00**

But when you think about the purpose of the bill, really the bill is designed to impose a \$30,000 limit on donor contributions to PACs, and this amendment doesn't actually help with that. It does not. Madam Chair, you may remember when you weren't in the chair, when you were on one of the partisan sides talking about – and I agreed with you, by the way, when you said it – how the NDP, with the legislation that they put through when they were in office, was stacking the deck in their favour. I think many of us remember that famous speech that you gave. It was a good one.

Really, that's not what should happen in here although when the other side was in government, they sure went out of their way to stack the deck in their favour. I remember that one of the contributions they put on happened to line up perfectly with the pattern of their average donor and not at all with the pattern of the donors from the other side, which is, I think, pretty much the definition of stacking the deck in their own favour. In the meantime, along came our Justice minister and our government, trying to balance the playing field in the next election, which I think is the right thing to do, and what I don't see in this amendment is a real improvement in that.

Now, what's interesting about this, Madam Chair, is that with this amendment they brought forward, I guess one of the key things for the folks at home to keep track of: it's to make it just slightly more complicated for those who sell memberships to their political party. Now, I don't think you have to be real imaginative to know that selling memberships is something that goes on in the Conservative party a lot more than it does in the NDP. Oh, they have memberships – don't get me wrong – but what's different is that

we're a party unto our own with no legal or official affiliation to the federal Conservative party, which is quite a bit different than our colleagues across the aisle.

Here's what one of the big differences is, Madam Chair. If you buy or get – actually, I don't even know how you get a membership in the NDP. I've never had one. Maybe I'll get one, or maybe I won't. But the point, from what I understand, is that if you end up with a federal NDP membership, then you have a provincial NDP membership, where if you get a Conservative federal party membership, that you have to pay for, then you've still got to buy a provincial one, so it's completely different.

Really, again, even in opposition, with the amendment they're trying to stack the deck in their own favour because the purchasing of memberships, which is a bigger part of what we actually do in the nomination process, and selling of memberships is a much more important part of our process because, unlike most of the NDP nominations, we have competitive nomination contests. Heck, sometimes there are three, four, five people wanting to be an MLA for the United Conservative Party, which, just as a short aside, really speaks to the quality of the people on this side because they've all had to actually earn their way onto the benches here. They were not awarded their – they just didn't have their names on the ballot awarded. In many cases they actually had to fight for it and fight off, in many cases, some other really talented, quality people.

We've been blessed that way as a party. Many times when we're running our nominations, the leader just doesn't tap you on the shoulder and say: "Hey, you. It's your turn, and – trust me – no one will be allowed to run against you." Here you actually have to fight for it.

**Ms Hoffman:** Are you speaking to the amendment?

**Mr. McIver:** I am speaking to the amendment. Thank you to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora for reminding everybody in this Chamber and everybody at home watching that one of the big differences here, that has everything to do with this amendment, which is about how you buy memberships, is the fact that on the United Conservative side we sell memberships even to get our name on the ballot, and then you still have to win an election to get in here.

But before you even get your name on the ballot to run in the election, the way it works is that we go out and we sell memberships, we knock on doors, we have coffee parties, we go meet people, we meet constituents. We go out sometimes and hit Tim Hortons and go table to table and sell a membership. So this amendment to make it a little more complicated is actually something that makes it more complicated for the United Conservative Party and not at all for the NDP because almost all of their nominations are not competitive. You see the difference? Again, even in opposition they're trying to stack the deck in their favour with this particular amendment. Really, it's a little bit troubling.

Again, it's not consistent with what our government said. I mean, again, one of the things that we said that we wanted to do, one of the big things, is to block the AFL loophole, which prohibits groups formally affiliated with political parties, like the AFL in the NDP's case, from having undue influence over the process and also make it illegal for foreign entities to finance third-party advertisers. Now, if this amendment was to actually assist in any of the useful work of this legislation, I'm sure that folks on this side of the House would actually consider supporting it, because that would be a good thing, right? Of course.

But after carefully looking at this amendment and comparing it to the purposes that the United Conservative Party has for bringing forward this legislation, it seems very much inconsistent. Very much inconsistent. Here it's section 25 they want to amend by striking out "An annual membership fee" and substituting "An annual membership fee paid [for] by a person for the person's own." Well, Madam Chair, I'm not sure how that actually does what the NDP says they want to do, keep big money out of politics. It seems completely inconsistent with that. It sure doesn't block the AFL loophole. But wait a minute. They don't want to block the AFL loophole; they invented the AFL loophole, and why wouldn't they? It only benefits one political party. It's an attempt to stack the deck in the NDP's favour, which really is problematic. This amendment doesn't do anything to fix that.

So as I consider this, their amendment doesn't help ban foreign money from interfering in Alberta politics, it doesn't help keep big money out of Alberta politics, it doesn't block the AFL loophole. In fact, here's the thing. The hon. Justice minister supported an amendment that was actually consistent with some of the better things that the NDP asked for, right? Madam Chair, I guess if they stand up and say that we just voted against this because the NDP brought it forward, I don't know how they could because the other amendment that was supported by this side and by the Justice minister actually was quite consistent with at least some of the things that the NDP asked for. This is just about making better legislation.

**10:10**

What is here in amendment A2 doesn't really meet the standard, does it? No, it does not. Madam Chair, I've just got to say that if this was an active part, this amendment, of making better legislation, I'm sure that under the guidance of our Justice minister, whose legislation this is, we might get behind it. We might vote for it. We might say that this should be a part of our legislation. We might all get behind it and vote for it. But I keep looking at this, and I just don't find the improvement to the legislation that I think Albertans deserve. Because of that, I have to say that I wouldn't be able to bring myself to support this, and I would recommend that all members of the House don't support it. In fact, heck, assuming that the NDP wants to make the legislation better, they shouldn't support it either because the amendment actually doesn't improve the legislation.

Thank you for this time. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment.

**The Chair:** Any other members on amendment A2? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora.

**Ms Hoffman:** Yeah. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Here we are, 32 minutes into the pressing one hour that the Government House Leader told us that we needed to get to work. We have many amendments that we would like to bring forward.

I'd call on the government to stop their shenanigans. Let us vote on this amendment. It's clear that they don't want one member, one vote, that they want to be able to have rich, deep-pocketed friends of the Premier come in and buy 424 memberships in individuals' ridings to potentially work against them. This amendment is to stop that loophole, to mean one member, one vote, that you have to buy your own membership. You can't come in and dump a bunch of memberships into somebody else's nomination race. If the government wants to vote against that, if the government thinks it's okay to have 424 memberships bought by one person, they can be on record for that. I'm sure members in this House who are nervous about their nominations will think about that tonight.

But, please, let's deal with this and get on to other amendments because we have lots of business, and this government brought in a really heavy-handed motion so that we only have 25 minutes left, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Any other members to the amendment? The hon. Member for Cardston-Siksika.

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to rise this evening and speak to the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Edmonton-South, I believe it is, which reads: the hon. member moves that Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), be amended by striking out section 5(26) and substituting the following:

(26) Section 25 is amended by striking out "An annual membership fee paid for" and substituting "An annual membership fee paid . . . for [by] the person's own."

**Mr. Feehan:** You're not supposed to read it for the first time when you're standing up.

**Mr. Schow:** Right off the bat, Madam Chair, I hear the Member for Edmonton-Rutherford heckling. He can't help himself. It was evident today during question period, where he just couldn't hold back and said that people were dying on the Premier's watch . . .

#### **Chair's Ruling Relevance**

**The Chair:** Hon. member, I would ask that you stick to the amendment at hand. We do have a limited amount of time, in which the majority of the members of the government are speaking, too. While I am extremely sympathetic to other members in this Assembly, I'm going to be very strict on relevancy. You will speak to amendment A2 and amendment A2 only. Please proceed.

#### **Debate Continued**

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Madam Chair. It has been practised in the past that during Committee of the Whole there has been some level of latitude, but I take your advice under advisement. I was just simply putting into context the nature of debate. Though members in the Chamber may not like the fact that I have decided to stand up and speak on this amendment, as a duly elected member of this Chamber it is my right.

**Member Ceci:** Whoopee.

**Mr. Schow:** Whoopee. That's what the Member for Calgary-Buffalo has to say: whoopee. He's saying whoopee to all the 40,000-plus constituents in Cardston-Siksika who rely upon me to come to this Chamber and represent them. How dare that member disrespect those constituents. I have a job to do here. I was duly elected to do it, and I will do that without feeling intimidated by the Member for Calgary-Buffalo. Let's be honest, Madam Chair. That member doesn't intimidate me one bit. The worst Finance minister in the history of this province does not intimidate me one bit.

Now on to the bill and the amendment at hand, Madam Chair. I would like to see amendments coming forward to this bill that deal with the spirit of the legislation, what the legislation is attempting to accomplish; that is, multiple points, the first of which is removing foreign entities from Alberta's elections. These elections are decided by Albertans. As the members opposite . . .

**The Chair:** I hesitate to interrupt you again. Perhaps we could provide you with a copy of amendment A2.

**Mr. Schow:** I have a copy right here, Madam Chair. As I have said before . . .

**The Chair:** I would ask you to speak specifically to the amendment. If we want to discuss other things, I'm happy to get to the vote. If not, we are on amendment A2, and you need to speak to that.

**Mr. Schow:** Madam Chair, I am well aware of the amendment that we are on at the moment. As I have said, in the past significant latitude has been given to other members.

**The Chair:** Hon. member . . .

**Mr. Schow:** As I prepare to get back to the amendment, I am allowed to elaborate with some degree as to how . . .

**The Chair:** Hon. member, are you questioning the chair in this regard? I don't think you're doing that. I know that you have a considerable skill set in debate. I look forward to the riveting debate on amendment A2.

**Mr. Schow:** Well, Madam Chair, I am honoured by that compliment. I wish members of the House had voted for me as the best debater in this Chamber, but that just wasn't the case. I mean, that is for the people to decide, not me.

Yes. What this amendment seeks to do is strike out in the bill, which would be, for those who are looking for it, on page 123, 26(c)(2):

An annual membership fee paid by a person on behalf of another person for that person's membership in a political party or in a constituency association of that party, or in both, is a contribution by the person who paid the fee for the purposes of this Act.

Madam Chair, this amendment to this bill, the one put forward by the hon. Member for Edmonton-South, doesn't deal with the spirit of this bill. This is a small change the members are trying to make to this bill that doesn't actually address the primary concerns that the bill was put into this House to deal with. This bill was put forward to deal with things like keeping big money out of Alberta politics.

It's also meant to make sure that we are having a fixed election day, Madam Chair, so that the government of the day can't use taxpayer dollars to campaign for an election, like we saw with the previous government doing a tour around the province, making plenty of announcements on the public dime, in preparation for an election that they knew when they were going to call, leaving the other members in the opposition at a strategic disadvantage.

Anyone who knows, who has run in a nomination, like myself – when it comes to paying for memberships, I ensured that every person who voted for me or the other member paid for their own membership.

Now, I heard members opposite talk about one member, one vote. I am drawn back to the leadership campaign that I worked on for the hon. Premier, then candidate and winner of the PC leadership race, then winner of the UCP leadership race. That was a one-member, one-vote election won by a landslide by the now hon. Premier.

Going back to the purpose of memberships, all political parties have them, as they should. Having a membership entitles you to certain privileges that go along with being part of the club, if you will. Now, provincially we are not affiliated with any party federally. We don't have any federal overlords, as I may say. We also don't have any union overlords. In the NDP they have a membership, but if you have that membership, it makes you a member of the federal party as well as the provincial party, which,

I may add as an aside, has put them at odds on a number of occasions, where their federal leader, their federal overlord, has certainly been in a conflict of opinion with the provincial leader. But, you know, I digress, Madam Chair. The point of a membership in a party is to give you the ability to have a say, to be a shareholder in that party, if you will, to attend things like conventions, to vote on policy, to join constituency associations, to be active.

**10:20**

My first experience in politics – I reflect on this with great fondness – was when I made a phone call to the constituency association for James Rajotte, the then Member of Parliament. I called a number of them trying to get involved. I was a young grad student doing my master's in political strategy, and I was trying to get involved in politics. I thought it would be a great opportunity to do so federally. I made some phone calls, and nobody returned my phone calls. But Elisabeth Hughes, who was then the president of James Rajotte's board, called me back and invited me to her meeting but made it clear that, you know, to be a part of the constituency association, you had to have a membership, which I did. I got on that board.

Having a membership gave me the opportunity to jump on the board and be involved locally, both in outreach in the community, knocking on doors, getting out the message about the federal Conservative Party, about the then Prime Minister the Rt. Hon. Stephen Harper, the greatest Prime Minister this country has ever seen. Wherever he may be at this time, I hope he's getting some great rest. He put in tremendous work for this province and for this country. Sitting right next to him in Ottawa was our hon. Premier. I'm honoured to have that member leading our party at the moment.

Madam Chair, when it comes to memberships, there's so much involved in that. It's so important that people get involved and have memberships in a political party, so I encourage members of the public to be involved, get a membership, regardless of your political stripe.

This amendment in its attempt fails to address the spirit of the bill, and that, of course, is that we would like to make sure, for example, that the act gives flexibility for increasing the number of advanced voting stations where needed to make it easier for Albertans who want to vote early. Now, I don't think there's anybody in this House or within the sound of my voice who would disagree with that principle. Higher turnouts in elections are good for politics; they're good for democracy.

If I can reflect back to April of 2019, we saw over a million people come out and vote in droves for the now governing party because we put forth a message that was far more favourable than the members of the opposition. Now, a large part of that was because we had people who were engaged in the process. That process starts with things like constituency associations, and being part of a constituency association requires that you have a membership within a political party.

What I would like to do is flip it over and potentially ask a question to the Minister of Justice. Why are memberships within political parties such an important fundamental piece of the political process, and why is it important to address memberships within this bill?

**The Chair:** The hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul.

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm a little frustrated myself because I also had an amendment, and it was going to deal with this situation here. It was simply to ask that if you were buying a membership for somebody, you would actually get consent for that membership. I'm obviously not going to get that

opportunity to do that, which would have helped to correct this bill, so I will be standing up in this House and voting against Bill 81.

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

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Obviously, what we're seeing here is a very gross and disgusting display by the government side in filibustering the little time that they've allotted opposition to work in Committee of the Whole. For those watching at home, Committee of the Whole is a time for some discussions back and forth with the minister. It's an opportunity for opposition to bring forward amendments. So far in Committee of the Whole the government has brought forward an amendment, so they've taken most of the time themselves with amending their own bill.

The opposition has brought one amendment forward, which now the government, who never cared to talk about it yesterday when it was brought forward – now all of a sudden they all want to talk about it. Now they're wasting the time of the opposition, who should be having this time here to bring forward amendments to make this legislation better to represent our constituents. Of course, this government has wasted now 45 minutes of time just talking amongst themselves. I think that's disgusting and disrespectful to Albertans and to our constituents, the people we're here to represent.

The Government House Leader got up and said that they had to bring in time allocation because there was filibustering going on. Well, the only filibustering going on is on the government side. Obviously, this amendment that we have before us should be voted on. If this government doesn't like it, vote it down and carry on. What's going on here is, again, a disgusting display and takes away the democracy and ability for people to represent their constituents in this House.

The NDP in four years brought in closure, I believe, three times. That's all I could find. This government in two and a half years has brought in closure 25 times. That's a horrible record for this government. I ask that they allow the business of this House to carry on and that we be able to bring forward amendments as we see fit.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** The hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I just wanted to speak on behalf of a few things. First of all, I want to thank the minister for the amendments that he brought forward and for working with us on that. I also want to thank Mr. Resler as well because though that interpretation might not be accepted, I do appreciate any interpretation that holds us accountable, to be better, to be more transparent, and to be more honest about how it is that we run our elections.

The MLA had brought forward the idea of having an amendment should that happen in this House. The amendment was an ability to be able to look at – right now in my household, between myself, my children, and my husband, I can buy 400 memberships per person, 1,600 memberships within my own family. That doesn't actually take the big money out in any respect. If that's the way that we're going, well, then let's be transparent about it. Let's make sure that every single one of those memberships – every single one of them – needs to have a sign-off and needs to be acknowledged as a membership because where we'll go with those is that if those memberships can be purchased, any special-interest group, Madam Chair, could come in. Any special-interest group of any sort could come in and change the way that a nomination is handled.

If you don't like the person who's running for it, well, then stand up and say that loud and proud. You don't want that person? Don't

vet them. Don't let them run. However you like to do that, that's an honest and transparent way to do it. But to pretend that we're going to have honest and free and democratic elections for our nominations with the ability to have that many memberships, then at the very least let's provide the fact that we need to know that every single member knows that they're a member.

If it ends up going to an electronic vote and if those memberships are then transferred to a PIN, that means the person becomes a PIN. They are no longer a person that has conscientiously bought a membership and knows that they've bought a membership, because they have not signed on the bottom line saying: yes, this is my membership.

To be able to go into seniors' homes and be able to collect dollars and be able to put that on a credit card and put that through: that's happened in the past. That's fine. But to legalize something that's been illegal in the past is not appropriate unless we actually understand and make sure that every single one of those members know that they have a membership.

It is something, I think, that we've prided ourselves on in our party. It's something that we believe in. It's truly something that we want to see. Though I may not agree with the amendment that is on the floor right now, I would have really liked to have seen other amendments come forward because I really, really believe, through you, Madam Chair, that it makes this legislation better and that we have the conscience of the people.

The MLA for Cardston-Siksika had said that he would like to talk about what his constituents want. Well, let me tell you what mine would want. Mine want to physically show up at a ballot box and put in their name for their favourite candidate. I hope that we have these competitive nominations. It's one of the best parts about running in our party, one of my favourite pieces, because I really believe that it shows democracy in action. To disallow that and for a person to have a membership bought for them without their knowledge, without their consent goes against the fundamental principles of who we are, Madam Chair. If we can allow that amendment to happen, I truly believe, through you to the minister, that this makes our legislation so much better, so much more transparent. If we are going to be able to buy multiple memberships, especially in areas where we might have multigenerational families, rural areas, I can understand the logic behind it. Through you to the minister, Madam Chair, let's allow the amendments to come forward so that we can actually make this legislation better.

Thank you so much.

10:30

**The Chair:** The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat.

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I just briefly want to say that tonight is an incredible night of antidemocracy and antigrassroots. The whole heart of this is that we're going from a situation where you cannot buy a membership for someone else to where you can now buy hundreds of memberships for someone else. I believe that's the heart of what the RCMP investigation is from three years ago into this Premier and this leadership, and here we are tonight denying Albertans the right to debate.

Secondly, my amendment, if I had been honoured the chance, because I couldn't speak long enough, was to go with what the UCP members passed at their membership, where one only could buy it for immediate members . . .

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Point of order.

**The Chair:** The hon. Government House Leader.

### Point of Clarification

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Madam Chair, I rise on 13(2) for you to explain your ruling to the Deputy House Leader while letting that rant go on about fake RCMP investigations. Are you going to call the House fairly or not?

**The Chair:** Hon. member, I'm about 44 seconds into listening to this member speak, in which most of that time has been listening to you yell at me from across the aisle. So, quite frankly, I don't know what that hon. member has said yet, but perhaps you'll allow me the opportunity to listen to him as other members in this House have had their opportunity to speak as well. We have seven minutes remaining in this debate, and we're going to carry on.

We are on amendment A2, and I suspect the hon. member will be speaking to that.

### Debate Continued

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I wholly support the amendment brought forward by the NDP to restore the membership obligation for one member to buy their own, and I hope that all members in here will respect that grassroots democratic right.

Secondly, though, what this government is doing tonight – there are other terrible parts of this bill. It allows non-Albertans to participate in our electoral process. We have to flesh that out. We have to define that. It also takes away so much of the grassroots opportunity for Albertans to be involved. There's a part in here where the elections officer may strike a party forming if it's before an election. Are we going to take away the grassroots democratic rights of Albertans? I am not, and I hope this government is not.

Please, all, support this amendment. Thank you.

**The Chair:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this amendment. I just wanted to say that I believe that I want people who are voting in membership votes to be deliberate, engaged, and informed with an intent and a knowledge of their decision to participate in the democratic process. I think that is the fundamental strength of us having party memberships. I don't want bulk participants; I want aware participants. I want people to stand up and be there of their own knowledge and of their own avail. I want fair, open, and transparent principles to guide whatever we do in the spirit of informed and, in this case, written consent. It sounds like we won't get to that, but it's a very simple, simple but subtle, change. Minister, I do thank you for the amendments you brought forward and for spending a lot of time listening to us, but the issue of written consent for these memberships, I think, is extremely important – it sounds like we won't get there – a decision to participate and arrive at a decision without any coercion or influence.

Happy to hear Elections Alberta is going to keep the reporting system in place. That's fine. That's good.

Effective doubling of contributions: that's going to be the de facto effect of this bill if we include the nominations and through the party and constituency association and campaigns. Is this complicated? I don't think so. I think it's fairly simple. We're fair, open, and transparent, and I want to enfranchise our grassroots members, not disenfranchise them by actually putting hundreds and hundreds if not thousands of memberships into the pool that have not had that written consent. I'm having a real challenge with this.

This bill without that written consent component to it is going to be very, very difficult for me to support, Madam Chair. I just wish

we could support this one and move to the next one, but we don't have time. I would like to see us do this in a way which actually allows us to come forth with the best possible legislation, and I'm not sure we're going to have that opportunity.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** The hon. Minister of Justice, followed by Drayton Valley-Devon.

**Mr. Madu:** Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, this bill: it's won. It's a bill that I in my capacity as the Minister of Justice brought before the floor of this Assembly. It moved through first reading, we debated it at length at second reading, and I can confirm to the members of this Assembly that on this side of the aisle I have made sure that the content of this bill and the concerns that have been raised on this particular bill have been thoroughly discussed, have been thoroughly reviewed, and it was on the strength of those reviews and conversations that I then tabled the amendment that was passed by this House.

As far as I am concerned as the Justice minister – and I am a straight shooter. I am someone who stands on my record and am prepared to defend it any time, any day. To come before the floor of this particular Assembly and say things that are nowhere near the current provisions of the bill or suggested amendments that are being sought for right now in the course of multiple conversations is disappointing to me. Disappointing. The Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat would want us to believe that, you know, right now there is bulk membership. Madam Chair, that is not true.

This is our party bylaw. Membership, article 4, reads:

- 4.1. Members shall be Canadians Citizens or Permanent Residents of Canada (as defined by applicable law) who:
  - 4.1.5. have paid the prescribed membership fee, personally or through an immediate family member (spouse, child, or parent).

Our own party bylaw went beyond the current provisions of the EFCDA to put restrictions and limitations around the purchase of membership. For anyone to stand before the floor of this Assembly to impute anything to the contrary is disappointing. I mean, it is flat out inaccurate. Throughout the history of this young party that provision has guided the purchase of membership and all of the contests that have taken place as a political party. And here we are.

What the members opposite would want us to believe – and we are a political party that is made up of people from all walks of life, from all backgrounds. Some of our members have language barriers and challenges. Some of our members barely speak English. As Justice minister I have a responsibility to protect each and every one of them. We have Elections Alberta that supervises elections in this province. I am not going to go with an amendment that would create problems for many of our citizens. I won't do that. Let me be clear. I will not do that. I have a responsibility to think through the consequences of amendments that have been put before the floor of this Assembly. Where it makes sense, I will take it into consideration, and I have, and they are all reflected in the amendment that I have put forward, passed by this House.

**The Chair:** Hon. minister, I hesitate to interrupt, but pursuant to Government Motion 113, agreed to earlier this evening – it states that after one hour of debate all questions must now be put.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:39 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

For the motion:

Barnes	Feehan	Loyola
Ceci	Gray	Shepherd
Dach	Hoffman	

Against the motion:

Aheer	Lovely	Rowswell
Amery	Luan	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Madu	Schow
Copping	McIver	Schweitzer
Ellis	Nally	Sigurdson, R.J.
Fir	Nicolaides	Singh
Frey	Nixon, Jason	Smith
Getson	Nixon, Jeremy	Toews
Horner	Orr	Turton
Hunter	Pon	van Dijken
Issik	Rehn	Walker
Kenney	Reid	Wilson
LaGrange	Rosin	Yaseen
Long		

Totals: For – 8 Against – 40

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

**The Chair:** Now to Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2).

[The voice vote indicated that the remaining clauses of Bill 81 were agreed to]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:44 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mrs. Pitt in the chair]

For:

Aheer	Long	Rowswell
Amery	Lovely	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Luan	Schow
Copping	Madu	Schweitzer
Ellis	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Fir	Nally	Singh
Frey	Nicolaides	Smith
Getson	Nixon, Jason	Toews
Gotfried	Nixon, Jeremy	Turton
Horner	Orr	van Dijken
Hunter	Pon	Walker
Issik	Rehn	Wilson
Kenney	Reid	Yaseen
LaGrange	Rosin	

Against:

Barnes	Feehan	Loewen
Ceci	Gray	Loyola
Dach	Hoffman	Shepherd

Totals: For – 41 Against – 9

[The remaining clauses of Bill 81 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:** Well, thank you, Madam Chair. I move that we rise and report Bill 81.

[Motion carried]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-East.

**Mr. Singh:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration a certain bill. The committee reports the following bill with some amendments: Bill 81. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

**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. That is carried.

### 10:50 Government Bills and Orders Third Reading (continued)

#### Bill 81 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2)

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. Minister of Justice.

**Mr. Madu:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is my pleasure to rise today to move third reading of Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2).

[The Speaker in the chair]

I have been encouraged by the debate about this important piece of legislation. Bill 81 is an important step forward in this government's commitment to strengthen democracy. This is a commitment that we take seriously. By allowing only those who live in Alberta to be able to make election advertising contributions during an election period and banning people living outside of Canada and non-Canadian corporations or organizations from making political advertising contributions, this legislation would help remove foreign money and influence from Alberta elections. Foreign entities have no business interfering in Alberta's elections. This province belongs to its people, and elections must remain a time for Albertans to discuss and determine the fate of their province without undue influence.

As this government promised, Bill 81 contains a limit of \$30,000 for donations to third parties or what is commonly referred to as political action committees, PACs. Political parties, candidates, and constituency associations would also not be able to make political advertising contributions to third parties. The Chief Electoral Officer would also be able to refuse to register a third party if the third party is affiliated with a registered political party.

Through debate, Mr. Speaker, we discovered that the criteria for the Chief Electoral Officer to consider were too broad. A House amendment that was introduced yesterday proposed to narrow the criteria by removing the need to examine the following: the activities of the third party, political parties, the constituency associations, and candidates; the involvement of the third party in



campaigns and their public statements in support of a party or a candidate; and political programs, advertising materials, and policy statements of a third party or a registered party.

Mr. Speaker, in Bill 81 the Chief Electoral Officer would be required to consider the following: how the third party is organized, including whether a person who is the chief financial officer, signing officer, or principal of the third party holds a similar position in the political party; interactions or agreements between the third party and a political party, including those that indicate that the third party is under the control of a political party; and how much the third party participates in the political party's decision-making.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 81 would also increase the amount political parties could spend on elections by removing the flat rate and introducing a formula for determining the amount. This would put Alberta in line with other Canadian jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about nomination contestants during the process of debate on Bill 81. This legislation would increase the expense limit for nomination contestants from 20 per cent to 25 per cent of a candidate's limit. It would also make it so that contributions to nomination contestants are not part of a donor's maximum contribution limit, and they would no longer be tax deductible.

House amendments introduced before the floor of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, also introduced a limit of \$4,000 to nomination contestants or a combination of nomination contestants. In addition to these important changes, Bill 81 would establish a set election date for Alberta elections, the last Monday in May. This would level the playing field for all political parties and remove any advantage the ruling party might have in scheduling an election when it suits them. The amendments would also make it easier for Albertans to vote by allowing for the increase of advance voting stations and helping voting stations run more smoothly. Bill 81 would also update Alberta's election legislation by adding references to the Recall Act and the Citizen Initiative Act and modernizing their language.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 81 has always been about strengthening the democratic process in our province. Albertans want foreign money, dark money, and undue influence out of our elections, full stop. Through Bill 81 this United Conservative Party government is making that happen. Albertans deserve to feel confident in their electoral system, and these changes will increase transparency and trust in the system.

I want to thank all members who have participated in the debate on Bill 81. I ask for their support for third reading of Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora, followed by Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that we have an opportunity now to speak to Bill 81. I certainly would have appreciated the government actually demonstrating a commitment to what they said, which was that they wanted us to bring in amendments and have an opportunity to consider them and debate them, but definitely we saw behaviour that didn't reflect those words in committee just now. I would say that it's probably one of the most overt antidemocratic moves we've seen from the current government in this place.

As we consider Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), here under consideration, I want to begin by speaking to the bill in its final form with regard to the piece about buying memberships on behalf of others. I think that if you were to talk to

a grade 6 class – the current curriculum talks about democracy in grade 6 – and you talk about becoming a member and choosing to join an organization, whether it's a club or a political party, I think most kids would know that you should be expressing your own intent, that somebody else shouldn't be able to sign you up without your consent. So it would have been great if we would have had a chance to consider that amendment.

It would have been great if we would have seen a commitment to one member, one vote. As was very accurately highlighted by the MLA for Chestermere-Strathmore, a family of four could donate the max through buying memberships for others, and that would mean over 1,600 memberships in one specific nomination potentially. We know that that would flood antidemocratic sentiments throughout the party, and I have to stop and take a little trip down memory lane to reflect on why it is that the government might be choosing to try to bring in such an antidemocratic move through the addition of being able to buy memberships for somebody else. Of course, we know that there have been multiple RCMP investigations into the UCP leadership race as well as some nomination contests, and rather than seeing these investigations, heeding their caution, and changing their behaviour, the government instead has decided to try to change the law. So here we are considering this on Tuesday night in a bill in its final form.

Now, some would say: well, other parties give away memberships or make it really easy for people to become members. Absolutely, we've seen that. Both of the parties represented in this place currently, I believe, have a \$10 membership fee, but we have seen times where political parties will have a no-cost membership fee, where they'll say: you feel free to join. But they actually make the individuals join themselves. They don't allow other people to sign them up without their consent. We saw that in the Alberta Liberal Party in this place when the leadership review was happening and the subsequent leadership race that resulted in Raj Sherman becoming the leader of the Alberta Liberals. Take that outcome for what you may. There was significant uptick in the number of memberships because their party made them free.

**11:00**

Why won't the UCP, if they want increased memberships and increased engagement, then make their memberships free or make them a dollar or do something? If cost is the barrier, then find a way to reduce the cost, but the truth, Mr. Speaker, is that they don't want to reduce barriers. They want to increase opportunities for people with deep pockets to have undue influence on the democratic process.

If this was only about a private club or a private organization deciding how you become a member, so be it, but it's not because this private club happens to be a political entity that, in turn, has the opportunity to present ideas to the people of the province, run for government, and sometimes even end up in the seat of power.

If this really was about just creating opportunities for increased membership and increased engagement, the government would not need to bring in a bill. They could just reduce the cost of memberships within their own party constitution, with their own party operations. Instead, they're changing the law to make it that people who have extra money can have extra influence, extra say, and, in turn, increased access to power and influence. We saw this, again, very recently highlighted by folks who received correspondence from their employer encouraging them to come out to the UCP convention to throw support behind the current Premier.

Again, this relates, Mr. Speaker, to Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), because this government, under the leadership of the current Premier – I think the government whip referred to the Premier right now or the leader right now or at the

moment; those were the words: the leader at the moment – has created this massive opportunity for people with deep pockets to come in and buy 424 memberships each. This absolutely will have an impact on democracy. As some have said, you know, have fair and open elections, have opportunities for people to be engaged in the democratic process, which the Government House Leader and others like to talk about in this place regularly. What they've actually done through this bill is reduce those opportunities by creating an unfair, unbalanced playing field for those who have the deepest pockets to have the most influence, the most memberships.

Perhaps it will result in less work for the police because the RCMP won't be able to investigate this, because they're actually changing the law to try to make it legal for them to have this kind of undue influence, undue antidemocratic membership sales to tip the balance of power. I also can't help but wonder. Oh, it's interesting. Again, Michael Scott: "Sometimes you start a sentence. You don't know where it's going to go, and you hope you find it along the way." Right? That's a paraphrase to *The Office* fans. I'm sure it's not a direct quote. With the interesting timing of the fact that we are presently in a nomination race in Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche, a nomination race that seems to be quite hotly contested, now the government is creating an opportunity for people to come in and buy hundreds of memberships on behalf of others in that one potentially under-close-watch nomination race that's presently under consideration.

The other interesting piece, of course, is that one of those nomination contestants was the opponent to the Premier in the UCP leadership race that resulted in significant accusations, the RCMP being called in, and still to this day, as last reported, an investigation to actually come to some sort of conclusion about the wrongdoing that took place in that nomination contest.

Again, we have a government here that has decided that they are going to say that they rarely bring in time allocation except, you know, they've done it 25 times and they just did it to their own caucus members in this place, who clearly had ideas, concerns, and wanted to have an opportunity to raise them in this Chamber, to have their colleagues consider amendments to make this bill less bad. The government instead decided to invoke the very heavy-handed measure of closure and then in an even more overt, rude, and aggressive manner decided to eat up the vast majority of the time so that nobody else could bring forward amendments.

I guess I will say that the government acknowledging that their own bill was not fit for prime time through the amendments that they brought forward yesterday should be a testament to why it is that this bill is not fit to be passed a third time and therefore proclaimed. I think that if the government – if the Justice minister would have taken proper engagement within his own caucus, within his own party, within the province of Alberta, he would have received very useful feedback that could have been incorporated in this bill to make it less harmful to democracy.

We've already heard independent members talk about how this doesn't reflect the will of the UCP membership in terms of some of the changes, and we've also heard that it doesn't reflect the will of some members of the UCP caucus, again, highlighted in this Chamber. I will tell you that it definitely doesn't reflect the will of our caucus or many Albertans who've been reaching out to us to express their gross frustration with this government of such significant scales.

[Mrs. Frey in the chair]

I also want to say that there are a few other key points that we haven't had an opportunity to address yet this evening as most of the conversation at this point has been about the government's

choice to create a massive loophole so that rich people can buy memberships on behalf of others. As we've also seen, the government has regularly refused to do proper consultation to actually get feedback about what needs to be fixed. We saw that the Justice minister did bring in a last-minute amendment himself here last night. I think that's based on the fact that he acknowledges that there are issues with this bill. His caucus members, many of them, have acknowledged that there are issues with this bill, and I think it would be wise for us to heed those concerns as we continue to debate this here this evening. Again, if this is about wanting to drive up memberships, there is nothing saying that the party can't reduce the cost of membership, the cost to play, the cost to enter into these engagements.

I also want to talk a little bit about the third-party advertising piece as it relates to Bill 81. It creates a set of criteria to put limits on who is and is not allowed to express political views as a third-party advertiser. I have to say that I spent a lot of time on the other side listening to members of the Wildrose talk about small government, small-touch government: keep government as minimal as possible; don't stifle freedom of speech; don't stifle people's ability to express their opinions. Then here we have a government bringing in a bill that is absolutely putting limits and curtailing freedom of speech. I would say to many of the colleagues who sat in this Chamber and expressed libertarian views that I think that this definitely is an extreme overreach, and I think it is an attempt for the Premier to create an environment where those who are dissenters don't have an opportunity to speak.

That's being done in this legislation, and we saw earlier this evening it also being done in this House through the attempt to bring in sneaky maneuvers to actually stifle caucus members. This from the Premier who once talked about how it was fine for people to have dissenting opinions when members of his own caucus were talking about things that he said he didn't agree with when it came to the way that COVID was being handled in this province, for example. He said that, oh, he was fine for people to have dissenting opinions and to have lots of different feedback and that there was room within his caucus for people to express their different opinions when it comes to questioning the science behind the spread of a deadly virus. But when it comes to expressing concern about folks who have deep pockets having undue influence and the opportunity to buy hundreds of memberships on behalf of others with that, no, got to bring in the whip and got to definitely shut down conversation and opportunities for people to express their opinions, bring forward amendments, and try to create a balanced playing field within their party, within the province, and within all political parties.

11:10

While this bill has been amended by the government, the proposed legislation still has long-lasting implications for elections in Alberta, and many of them, I say, will be harmful to the democratic process. One of them, of course, is that participation in third-party advertising remains limited.

Let me give you an example. I don't think they often spend money, but any of you who've been to protests – really, there haven't been as many able to gather in the ways they have in the past. I would say that the Raging Grannies, who are, you know, mostly elderly women across the province who get together and sing political songs, definitely have from time to time taken angles of attack against individual political parties. Telling these grandmas that they can't get together and be third-party advertisers on issues that matter to them, their families, their grandchildren in times of an election – it's clear that this government doesn't want to have opportunities for those who

oppose them to be united in their voice – I think is incredibly disrespectful and antidemocratic to the Raging Grannies or any other group that wants to have a chance to get together and have their voice heard. What it does is that it encourages other groups to pop up and for those established groups that have already made their opinions known on a variety of issues to have their free speech curtailed in a significant way.

It does change how elections are run in this province in a number of ways. We know that the implications won't be fully known until we can see the impacts on voter participation. It's important to us that we bring forward an opportunity for this government to pause and take a sober second thought, Madam Speaker, because we've seen already that this government has admitted that they got some pieces wrong in their original draft. I would say that they got more pieces wrong that they have refused to acknowledge and refuse to even allow debate for in this place.

Specifically, again, I am deeply concerned around creating massive – I don't even want to call it a loophole because it's so intentional for the government to create opportunities for the Premier and others who are organizing within the Premier's office to go out and buy memberships on behalf of others or to support some others in buying memberships for individuals when we know that that is not the foundation of democracy. The foundation of democracy is people, individuals, volunteers getting out, doing the hard work, talking to one another, not manipulating the system to try to create as much purchasing power for deep-pocket friends as opposed to ordinary citizens.

I think that we've seen tonight just how nervous this government is when it comes to talking about democracy and the changes they're making to the way parties are run and elections are held, and for good reason. There is a long track record of political interference and misconduct when it comes to leadership races as well as some nomination contests. Of course, there have been moments where the RCMP have been called in to investigate fraud, forgery, and bribery. The solution isn't to change the laws to make it easier for you to do those things that are currently classified as fraud, forgery, and bribery. The solution is to stop doing those things, to pay the fines, own up to the mistakes of the past, and for those members to start anew with proper, fair, democratic engagement.

This bill definitely is not a step in the right direction. I would say that the amendment that came forward last night is to cause slightly less harm, but there is a significant harm being caused to democracy through this bill and through these provisions that specifically attack freedom of speech and also the provisions that further the influence of those who can afford to pay for more memberships. Again, parties determine what their membership rate is. Really, if the parties want to find ways to get more people engaged, they can do that, but they shouldn't be doing it by saying that you can go and buy memberships for others.

I would have loved to have had an opportunity to consider some of the other amendments. I think one amendment – I love the amendment that we put forward, the Member for Edmonton-South specifically saying that the person has to consent to it and pay for it themselves. I also think that there were probably a bunch of other amendments that could have come forward saying things like “You can only buy for people in your immediate family,” for example, or “You can only buy if that person has formally consented in writing that they actually want to be a member.” I imagine that there were many places between what we were proposing and what the government has decided to ram through that could have been considered.

[The Speaker in the chair]

When we talk to those students in grade 6 democracy classes and we're explaining to them about the role of this Assembly, we talk about how there are three stages of reading of a bill and in committee is when we have an opportunity to bring forward our best ideas and every member of this place, all 87 of us, even if we weren't the bill's sponsor, has an opportunity to contribute to try to make it better. I will continue to say those things when I go into classrooms, but I don't know how the government, that just put such a leash on and really stifled the voices of not just the opposition, not just the independent members but of members within their own caucus, can talk about the three fair stages of bill consideration and engagement when it comes to the behaviour that we've seen displayed in this place this evening.

I guess one way the government could show that they are not as divisive and focused on shutting down their own members would be to consider whether this bill needs to move forward at this time and, if it doesn't, creating an opportunity for this bill potentially to be something that we work on together. We've seen this in the past, that we've created some all-party committees. I would say that there is significant interest from private members within the government caucus, from independents, and, of course, from the NDP opposition to be engaged in this legislation. I hope the government takes that into consideration this evening.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjection]

**The Speaker:** Didn't you move the bill? You moved third reading. You may have the opportunity to intervene on a subsequent speech, and you will definitely have up to five minutes to close debate, but you've already spoken to third reading. Unless there's an amendment or otherwise, that's your opportunity.

Prior to the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora I mentioned the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore. Then we will go to the hon. Member for Brooks-Medicine Hat and Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland. The hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. Again, I appreciate this debate, and I have to say a hearty thank you to our Minister of Justice for the immense amount of work that he did working with us to look at this bill. I want to make sure that, you know, what I'm saying right now is not in any way to suggest that he didn't work with us. I know that that's some of what the opposition was saying. That's not true at all. In fact, he's an extremely honourable man and worked really hard with us to try and get this legislation to be where it is. I just need to say that.

Having said that, there were a lot of issues with the bill. I'm not a lawyer. Through you, Mr. Speaker, it took a lot of work and a lot of energy to try and understand where this bill was coming from, especially – especially – because I'm so honoured to stand here on behalf of the grassroots today. This legislation pours with the intention of what the grassroots want from us, what their expectation is. Of course, as government you can't always put what is in grassroots policy directly into legislation. That's not always feasible. The minister had mentioned it before in, again, another beautiful statement regarding the bylaws of our party and how important that is. But we also know that things that are put into statute: should there come a question as to which one is going to fall at the end of it, the statute will always supersede what happens in the party bylaws, which is, of course, normal because it's a statute.

The reason why I need to speak about this is a few things. One of the things is that we talked about purpose and commitment, removing big money, all of those kinds of things. Again, if the intention is that we are able to have multiple memberships bought by one person and if that is feasible, let's just make sure at the very,

very least that we have consent for that. Let's make sure that we take the time to acknowledge that every single person that has a membership has signed on the dotted line saying: yes, that's my membership.

**11:20**

In my constituency when we door-knock and when we go out and see people – I mean, I think the Minister of Municipal Affairs was saying about how we go to Tim Hortons and go table to table, and, good Lord, I'm sure it's every coffee shop in every one of our constituencies.

One of the most admirable nominations that I saw was actually for the Member for Brooks-Medicine Hat. She ran a tremendous nomination and worked so hard in a competitive nomination. Can you imagine what that would have been like? People were saying things about her, that she was young and that she was inexperienced and that she didn't have it. She's a rock star and phenomenal and completely, amazingly competent. Future leaders of our parties: these are the kinds of people that we hope run for our party so that when they're here, they'll be able to take these parties forward. I've said this to her on many occasions.

But imagine, Mr. Speaker, if the legislation was legalized at the time for some special-interest group who doesn't believe that a young woman in a rural area in her 20s is capable of running for a nomination and decided to use those nomination vote opportunities to vote her out. Imagine if a whole bunch of people got together deciding that the Member for Brooks-Medicine Hat, because of whatever reason, was not capable. In fact, when she ran her nomination, she had to fight really, really hard against some people who actively attacked her for those exact reasons. Because of the way that the nomination was run and because she ran such a strong nomination and because she door-knocked every door – I would have to say the Member for Banff-Kananaskis equally. We called her fierce during the election. A fierce nomination. She wore through a pair of her running shoes running from one end of her riding to the other. Again another young candidate who put everything on the line to be here in order to be able to stand up for her constituency.

Imagine if people felt that these incredible young Conservative women were not capable to do their job and decided to run a campaign against them. Because they can buy memberships without any accountability and without any consent from the folks that they're selling the memberships to – I am absolutely certain. I know the work that the MLA does in Brooks-Medicine Hat. I know the work she does with her board. I know how much she's in her community. I know her commitment. I've heard her speak on many occasions. She is a very, very fantastic speaker, and as a person who is double her age, I'm very impressed by the human that she is.

You can imagine my concern knowing that somebody with her capacity and her ability may be targeted. Or perhaps if I look at my own riding – if I look at my own riding – being an ethnic female in a rural area, maybe somebody would think that that's a bad idea or that a woman running in my riding is a bad idea or anything. I mean, I could pick a thousand different things. I get all the time the variations of not being conservative enough, being too conservative, whatever it is. There are a bazillion reasons why people may or may not want you to be elected in your area.

If it comes down to fair nominations and somebody else is chosen, so be it. All of the power to them. I love democracy. In fact, I love it so much that it's a worthy sacrifice to make to do all the things that we do here but also to be not chosen. That's how important it is.

I think that when we look at that accountability and that transparency, it's one of the pillars of why I'm part of this party.

It's what I believe in. It's the way I live my life, at least to the best of my ability. I'm sure I fail on multiple levels. But I want to be able to go back to my constituency and say: your membership matters; it counts for something; it's legitimate. I do not want to be legalizing something that was once illegal in order to – I don't understand this huge, gaping hole that you can drive a truck through at this point in time, that allows us to be able to do that without consent.

With that, I'd like to present an amendment, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. member, just in the name of expediting the process here, if you want to pass that to the page.

**Mrs. Aheer:** You betcha.

**The Speaker:** We'll get it delivered here, and then we'll proceed as soon as we have it. Hon. members, the amendment will be referred to as RA1.

The hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you very much. I'd like to move that the motion for third reading of Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), be amended by deleting all of the words after "that" and substituting the following:

Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), be not now read a third time because the Assembly is of the view that the bill fails to require the express consent of a person of their intention to participate as a member of a political party or a constituency association of a political party.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a really, really easy amendment to make. It is in the spirit of the entire bill, which, I believe, holds to the principles I know for myself and I hope for the people, my brothers and sisters, that I'm here with in order to make sure that we are able to do what's in the best interest of democracy.

I was told by somebody that if we put the bill off for some reason, we will not be able to proclaim it early enough and get it in before nominations get going. I'm fairly certain that with the will of the Legislature and the proclamation of bills, we can get this legislation fixed, passed, and on the docket as soon as possible in order to make sure that we have the very best legislation in front of us, Mr. Speaker, in order to be able to uphold what it is that we all came here for, and that is so that we honour our members and that that membership means something and that a physical, human body gets to show up at a nomination race to put their paper in the box to determine whether or not we should be here. It's an absolutely amazing opportunity for us to do engagement and reach out to our constituents as well.

Mr. Speaker, thank you so much for the opportunity. Again, I want to thank the minister for all of your help and all of your work.

Thank you.

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

**Mr. Madu:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me begin, first and foremost, by thanking the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore for her contributions to the debate on Bill 81 and the progress that we have made so far. I do want to thank her for the spirit behind this amendment.

That said, Mr. Speaker, I have committed extensively my time in making sure that I address every single concern that has been raised with respect to Bill 81 before tonight's proceedings. What this amendment would effectively do is to say that this Assembly is of the view that the bill fails to require the express consent of a person of their intention to participate as a member of a political party or a

constituency association of a political party and therefore should not now be read a third time.

Mr. Speaker, this is unfortunate because tonight we have seen the expression of how our democratic process is supposed to work. We voted. We voted on the amendments that were before the floor of the House, and the majority expressed their view. That is how our system is designed to work, and the will of the Assembly has been expressed tonight. The majority will of the Assembly has been expressed tonight. You know, there is nothing – I want to repeat. I as Justice minister brought before this Assembly Bill 81. There's nothing in Bill 81, in the current EFCDA. We've had the time since the introduction of this bill to debate the actual bill itself, some of the provisions that some of our colleagues have got concerns with. We've had the opportunity to debate the actual Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), before the Assembly. We've had the opportunity to consider some of the amendments that have relevancy to Bill 81.

**11:30**

This amendment, that talks about the consent of a person, of their intention, is nowhere to be found in the present act. It's not in the present act. Mr. Speaker, in 2015, 2018 the NDP made a series of changes. If they had a concern – and I think it's important for all members of this Assembly, you know, to really think through the consequences of the amendment before the Assembly. In 2015 the NDP made a series of changes that struck section 26, 27, and 28 of the act. If there were concerns, if they had thought that interpretation of section 25 was problematic, that would have been an opportunity for them to also strike section 25 or perhaps amend it. They didn't do that, and I have the bill here that tells you the amendment, what was repealed in 2015, right here.

They also made changes in 2018. That was not an issue because throughout the existence of the EFCDA, that has never been an issue. That has never been a subject of contrary interpretation until bulletin 6, released November 19, came to the surface, and some of our members in the course of debate on Bill 81 decided to raise that particular issue. The question I have for each and every one of them is: why this time in the game? It wasn't raised with me. Why now in the game, at this late hour? I understand that we may have our individual concerns, individual differences, perception on what a perfect bill ought to be, but at the end of the day we are called upon to express the will of the majority. It cannot be: unless I have my way, the high road or we implode. That is not how our system is designed to work.

I want to be clear. I have enormous respect for each and every member of this Assembly regardless of political stripe or party. The tradition of this Assembly requires that. First and foremost we are human beings before we got involved in politics and before we got elected. By my very nature I have enormous respect for every human being regardless of where they come from, but I also demand of my colleagues what I demand of myself. We cannot – and I want to underscore this point. It is not acceptable in a pluralistic society or in a democracy to say: unless I have my way, I am going to destroy the block. That's not how it works. That's not how it works. That's not how our system is designed to work. There is nothing – and I say this in the context of what I'm beginning to see. Mr. Speaker, right now you can sense the frustration of my voice.

Since the introduction of Bill 81 and since second reading I've had at least four meetings to walk through with my colleagues the concerns that they had with respect to Bill 81. This amendment that deals with consent: the first time I saw it came about was yesterday in the late hours. It was yesterday. Prior to then I have worked with my colleagues to go through the concerns that they have with

respect to Bill 81. I have implemented the changes requested by the will of the majority of our caucus, by the majority, and that's how our system is designed to work. I think we should all respect that.

There are things I haven't liked even as a member of government, but that does not mean that I am going to bring down the government that I helped to elect because I didn't like a particular course of action. That's not how our system is designed to work. I have had, you know, concerns. I don't think it's a secret. I have had some concerns with some of the public health measures, but I haven't had to say: we must destroy the government, that all of us worked so hard to put in place, because of that. We do have a responsibility to strike the right balance. It cannot be my way or the high road, Mr. Speaker. It cannot be.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker – and I have enormous respect for the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore. I consider her to be a sister. We are friends. But I think that this amendment is misplaced, in the most respectful, constructive manner. This cannot be happening in this late hour after all that we've been through with Bill 81. My hope is that we focus on the reason why we introduced Bill 81 in the first place. Each and every one of us ran on our platform commitment, on what we will do if given the opportunity to govern in a platform mandate. Each and every one of us stood by that platform commitment. Bill 81 accomplishes that. We have not just a legal responsibility but a moral responsibility to uphold that.

We committed to Albertans that we would get rid of big money and dark money created by the AFL loophole that allowed the NDP to funnel tens of millions of dollars. Guess what. Bill 81 accomplishes that. More than tens of multimillions of dollars coming from the AFL: it is now limited to \$30,000, as exactly written in our platform commitment. We made a commitment that we would get foreign money out of Alberta politics and the election advertising by people who live outside of our province, whether in other parts of the country or overseas. Guess what. Bill 81 accomplishes that.

We committed that third parties who are deeply affiliated to political parties, you know, would be limited as to how they can influence our elections. A typical example is Alberta Federation of Labour and their affiliate, deeply written into section 7 of the NDP constitution. Guess what. Bill 81 accomplished that. Upon the request of the Chief Electoral Officer to clarify section 25, we did that. We didn't have to do that in the first place, and nothing would've changed from the current interpretation. Nothing would have changed. We did that. We accomplished that.

**11:40**

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, Albertans want us to focus on amendments and, you know, the statutory provisions that would impact their lives in a significant manner or, in the case of our election, in a negative manner. This amendment is seeking to do what section 25 doesn't talk about. Our party, all of us, work together to come together to build a United Conservative Party, and following the establishment of their party, we instituted a bylaw. That bylaw talks about how we deal with membership. By the way – and in case I haven't said this before, let me be clear. For me, I deeply believe that the state has no role to play in intraparty business. In case anyone is in doubt, that is my own personal belief. The state has no business in how societies, political parties deal with their internal affairs. Nomination is deeply a matter for the political party to deal with.

That said, I recognize that the NDP, you know, don't run nominations. They do not. In 2015 I was in this town. I couldn't find it. The Member for Edmonton-City Centre is heckling, but I can confirm that there were no nominations that took place in Edmonton-City Centre. I can confirm that, and I stand to be

challenged on that. There was no nomination. I assume in other ridings there were no nominations. They are actually pushing for something that they can use to go after Conservatives. No, I wouldn't allow that because it doesn't impact them. It doesn't affect them one bit. I wouldn't allow that because it doesn't impact them, and that tells you that it has no relevancy to how we conduct our nominations.

It is on that particular basis, Mr. Speaker, that I would respectfully urge all members, inasmuch as I have enormous respect for the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore, that this amendment is ill conceived. It has no relevance to Bill 81 or the current state of the law, and it should be voted down.

**The Speaker:** Prior to the moving of the amendment by the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore, I had made a commitment to the hon. members for Cypress-Medicine Hat and Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland. I'm not sure you will be on the referral amendment, on RA1, if you'd like to do that.

**Mr. Barnes:** I would like to.

**The Speaker:** Okay. The hon. Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat, followed by the hon. Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul.

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore for bringing this amendment forward. At this point in time I fully believe to honour Albertans, to honour our constituents, we only have two choices, and that's to vote against this bill at third reading or accept the amendment and move it on to where this bill can be fully analyzed, fully debated, and made as best as possible for Alberta families and Alberta communities.

I want to clear up a couple of misconceptions that the Minister of Justice had talked about, again, with the idea of honouring Albertans, honouring our constituents. You know, my goodness, tonight in here I saw my colleagues from Central Peace-Notley, from Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, of Calgary-Fish Creek, and Chestermere-Strathmore all stand up and try to be involved, to try to honour and be honoured by their constituents, to make this bill better, to at least understand it. It's a sad night in here, and I'm going to come back to that when we were so stymied.

Minister, let me be clear. You said that we had lots of chance to talk. Not once did you and I have a chance to talk outside this room about this law. I'm in here a couple of nights ago, and debate was adjourned by the MLA from Leduc-Beaumont just before I was going to speak. Okay; maybe it was time to go on to something else, but that's what tonight was for. That's what tomorrow could have been for. This was our chance to talk, and you took it away. Shame on you.

Also, you talked a lot . . .

**The Speaker:** I just remind the member that he ought to pass his comments through the chair. You know, making a statement like "you" is likely to create disorder, so I'll just remind him to do that.

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you very much. You're so right, and I apologize.

You talk lots about all the work you've done on this bill, and it sounded like you were saying that it's going to be bulletproof and that it's all this great thing. Uh-uh. I've been talking to legal people out there. I've been talking to members of this House who say that this bill is so full of holes that it's almost certain to go to court. Eighteen months before the next election, Mr. Speaker, 18 months before Albertans get that democratic, God-given right once every four years. This changes – dramatically changes – the way

nominations can be held. As the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore said, four family members can have huge influence on a nomination now and an outcome.

The legal system, the court system, is a necessary check and a necessary guide to what we do in here, but my goodness, what we do in here and the thousands and thousands of Albertans that we all represent are as important and need to be respected, not time allocation where government members stand up and use all the time when hon. colleagues, in the most respectful way, wanted to understand this bill better, wanted to change it, wanted to make it better. Again, I'm so supportive of this amendment because it will give us that chance to do it. I honestly believe that our only two ways to honour our constituents – and keep in mind that they're the ones that will be holding us accountable in 18 months – are if we do one of two things now: vote no at third reading or accept this amendment. Let's spend the proper time and the great resources that we have, with all the staff here and outside this Legislature, to make this bill as good as possible.

I think back. You know, one of the great things about being in here almost 10 years and three elections – and I'm so grateful to the people of Cypress-Medicine Hat – I've seen at times when governments in here haven't been accountable and haven't respected what Albertans were saying, and I've seen what happened. I remember sky palace. Millions of dollars – millions of dollars – spent behind Alberta taxpayers' backs and ministers pointing at each other, pointing different ways, nobody taking accountability. You couple that with empty airplanes flying around Alberta at taxpayers' expense and nobody willing to take accountability for the logs and hiring an ex-husband to handle a legal Tobaccogate case, and a governing party, after 44 years, was reduced to nine seats. That's accountability, Mr. Speaker.

That's what I'm seeing from this government tonight. We just wanted to stand up and ask questions. Sure, we wanted to make amendments. As the hon. minister said, we knew we weren't going to win them all. We knew that there were going to be some other good ideas heard. We knew that other Albertans were going to have their voice heard. But we didn't think we would get one of the most important bills of the fall session reduced to where, you know, we could talk for two minutes. That's exactly what happened, and that's why – I'm sorry. I'm back to: we have one of two options. Either we're voting no at third reading, or we support the hon. member's amendment and we do this right.

**11:50**

Now, a couple of things that I briefly alluded to earlier that I want to go back to. I'm on page 105 of Bill 81, clause (2.02). Please allow me to read, Mr. Speaker.

The Chief Electoral Officer shall refuse to register a political party that seeks to be qualified under section 6(d) if the information referred to in that section is provided to the Chief Electoral Officer fewer than 60 days before the issuance of a writ of election.

It says "shall." Doesn't say "may." I wonder why this is in here at all. Why are we taking away the democratic right of fellow Albertans, who have to go out and get I think it's 9,000 signatures, have to go out and develop ideas and interests? Not that it would happen, but let's say a political party is starting, and it's got some momentum. How does the UCP stop the momentum? By calling an election. Is that the kind of province we want to live in? Hey, Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm wrong. Maybe there's more to this. But what I'm not wrong about is that I didn't get the chance to find out tonight. I didn't get the chance to debate this. The 50,000 people of Cypress-Medicine Hat that I'm so grateful to represent didn't get a chance, and I believe that people will be held accountable for that.

You know, the other one that I wanted to talk about tonight is an amendment vital to protecting Alberta's interests and our democratic process from partisan foreign influences. As it is currently written, I believe that Bill 81 throws the door wide open for who can register or donate to third-party advertisers for Senate races or our referendums. Of course, I don't think the citizens' initiated referendum law has been proclaimed yet, but hopefully it will some day. Under the current EFCDA only Canadian citizens that are ordinary residents of Alberta are eligible to register to be third-party advertisers. In addition, only individuals, unions, and corporations that normally reside in Alberta may contribute to third-party advertisers. This is a reasonable position, I think. It prevents outsiders from attempting to hijack the electoral process.

My goodness, Mr. Speaker, didn't our taxpayers, didn't our government just spend, like, \$10 million on a study and an analysis and spend two years looking into this, and now we may have to spend more tax dollars on defending the lawsuit? But here we are one day saying: oh, let's make sure that we're Alberta first and that we're protecting Alberta families and communities in the great agriculture, forestry, resource development, and all the diversification we had. The next day we're putting Bill 81 on the floor, that says: "No. It's all right. We'll let non-Albertan money come into our Senate races and our referendums." Really? That's how we do things here?

Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm wrong. I'm sorry. I just wanted to find out. Two hours ago at Committee of the Whole I just wanted to find out, and now I can't do that. At least with the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore's amendment it will give us a chance to bring those people in. [interjection] Yeah. Sure.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you for allowing the intervention, Mr. Speaker. Please do ask the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat to perhaps comment, as he speaks about the amendments before the House, about the period of time that we have between now and the next election, indicated in his remarks. Eighteen months was the period of time before the so-called statutory period that we would have to have the election held by. I'm wondering if indeed the member figures that the bill before the House and the amendment that addresses it is something that was brought to this House as an effort by the government to protect their own political survival rather than improve the democratic process in the province. It seems to me that a lot of these elements of Bill 81, including those addressed by the amendment here, are aimed at improving the prospects for the government to become re-elected by tilting the balance in their favour. I wonder if the member could talk to that.

**Mr. Barnes:** Yeah. Thank you very, very much for that. I don't know, but I've heard that from many, many Albertans. This looks like it's obviously being forced through. It looks like it's not being fully debated. You know, call a spade a spade. There's still a lot of concern over what happened three, four years ago under the RCMP investigation on the unity election and then on the leadership. Albertans are wondering, you know? That is another reason, hon. colleague, as to why this should have been debated in full. That's a whole other reason why we need to go slow and thorough.

Like, I think often of that family person, that single person who works hard and pays their taxes and is counting on us to get it right. When they go to the polls once every four years, they want to know that the system is as pure as possible, that that vote is as good as it can be, and that everything is on the up and up. That's what we lost tonight. You know, that's what we lost tonight.

**Mr. Schow:** You endorsed the Premier. You were there.

**Mr. Loewen:** You had your chance to speak.

**Mr. Barnes:** Yeah.

You know, I was talking last week in Medicine Hat with some friends about the situation, and they're disappointed in the direction of the government, not meeting expectations, not delivering on the many things that were promised – and we can go over that later – but some of them mentioned to me some of the Liberal government's problems and how the Liberal government has avoided those. Yeah, I'm talking about the WE scandal. I'm talking about the sponsorship scandal way back when. I'm talking about SNC-Lavalin. Do you recall that the federal Liberals passed a deferred prosecution agreement to change the history? I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Albertans are asking me about these things. Albertans are saying: "Is our system honourable? Should I get involved?"

You know, again, here we are tonight. We're here for six weeks. We've been here all week. We've got two days where we could have sat and we could have really worked on this for Albertans, and, Mr. Speaker, it did not happen. Instead, in addition to the concerns I mentioned, we had a law and an interpretation bulletin from the elections officer saying that you couldn't buy a membership for someone else. You couldn't. Some of my hon. colleagues thought that there was a mechanism to find some halfway mark, and I would have loved to have heard that debate.

I'll bring up again what the UCP member said. Mr. Speaker, they said that the boundaries with money in a family are different between parents and kids and spouses. You know, it's usually one pot. Okay. It makes sense to do it in there. Wouldn't it have been good for Albertans if we could have debated that tonight just for 20 minutes, just for half an hour? Wouldn't it have been great if we could have talked about that? Then when we're sitting in a coffee shop a week from now, we could have talked about how it's a way to get your 15-year-old daughter or your 75-year-old aunt involved in politics. Instead, almost in my 10th year I'm looking at the night – of all the nights that I've been in here, this is the night where the most that people of Cypress-Medicine Hat have had the least opportunity to have influence on their future, and that's why we need to vote no on third reading or support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

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

**Mr. Hanson:** Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You know, I'd just like to start by – I got a little worked up there when I wasn't allowed to get my amendment forward. Just to clarify, I did give the hon. minister that amendment yesterday, so he was aware that I had it going forward, and it was still delayed. My amendment was fairly simple. I was adding seven words. It's at the clause that says, "An annual membership fee paid by a person on behalf of another person." I just wanted to add: with the written consent of that person. Is there anybody in this House that would not recognize that as an individual's right, that if someone is going to buy a membership on their behalf, they should at least know about it and maybe pass their consent? Is that unreasonable? I didn't think it was unreasonable.

**12:00**

I know that it came up in discussion – I know I'm not supposed to talk about what takes place in caucus, so I'll stop there, but there has been discussion on this issue. There were two major issues. The minister did address one of them in an amendment yesterday, and I thank him for that. I do appreciate that.

I'd just like to read you something here, and this is right from the UCP membership, its membership application terms. There are two boxes that you check. One of them says that you've got to "be at

least fourteen (14) years of age” and “indicate intention to join the UCP by personally authorizing this application for membership in the UCP.” We did that during my nomination process. During the leadership race every person that bought a membership filled out this form, signed their name for it.

I’ve got no problem competing in a fair nomination. Last time I did, it was some very prominent individuals in my area, and guess what? I just worked harder than they did, and that’s what it should come down to. I don’t want interference by a PAC, whether it’s a PAC that’s going to buy UCP memberships or a union PAC, the Alberta Federation of Labour, that’s going to come and interfere with my nomination process or your nomination process or yours, Mr. Speaker. People need to know if you’re buying them – I wouldn’t buy my wife a membership in a political party without getting her consent.

You know, all due respect to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I actually requested a delay to this bill yesterday. This is not new. Thank you to the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore for bringing this forward. This is not new. There was so much discussion and so much dissent in our discussion on this bill that it obviously is not something that’s agreed on by everybody in this House.

Now, we’re going to, by 2 o’clock in the morning or 3 o’clock in the morning, maybe 4, end up voting on this referral or on the bill. As I stated, when I couldn’t get my amendment through because of time allocation and the filibustering from my own party that interfered with my ability to act on behalf of my constituents, that’s where I got my frustration from. I said at that time that I’m not going to be voting in support of this bill because of this little clause. This little clause. It would have been so simple, to the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason that they don’t want to delay this is because we have upcoming nomination races and maybe, possibly, a leadership. You know what? If we delay this bill and get it right so that people can’t interfere with our political process – that’s what we’re trying to protect, our party and our political process. This opens it wide open. This doesn’t protect us. You may think: oh, we could work and influence the candidate that we want as a party, that’s going to be best for our party. But it also opens it wide open to somebody like the Alberta Federation of Labour or another union, that could come in and dump a bunch of money into your constituency race and interfere with that. I’m not happy with that.

I was happy with the process that we had. I went out and knocked on doors and talked to people, got their support in a brand new constituency. I went and knocked on their doors and talked to them and convinced them that I was the best man for the job. You know what? Some of the folks that I talked to said, “No; you know, we’re supporting this other guy.” What I asked them then was, “Okay; well, if I’m not your first choice, make me your second choice, because we have an open election nomination process.” You know what, Mr. Speaker? It was those people that got me across the line because it came to a very close vote. I didn’t have 51 per cent. The lowest guy dropped off, but all of his supporters supported me, and that’s how I won my nomination. That’s a fair nomination. We all worked, all three of us.

This is interference in that process, and – my apologies, through the Speaker to the minister – with all due respect I cannot support this bill because of this little clause. There is a lot of good stuff in this bill, I agree, a lot of really good stuff. I thank the minister for the amendment that he put forward yesterday, but this one little piece just goes above and beyond. Because of that, I will be voting in favour of this referral amendment, and if that fails, I will be voting against this bill. I have to stand up in the House and vote against my own colleagues and my own party.

I ask all of my colleagues to look within yourself and see if you’re happy with the fact that somebody can buy a membership on your behalf and you don’t even know about it. They don’t have to get your consent. You’re happy with that? Right here – I’ll be happy to table it at the next session; I’ll table a copy of the UCP membership application form – where it specifies that you authorized the purchase of this membership . . .

**Some Hon. Members:** Exactly.

**Mr. Hanson:** All right. So why can’t we accept a simple little amendment like that? We could have had it. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. Order.

**Mr. Hanson:** Thank you. That, folks, is the reason for my frustration tonight. Again I apologize for the bit of an outburst I had, but when I saw what was happening, the interference with the process – time allocation is one thing. Time allocation is one thing, but when members of cabinet stand up and filibuster the whole process, it’s embarrassing to me. I was absolutely embarrassed to witness that, and I’m very disappointed that I couldn’t get this simple amendment put across that I think could have been supported and would have made this bill better. I could have supported it at that time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Central Peace-Notley.

**Member Ceci:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity. I won’t take a lot of time to address the reasoned amendment put forward by our colleague . . .

**Ms Hoffman:** You will. You’ll take 20 minutes.

**Member Ceci:** A new play.

. . . from Chestermere-Strathmore. I want to thank her for bringing this forward, Mr. Speaker, because I, too, like the previous speaker, believe that there are problems with this bill that need to be addressed, and this side has tried to address those from the get-go. We have put forward amendments. We have argued for a number of changes, and those were all voted down, unfortunately.

But I find it stimulating and exciting to listen to the most recent speakers talk about this because what they’re really talking about, Mr. Speaker, is democracy and how the government is abrogating that with this bill, how the government is essentially stacking the deck with this bill. I listened to the Justice minister and Solicitor General talk about how – and I’m paraphrasing here. What I heard was that, you know, his intentions were pure, he’s pure of heart, he’s just worked hard to bring this forward. There are huge problems with this bill, and while he may have changed one aspect with the previously unlimited contributions that could go, in nomination contests, to one contestant, I just don’t get how he can have that much of a blind spot and still say that this is a great bill.

Yes, he changed it as a result of hearing all of the problems, all of the concerns brought forward from this side, from people here, and he brought in a \$4,000 limit. Any one person can give up to \$4,000 to one or as many nomination contestants as they want to, but, Mr. Speaker, how can he claim that this was a good bill with that huge of an egregious problem in the bill? It just doesn’t make any sense, and it is a way for big money to enter politics and to open the floodgates to contributions in nomination contests to do what they want to do . . . [interjection] Oh, sorry. I didn’t see you.



12:10

**Mr. Feehan:** I am very interested in what you're saying about the return of big money into politics. I wonder if you actually might take a minute to talk about what the effect is of that big money in politics and how that actually does subvert democracy and how that actually does change the outcome for average Albertans, who perhaps don't have all that amount of money, and how that is really not in the tradition of western parliamentary democracies and the desire for a democracy where it's one person, one vote and how money, you know, has an effect that is contrary to the underlying principles of what it is that we wish to do as members of this really great democratic tradition that we have been handed down and kind of the shame of us destroying that.

**Member Ceci:** Yeah. I appreciate that intervention. You're right there, and you should have said something to me.

You know, the whole thing about one person, one vote is what's at the basis of democracy, and to change that with the way that this bill is changing it is, frankly, an embarrassment to this province. I, like all of the people on our side, sold memberships: one person, one vote. Those memberships: if you're lucky enough to get a person to buy them from you and come out to your nomination meeting and support you, you know that you've made a connection there that you can count on. That's what I think is being lost here by the minister who is changing that.

You know, I think early on we were told that Saskatchewan had made this change and we should follow Saskatchewan. Well, why? Why should we follow Saskatchewan on this issue? Other provinces – and it's the \$4,000 or the unlimited contributions, I guess, in particular, that Saskatchewan has done or the Saskatchewan Party has done. That is just egregious. It's egregious because it allows, essentially, membership brokers to come into the process, line up people to go to nominations, and that's... [interjection] Yes.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you for allowing the question. I'm very interested in this concept of a membership broker because it certainly speaks to the fact that the people who are buying memberships may or may not even be members of the party themselves. They could be persons with a third-party interest, an outside interest, and they may actually just be wanting to have sort of a large influence on the outcome of the actual nomination process so that they can therefore, you know, sort of make sure they're lined up and have a larger influence on the decisions of the government. I'm very curious as to who you think might be the type of group that might be interested in pushing government down the road by using their access to high levels of finances to do that.

**Member Ceci:** Yeah. I said "membership broker" because I think that there are memberships of opportunity that will come forward as a result of this Bill 81. We heard people talk about, you know, that hundreds and hundreds of memberships can be purchased on behalf of somebody else and they don't even have to know about it. They just have to show up, and they can vote. That's not what democracy is all about. That's not what an informed – I heard my friend from Calgary-Fish Creek talk about an aware person in the electoral process. That's not what this is all about, unfortunately. It's about stacking nominations, and there's no other way to say it. It's about stacking nominations so that people can have an unfair advantage over other people who are playing by the rules.

The rules go out the window with regard to Bill 81, and that's the root of my concern. There is no longer one person, one vote; one person who knows that they gave money to a person to go out and

support in the future. That's not one person, one ballot. That's unfortunate.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you for allowing the intervention. I am interested in this whole concept of one person, one ballot, because of course that has not always been true in the history of the world, and that someone along the way had to come to the place where they decided that that was so fundamental, and it's an expression that we use all the time now. I just wonder what happens if we just cast that noble tradition of democracy out the window, as you say, and we suddenly move away from one person, one ballot to one person, many ballots and, in fact, so many ballots that one person could actually buy more memberships than normally vote in any normal nomination campaign. There are a few that go up but not many.

**Member Ceci:** Yeah. I've seen some of the problems that happen when attempts to stack nomination meetings take place, and I've seen busloads of people being driven up to voting stations. I have seen people walk into the voting station with the candidate's name on a piece of paper because those people were not proficient in understanding the electoral process or English was their second language. I've seen all sorts of things like that.

It concerns me that Bill 81 is potentially facilitating that sort of action going forward in this province. I am disappointed in large measure that we're even contemplating this Bill 81 in its current form. The concerns brought forward in the referral, RA1 I think it is, are clear in terms of needing more time to actually get this right, and the fact that there was one amendment supported that took unlimited funds in a nomination contest down to \$4,000 is not – is not – enough to make this bill worthy of consideration and support by this Legislature. We need to not only be seen to be doing the right things; we have to do the right things.

As I said, I've been saying "egregious" a lot. It's not right that democracy is undermined in this way. Nomination contests should be a time when people come together, they debate ideas with each other, they support or not support a person, and a person comes out knowing that they won fair and square. This is anything but fair and square. This is all about lining up potentially hundreds and hundreds of votes via the ability to pay for those people, and if they don't even know you're paying for them, then all sorts of problems will arise. Like the previous speaker before me, I would never think of buying a membership for my spouse. You know, that's her responsibility. That's her right. It's not mine to take that away from her and to go and purchase it on her behalf and say: we're going to vote now. That wouldn't fly in my family, and I don't think it should fly in any family.

12:20

I think it should be that the person has to make a conscious decision on their own, to actually pay for a membership because of the views of the person they would like to support, because of what that person stands for. To have this membership broker kind of decide that I'm going to put support behind that person, and I want you to take this membership: well, Mr. Speaker, how does that make our province better? How does that improve the quality of civic understanding around a person's civic duties? It doesn't. All it does is load up one potential candidate to get the vote of a whole lot of people.

I'm very disturbed that the minister has brought this bill forward and wants us to support it when there are gaping problems with it, when there are huge issues with this bill that should, frankly, go back to the drawing board. We've got 18 months. [interjection] Sorry. I think you've had four, yeah, that would be four. Thank you

very much for the consideration and the instruction from the Speaker.

I think the issues that I've brought up, that other people brought up before me, are so significant that we can't just sit here and gloss over the fact that this bill is before us and potentially we'll have a guillotine in terms of time discussion on it. We need to see it go back to the drawing board and really see this amendment, have the time to do what it needs to do, which is, in this case – the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore was talking about the expressed consent of the person of their intention to participate. So that's the kind of thing that will help this bill be better, and that's what I would vote for, Mr. Speaker, if we had the opportunity to actually get back to digging into this bill, which is not a good bill. We have seen some improvements to it, but as I said, they were egregious and it has only been made a little bit better by putting a \$4,000 limit on nomination contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to speak to this and the interventions from my colleagues. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Central Peace-Notley has the call.

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this amendment brought forward by the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore. I guess I kind of think about what led us to this point, where the member felt that she had to bring this one forward, this reasoned amendment. When I look at how the members of this Legislature were treated here just a few hours ago in Committee of the Whole, it made me think back to 2015 when, of course, we had the NDP government and we were debating a bill called Bill 6. Obviously, Bill 6 was a pretty contentious bill and, in fact, I think that was the only time that I could find that the NDP invoked closure in their four years in government, three times on Bill 6. Now, there could be more, but that was all I could find.

I'm going to read you a quote from this time, and just ponder this as I read it.

This government has made some mistakes in this bill, and they're running scared . . . So what they're doing now, Madam Speaker, is trying to stifle debate so that they can get through this. They can hopefully change the story and [get] home for Christmas, but that is unacceptable to Albertans, and it should be unacceptable to Albertans because this is the Assembly where their issues are supposed to be dealt with. This is where democracy is supposed to take place. This is where debate is supposed to happen, and by the government taking this action, they are stifling debate. They're not just stifling the opposition members; they're stifling the people who sent us here to represent them, and I think they should very much be ashamed of their behaviour.

I will very much be voting against this motion, and I would humbly ask all members of the Assembly, including the backbench NDP MLAs, who do represent the constituents who will be very upset about this decision.

Now, that was the Government House Leader, the current Government House Leader, from December 9, 2015. Maybe I'll just read some of the highlights again: this government has made some mistakes; they're running scared; they're trying to stifle debate; they want to change the story; they want to get home for Christmas; this is unacceptable to Albertans and should be unacceptable to Albertans; this is the Assembly where their issues are supposed to be dealt with; this is where democracy is supposed to take place; this is where debate is supposed to happen; they're stifling the people who sent us here to represent them; they very much should be ashamed of their behaviour.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess that's: what goes around comes around. And I guess when the Government House Leader uses

words like this and then all of a sudden does the exact same thing to this House today . . .

**An Hon. Member:** Twenty-five times.

**Mr. Loewen:** In fact, yes, this government has done this 25 times in the last two and a half years. They're setting records.

Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy is astounding in this place. It's astounding. This government has a majority, but they still feel that they have to bully the opposition around and stifle debate and do all the things that they were opposed to when they were in opposition.

I think they're scared. They're scared because their own members have problems with this bill and were bringing forward amendments, and they were scared to have those amendments come forward. They're scared of being embarrassed, and they should be embarrassed when their own members don't feel that they're listened enough to in caucus that they have to bring amendments forward on their own into this House.

Mr. Speaker, the minister talked earlier today about how we thoroughly reviewed Bill 81, thoroughly. He mentioned it a couple of times, how thoroughly it was reviewed, and then, of course, when it gets to the Committee of the Whole here, what do they do? They bring forward some amendments. How thoroughly was it reviewed when the government itself has to bring forward amendments and use Committee of the Whole time, which is an opportunity for the opposition to bring forward amendments and discuss the bill, when they take that time to amend their own bill?

Now, we've heard the minister say many things in this House during this debate that have turned out to be not correct, but I do want to point out a couple of things here. For one thing, the minister said that we are here to do some work. Well, unfortunately, because of the actions of the government, they didn't allow us the opportunity to do the work that we are here to do. They rammed it through Committee of the Whole in the most despicable and cowardly way possible. They invoked closure, and then they intentionally burned up all the time. [interjection] I'll take the intervention.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Through you, to the current speaker, to the motion for a reasoned amendment, the member talked about the government being afraid in his remarks just a few moments earlier. I think he probably knows many of the government members better than I do and better than most, and I was wondering if he might elaborate a little bit on what he thinks the government is afraid of and why it is that they would take this opportunity to stop their own members from actually engaging in debate. What would be the motivation and what would be the benefit to the government in stopping the members from actually engaging in democracy, private members, who should have every right to be a part of debate and consideration and bring forward amendments into this place? What would be the government's motivation, and what are they afraid of, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member?

**12:30**

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you very much, and I do think I know what they're scared of. They know that they have a flawed bill. They know that this bill has very little to do with what they said it did. They said that it was to close the AFL loophole. Two pages of this 150-page bill deal with the AFL loophole. What does the rest of it have to do with? Well, membership sales: that has nothing to do with the AFL loophole. Allowing organizations from across Canada to infiltrate money into our political process here: that has nothing to do with closing the AFL loophole.

They know that this bill is flawed. They know that this bill was designed to allow for manipulation of the party process by the Premier and his enablers. That's what this bill is about, and that's why I won't be supporting this bill. It isn't because it closes the AFL loophole. That's great, but unfortunately it does so much more bad stuff that takes away the opportunity for the grassroots members of our political parties to have their say. That's the problem with this bill.

Now, the minister also said that he respects each and every member of this Legislature, but collectively the minister has shown no respect for any of them. That's why they did what they did in Committee of the Whole and invoked closure and then intentionally stood there and burned up the time, knowing full well that their members wouldn't have an opportunity to bring amendments forward that they wanted. That's not respect. That's complete disrespect. [interjection] I'll yield to the member.

**Member Loyola:** Thank you very much, Member. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member – I can tell, from the time that I've known this member and the interjections that he makes in this House, that he cares a great deal about his constituents. Our duty inside of this House is to balance the representation of our constituents, no matter what political stripe they are, of course, with our own political party and the objectives that we have as a political party. Both of those have to be done. I was hoping that the member could speak a little bit more about how he feels his responsibility to his constituents is so important and making sure that that's heard inside of the House.

**Mr. Loewen:** Thank you, and I think that's a good point to bring forward. Obviously, as elected members in this Legislature most of us would have gone through a nomination process where the members of the party within our constituency nominated us to run in the election. Those same party members would have worked with us in the campaign, and they would have donated money to our campaigns, so these party members are the base reason why each of us is here in this Legislature. When we bring forward bills like this, that disrespect those people that brought us to this House to represent them, that's disrespectful. That's not showing the members of the party respect, by allowing people to buy hundreds of memberships without any regard for who these people are or even if they want a membership or even exist. That's not respect.

Now, I heard some members across the way talk about: the state has no business in party business. Well, I guess that if the state has no business in party business, then I'm not sure why we have a bill or election rules at all. I guess we should just throw it all out and just let the parties do what they want. Fortunately, there's a reason why we have these rules and these regulations. It's because the people of this province expect fairness in elections. They expect that when they go in and cast their ballot, they know that the process has integrity.

Obviously, we just had a leadership race where there were hundreds of thousands of dollars in fines levied. This doesn't happen randomly. That happens because people were breaking the law. There are investigations still going on. There are still accusations over that leadership race. Mr. Speaker, I don't understand how people can sit there and say: well, just let the party decide. Well, obviously, that's been a problem in the past, letting the parties decide, and that's why we have the situation where we have legislation to help protect the integrity of the election process in Alberta. [interjection] I'll allow an intervention.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Member. I am just very interested in hearing what you're saying about the fact that there are hundreds of

thousands of dollars in fines being levied against the party and party members. You were a member of the party. I would really like to know what it feels like when you're part of a party that you have gone to intentionally to participate in, in a positive way, and then your own party suffers fines, well, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. How does that undermine your own sense of participation and your own satisfaction with the party, which you did freely join?

**Mr. Loewen:** You know, Mr. Speaker, when things like this happen, this casts shadows and aspersions on the party itself, and that's not what we want. That's not what we want for the political party that we represent, that members have, you know, bought memberships in, donated money to, given time to. They don't want to have that stain on them from people that were breaking the law. That's not what they want, and that's what happens when the processes are manipulated by people for self-interest and not for the good of the people, not for the good of the party, not for the good of the province. That causes irreparable damage to the party.

You can go on Facebook any given day of the week now, and just about anywhere you can see people that still haven't forgotten about the leadership campaign and the kamikaze candidate and all this stuff going on. People still haven't forgotten about that. You know why? Because they're disgusted by it. What does that do to the party name? That helps destroy the party name. Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment before us right now that I believe has become necessary because of the process that we've seen unfold here tonight.

Now, there should have been an opportunity for amendments to come forward here in Committee of the Whole. Of course, that didn't happen because the Government House Leader, contrary to what he said in the past, decided that this was the time to, you know, take a big shot at democracy and close debate and then intentionally have ministers of this government waste the time that was allotted for the opposition to bring forward amendments. One of the amendments that we missed bringing forward had to do with the membership sales.

Now, I know that the minister keeps talking about: well, this bill is all about closing the AFL loophole. Well, when I look at page 123, I don't see any part of these amendments that has anything to do with closing the AFL loophole. Nothing. In fact, all it has to do with is membership sales. I'll read:

(2) An annual membership fee paid by a person on behalf of another person for that person's membership in a political party or in a constituency association of that party, or in both, is a contribution by the person who paid the fee for the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, it clearly says in here: "an annual membership fee paid by a person on behalf of another person for that person's membership." That wasn't there before. It wasn't there. It was put in by Bill 81.

**12:40**

I'm not making this stuff up. I'm not choosing to interpret something. This is in black and white. I'm reading right from the bill. You know, I heard the minister even suggest that he didn't change anything in section 25. Well, he did change things, and he did add things. It's clear. It's in black and white. I'm reading it. I'm not interpreting it; I'm reading it.

Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment that was going to come forward that would have brought Bill 81 in line with member past policy of the UCP. Now, I don't understand what anybody would have a problem with when it comes to including in the bill member past policy of the party that they represent. I don't understand. Of course, again, even the Member for Leduc-Beaumont said: let the members decide. Okay. The members have decided. They've told

us. It's in member past policy. Why not put it in Bill 81? Why put in the parts that are in here now when you could have just as easily put in member past policy? I'm guessing it's because they didn't want to. They wanted to open up these opportunities for other people to influence the political process.

Another loophole that we would have liked to close with an amendment was barring third-party advertisers that are from outside of Alberta from influencing the political process in Alberta. We talk a lot in this House about outside influence on Alberta, saying that we need to get that out. We spent millions of dollars trying to figure out how much money has come into Alberta and into Canada to negatively influence the processes and the policies here in Alberta. Now what we've done in Bill 81 is that we've allowed corporations and organizations from outside of Alberta to bring money into the political process for referendums and Senate votes. We could have had that amendment brought forward, and we could have closed that loophole. That's another thing that had nothing to do with the AFL loophole.

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity to do some good work here tonight. The government was too scared to let it happen. They cowardly backed out and invoked closure to stop the process and then intentionally filibustered so that the process couldn't happen naturally, which would have allowed these amendments to come forward. Then they could have voted them down. That's what the majority could do. They could have had that opportunity. They could have voted it down, but in fact they were too scared to even hear it, too scared to hear their own members express their frustrations with this process and this bill, which is why we should not be supporting this bill.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland.

**Mr. Getson:** Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Originally I stood up to speak to the main bill to try to set the record straight on a few things. Firstly, I appreciate the hoist amendment that was brought forward. I appreciate the commentary from my colleague from Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul. I appreciate the minister for taking the time to go through everything with us in the front end. I appreciate the members opposite for expressing their concerns and talking about the freedoms of democracy and everything that we take so near and dear to our hearts.

Bill 81, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2). You know, it's more vernacular, Mr. Speaker: there might still be a little hair on that dog, but I think the dog is still good enough to hunt. We went through a lot of issues and conjectures to try to get it around as a group on our side. I would like to also give credit to the member from – and I don't want to mess it up, because there are only a few of you over there I really like and will talk to. I don't want to mess it up with the ones I do like.

With the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, we had some constructive dialogue. This is, you know, through you to the members opposite, one of the best times that I've ever had here, as I still find myself as an interloper to this process, and I had mentioned that to a couple of ministers in the back as well. When I was on projects, we would have high-performing teams. You would have, literally, thoroughbreds. In the words of one old superintendent, old Roy Mackay out there, when you have thoroughbreds, every once in a while you get some stall doors kicked. That's what happens. But when you hook those ponies up all on one team and they pull, then you've really got a winning team.

When I first got here, I thought that, you know, debate in this House was literally debate. You'd go back and forth with some of

the interjections. Having gone back and forth here tonight, I think that's part of it. I really naively thought that we could get along. We get so fixated and cross-threaded on some of these things in our ideologies or where we come from.

I even heard the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie earlier in the evening describing our place, who we are, privilege, and those types of items, and obviously he doesn't understand because we've never had a chance to really gel or get to know each other.

The members that I do appreciate from the opposition, when they do stand up, are Edmonton-Mill Woods, Edmonton-Castle Downs, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, and Edmonton-Decore. When these folks say something, I perk my ears up. It's one of those things, Mr. Speaker. When you have respect for people – we might disagree where we come from, but you have that level of respect.

I think it's in that spirit that our own colleagues internally from our two parties that were formed in the past – we want to start talking about our history and where we came from – have upheld that idea of democracy so near and dear to our hearts. We want to make sure that anything we do, not only when we have an election but also with some of our nomination contests, is also upheld near and dear.

For me, being a little naive – I'm not a lawyer; I used to run contracts, so I understand the issue of contract law – being a new politician, you basically give me a rule set, and I'll figure out how to play in that sandbox. Where it gets folks concerned is when the rules start to change. Understanding some of the history here and hearing what happened before, these rules have been changed once before, and it sounds like – I can appreciate that we're trying to reset a few things to make sure that it's a level playing field.

I've heard some of our members saying, myself actually included: I feel so strongly in our party's policies. A lot of the policies that we have developed, both through general meetings and policy councils and everything else, that literally form part of our platform – now, I feel so strongly in our party that if I was just looking at that lens, I would apply that completely to this law. Like, that's what I would do. But understanding that not all parties are created equal and not all of them function the same way, that would be, quite frankly, overreach. You always have to flip it on the other side. Now, the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul . . . [interjection] I won't take an interjection now. Sorry. I'll keep going. I'll give you a bit, though. I'll let you stand up because it'd be fun to go back and forth with you.

The Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul was concerned literally about having that, in my opinion, again, acknowledgement of understanding who had those nominations. Now, not understanding the other parties, how they work or anything else, in our context how we understand it is knowing that with any membership sold, you can trace it back. Now, I think it's been debated back and forth, and whether we got that into this bill at this time or not, I think that in principle everybody from the Conservative side believes that. Now, it might be a matter of debate. It might be a bit of nuance of when we can get this in. If it happens tonight, great. If it doesn't, I'm okay with that, too, in the context that we're still debating and having that dialogue. To me, it's still alive if we can get an amendment or we can put something else out later.

What I really think needs to be done – being a contract guy, I'm trying to follow this, Mr. Speaker, and then trying to find the act and looking at two or three acts that are all separated. What I would propose should really be done – maybe it's a good housekeeping measure – is to spend a couple of years, get all those acts put into one, clean up house. Then we can stop some of that conjecture that's going back and forth, and maybe we can have some really good ideas and that point put back in, too.

The other thing I've heard talked about here at length tonight was – well, I don't know – what it's like to be a UCP backbencher. I hear these days gone by of antiquity and how cherry it was to be an NDP person and how they are going to start exhorting how we should run and how desperate it is – it's not the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods and the other members I mentioned but some of the other ones.

I'm going to read you something that was sent to me as a new backbencher from a former NDP MLA, who told me how desperate and lonely it was on that side of the equation and how they felt. I'll table this tomorrow or today if we have time, however that works out, Mr. Speaker. I will read a couple of points here. I'm just trying to get this. Here we go. Well, it starts off with:

It doesn't look good. I always maintained that if the legislation was good, there was no need to rush [through it]. Indeed, many of the NDP's bills would have benefited from more time – it would have made them stronger. I can tell you that, after the first rush of excitement that comes with passing bills I strongly believed in . . .

That's former member Luff.

. . . I found that being a government backbench MLA was a deeply depressing job. You carry the weight of having to hold quorum in the House, and [you] spend many hours being told by the official opposition that you are [running] the province [wrong]. You have few opportunities to speak . . .

Now, I don't know. As an MLA I get up and I chat my old jaw off lots. I represent my community, and I rep my areas. I have no problem with speaking here, and I have no problem saying my piece of mind. Anybody who's sat in the caucus room knows that. If you're an NDP MLA, maybe that's a different aspect.

12:50

Here we go.

. . . because of deals made [within] the opposition on speaking time . . .

They're being allocated time; they can't go back and forth.

. . . and you realize quite quickly that nothing that gets said will change anyone's mind anyway.

Again, coming back to me being naive in debate, thinking that when you're speaking in here you might have a chance to change people's minds, apparently that didn't happen on your side either, members opposite, so I wouldn't be pointing too sharp a stick in this direction.

In a majority government situation, all the bills are going to pass, given the right amount of time, so nothing you say really matters. In his book, "What I learned about Politics", from Graham Steele . . .

And she goes on:

" . . . being a government backbencher, I don't know what it is. All the decisions are made by other people, and you have to defend them as if you made them yourself."

Okay. So that goes give-and-take, back and forth each way.

You can see here on this side, Mr. Speaker, that government members of the caucus have free votes here. We have a free voice, free speaking. Now what's going to happen is that the opposition is going to try to hold that against us because there's dissension in the ranks. What you have are some thoroughbreds here that are bringing ideas to the forefront. They're expressing that freedom. They're expressing that democracy. They're making what this place was meant to be: open debate.

Now, we're all looking at the time. We're trying to get home. We're trying to get home to our families, and that's where we're a little pressed. We've been doing a ton of work. My colleagues that were, you know, in our party before, that now sit opposite to us, know why we're doing some of these time allocations. In the past it was to literally undo a bunch of things that they didn't agree with

before. We're trying to put those policies and those platforms forward.

Now, is everything going to be perfect here, folks? No, it's not. But to say that we're all divided and pulling each other apart and that we're even, you know, concerned about this now, that's not fair. I think we've got a lot of really good people here trying to work on this together.

Again, I still feel like an interloper. I don't know if I fit in this party. I don't know if I fit in and belong here. I don't know if I'm a good politician or a bad one. All I'm doing is my best. I think we have to understand that we all feel the same way. We're just trying to do our level best. We're trying to defend our rights and our freedoms, and we're going to maintain that. Sometimes those stall doors are going to get kicked.

To the opposition: again, when we work together, we can do some really good things, but if we start ragging the puck, if we start dragging things out and pointing fingers back and forth, it's not going to work.

I will take your interjection now, sir.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you very much for allowing the intervention, Member. I think, Mr. Speaker, that a few of those thoroughbreds that the member mentions have actually left the pasture, and they're looking from the other side of the fence. Perhaps the member could explain to this House how indeed his caucus is so full of singing Kumbaya together when, in fact, many of the members, who he claims have the ability to speak freely in caucus, are actually standing here in this House tonight suggesting that they are unable to bring their own amendments in because they are stifled in debate within their own caucus. Something is incongruent here, and I'd like the member to explain that difference.

**Mr. Getson:** I have no problem explaining that.

**The Speaker:** I'm happy to have the member speak to the interjection, of course. What I would say, though, is – and I do appreciate the fact that at the beginning of the speech he acknowledged that he had intended to speak to the motion, and now we're on a reasoned amendment – that perhaps he would use some creative and ingenious ways to tie his remarks to that and make his comments a bit more relevant.

**Mr. Getson:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. I appreciate the interjection from a socialist member not understanding how it works when you have free-spirited and free people talking and having disagreements.

The hoist amendment is suggesting that at this time the bill fails to meet the required elements and that it should be hoisted. I'll get back to that and what I feel. Right now I don't know that that's necessarily the case, but I do appreciate the member bringing that forward, because we can have these discussions and continue a bit more.

Now, the member from – you're going to have to remind me where you're from here. I'm starting to go blank. What is it?

**An Hon. Member:** Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Getson:** Edmonton-McClung.

The Member for Edmonton-McClung is on record asking why we have members in this House standing up and saying that they weren't necessarily heard or that we never necessarily got things through. Well, I think that would have to be posed back to those members. Again, I can't speak for them, but all I can say is that we're definitely showing differences of opinions depending on where you're sitting and where you're at. There are concerns over

it, but each member did also acknowledge the effort that the minister went through.

Now, if we didn't get the timing and we don't agree with those things – again to the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul: in principle I agree with you a hundred per cent. I haven't changed. I agree that if we were to do this and had a chance to get it through, then that's what we'd put in place. Now, if there are concerns on it – I also spoke to the minister, and in concept, I mean, that principle is there. Whether it's a matter of timing or we didn't get it through or we couldn't work it out, that's one of those things. It's like having a big happy family.

To the members opposite: I don't think your family history is so good when I have former members reaching out to me, over a year ago now at this point, telling me how desperate they felt in your organization. Again, be careful when pointing sticks because they just might come back and swat you.

You know, with that, I think that Bill 81 – there's still some hair on that dog. I still think that there is work to do on it, but I don't know how much more we can do given the time we have. I don't know that . . .

**Mr. Dach:** Whose fault is that?

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Getson:** Thanks, Uncle Fester. I had a crazy Uncle Fester once. It's okay, Mr. Speaker. I'm okay with those things.

With the bill I think that there's still, you know, a lot of hair on the dog. I appreciate everyone's efforts here because we are trying to work together for the best thing. What I'm going to ask people in the spirit of the season and everything else: let's try to get this thing back together. We can express our concerns. [interjection] Oh, sorry. Sure. Another intervention. This is my lucky night.

**Mrs. Frey:** Thank you, hon. member. A couple of questions, through you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland could maybe elaborate on the process which caucus goes through – I don't believe that would be breaking anything, kind of confidences – and the Minister of Justice has gone through with our caucus in order to get this bill to the floor in the first place. I know that I myself, you know, had some things that I wanted to see changed. I brought those forward in caucus, and those changes were made. I feel very satisfied with that. I'm just curious if the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland could maybe elaborate for the people watching – I know there are many watching intently right now – what those processes are and how a government who works together gets through those things.

**Mr. Getson:** I appreciate that, Member. Again, in the spirit of the hoist and in the intent of this – we even have a private members caucus now, Mr. Speaker. We've got private members that come together. Again, when you've got this many people and that much stuff going on right now with COVID and everything else – and I'll say this, you know, off the cuff – sometimes it seems like a bit of a firehose. Like, when you're in the main caucus and you're trying to deal with everything, it's pretty tough to get through that in the time allotment we have.

A bunch of us private members got together to have, like, a working group. That was the intent, to have a private caucus, so that we could work out a lot of these things, Member, and we've left that open to all of the private members. We've had different ministers come in and try to work through these items, and that's where we can get, what we found here most recently, a lot of the heavy lifting done. With the COVID restraints and constraints we've had on us, it's been very difficult for everybody here, you

know, with the Zoom meetings and everything else. We also have a thing called a members policy committee. They're chaired. A lot of the regulations and legislations coming forward are put through there. Now, each one of those tries to put as much information as they can in. Again, nothing is ever going to be perfect.

Again, I think there's been a lot of depth and breadth on this. You know, if I had my way, sure, we would take more time, we would kick this back, and we would get those other items. Probably if I had my way, the opposition sure as heck wouldn't like it because I would make it that you'd have to play exactly by our rule book, but then that wouldn't be fair either.

Again, with that, I really appreciate the member bringing this forward so we can have the hoist amendment, we can talk about it, we can get some of those things out, and we can express our concerns.

Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, I'm with you in the concept of how I would like that, for having the memberships signed off and having that within the act. I don't know if that's reasonable at this point. The minister has done his best effort.

With that, I would say that we get back to the bill, talk about those items, see if the minister would take that. I'm not at this point ready to support a hoist.

**Ms Hoffman:** Give way?

**Mr. Getson:** Well, I'll take that guy over there.

**The Speaker:** He'd like to speak next.

**Mr. Getson:** Oh, he's speaking? I'm good. I'll wrap it up.

1:00

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the opportunity to speak to this reasoned amendment, which I think is well positioned in debate tonight. I just wanted to just share some things here. You know what? I want to start out by saying that, you know, we have a caucus and colleagues and friends here, but we also have back in our constituencies our boards, our members, which make up the members of the broader party, and, of course, our constituents. I'm thinking of them tonight here as we're debating this issue.

You know, I think really what I want to relay here is: who put us all here? Well – guess what – it's the voters and really our supporters, the volunteers that put us here, the people that are sitting on our boards in a board meeting in my constituency tonight, and I had to send my regrets to that. Those people are out there supporting us and really giving us advice as we move through this process to make sure we're representing them and the membership and then the broader constituents we have back at home.

Mr. Speaker, I guess that's in the context that I want to talk a little bit about, the grassroots that we've spoken about here, and I want to posit that we are the grassroots party. You know what? The UCP is a grassroots party, and it was formed because 95 per cent of the grassroots members from two legacy parties voted to put us together in this room, in this Assembly, to represent them. More so than what we see from our friends opposite here, that was a grassroots movement. It was one that recognizes that we needed to do what was best for Alberta. Many of us supported that. We spoke about it. We brought it forward, and we live it here today; 95 per cent from two parties.

We can't choose when we're going to work with that 95 per cent. Actually, we're beholden to them. We are accountable to them day in and day out, and we'll live that. We'll live whether we have

actually succeeded in delivering that accountability to them as we move forward, Mr. Speaker.

I've heard the talk about one member, one vote. Again, coming from a party that rarely holds nominations – maybe they're going to have some this time around – that one member, one vote thing resonates with me personally. I take that very seriously, and I take the memberships we sell very seriously. And that goes back to the grassroots guarantee, which was brought forward by our leader back, actually, when he was running for the PC leadership and then as we were talking and we were moving forward with the unity movement as well. It's part of our DNA, that grassroots guarantee.

I, Mr. Speaker, personally intend to uphold that to the highest level that I can, as I committed to my constituents, committed to my members, committed to my board, and I'll continue to do that as well as pushing forward and standing up for and providing leadership around the issue of fair, open, and transparent, which I also believe this party was built on and is part of our commitment to our members. Part of that, I think, is making sure that we have the legislation that we bring forward reflecting that.

Again I want to thank the minister. This was a very, very complicated bill; 159 pages, pages and pages of amendments. We worked through some of that, and we worked through some of that successfully and gratefully for the changes made with that. But we didn't get to one of those opportunities to amend this bill with a few words, quite frankly, that was going to be brought forward by the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul. I appreciate that this is something that was done, hard work on the fly and no staff supports, really, done by the grassroots, us, here in this building. And we didn't get a chance to get there. We filibustered ourselves to be able to have that debate, to be able to put that on the table. If it was voted down, we're all representatives here. If it was voted down, that's democracy. It's sometimes said that that's politics.

But you know what? I believe that we are politics, and we have a commitment to our constituents, to our boards, to our members, to Albertans to raise the bar on that politics. That's what I believe was the intent of this bill, and I think we have an opportunity to get there through the reasoned amendment brought forward by the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore. [interjection] Yes, you may.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you. Thank you. Thank you so much. I just wanted to also suggest, along with what the member is saying, that there were multiple – like I said, thank you again to the minister, but there were lots and lots of concerns that I think were not completely covered, as the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland mentioned.

I think that when we raise our sights to that level, when that bar is the intention, taking a little bit more time, which I know I had brought up, I know that you had brought up, I know that several other people have brought up, is actually about giving this legislation the time that it needs in order to be able to pass.

I really appreciate what the Member for Brooks-Medicine Hat said because she's right. You know, there were many things that she brought up that were dealt with, but there were many things that I brought up that were not dealt with. I just wanted to pass it back to you, to the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, about some of those things that are concerning. I think it just – and I don't think it throws our timelines off that much. Any time that we have in this Legislature, whether it's the last moment or now, it's important to deal with that.

**Mr. Gotfried:** Yes. Thank you to the member for the intervention. In that line, again, we were doing this because it was a big piece of legislation. We've had a very busy session here, dealing with a lot of legislation, so getting through that 159 pages – in fact, it's double

that if we look at the existing legislation through it. We don't have a lot of support staff to do that. We're not lawyers, so it takes us time to do that. As we worked through that and we tried to work with the minister and our caucus on that, I think, again, we had some very fruitful conversation. The minister made himself extremely available to us but on short notice, on short timelines here.

I hear that we are talking about this being enduring legislation for all parties across that can be utilized for years and years ahead. It may not be amended for many, many years to come. So the question I have for myself and for my colleagues is: then why are we rushing this? Why could we not pause this and make sure that we get it right, at least amongst ourselves here, and that we can make sure that there are no unintended consequences, make sure that we're honouring, even within our own party but certainly across Alberta, for all parties, some of the concepts here of fair, open, and transparent that we can build within this.

I had some other ideas, you know, when we were discussing this. I thought that there were some other things, having been through a couple of nominations, that we could improve, and I realize that some of my ideas maybe were not actually the right ideas, and we had that opportunity to bring that forward. What I'd like to – again, the idea of us raising the bar here, the idea of us really living and bringing forward the opportunity to improve this legislation to the best way we can do it so that it can be enduring. The question I have is: why the rush? Is there a rush because we have to have this done by March or April or May or June, or could we bring it back in the spring and address some of these issues and get it really right for Albertans, for all Albertans, going forward? Can we raise that bar?

Mr. Speaker, I look at the consent issue here, that we were talking about earlier, that has not made it to an amendment on the table. I believe that consent needs to be brought in because, you know, an individual can buy 422 memberships. I mean, so five people do that, and you've got over 2,000 memberships in that constituency. Well, that'll wipe out the grassroots if that's brought in, particularly without consent, without the consent of an individual to put that in there. Those few words mean a lot, I believe, to what this legislation could mean.

I wish we could, you know, move forward, but I have concerns that we change this, and the legislation becomes the bar. That is the bar. That's the bar. Have we raised it? Have we lowered it? And then we have the parties that will reflect upon that and say: well, the bar has been set by the Legislature through new legislation and new statutes here, so we just need to do that. Quite frankly, we've heard here: well, we already have that protection within our party, and maybe that bar could be lowered instead of raised to ensure that we have that.

I am concerned about that, Mr. Speaker, that we don't have the ability to ensure that there is parity and there's balance between what we're doing for everybody in this province, for all parties in this province, and what we're doing here. I would really . . . [interjection] Yes. Please go ahead.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much to my hon. colleague. I appreciate the opportunity to intervene. I heard you saying, you know, that things have been rushed here. I'm curious about your thoughts because we only had an additional one hour at Committee of the Whole. The time was occupied by government members essentially filibustering themselves, yet we've now been talking for about two and a half hours at third reading. Perhaps if you think perhaps we could have spent more time at Committee of the Whole, and maybe there might have been some time tonight to get into some dialogue if the time had been used differently.

Then I'm also curious because we're talking about: why the rush? The nomination contest that's happening up in Fort McMurray right

away. Do you think that these changes are being rushed through now, and it may have an impact on that nomination contest? Between now and spring, that is the thing, and it's happening right away. I'm curious as to your thoughts on that.

1:10

**Mr. Gotfried:** Thank you to the member for your intervention. You know, I'm saddened that we didn't have an opportunity to bring some of the other amendments, and it may not have been just one from the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul. It may have been others from other parties here. There could have been multiple to give us an opportunity for robust debate. I'm concerned that that was the way that we addressed it, but, you know, that was the will of the House here. I'm okay with that.

**Mrs. Aheer:** And mine wouldn't be required.

**Mr. Gotfried:** We wouldn't be doing what we're doing right now possibly because, in fact, that was probably one that we were saying: "You know what? That was the last little piece that we needed to make this right for some of us here." I'm not going to speak for others in the House.

I'm not going to get into the time allocation, the timing of it. I'm more concerned about the fact of: what is the rush? Is there a sense of urgency for us to do that, or is it better for us to have the time to get this right through the reasoned amendment that's been brought forward by the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore? Maybe I'm a get-it-right, not get-it-fast, kind of guy. That's the way I like to do it, a self-admitted anal Virgo, as I often put it. Cross the t's, dot i's, make sure you get it right. This is our chance to get it right here. That's why I will be supporting the amendment put forward by the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

Again, I want to get back to the idea here of us raising the bar here and making sure we're doing it for the right reasons, that we are taking a look at the unintended consequences that come from that. For me, it's about the principles we bring forth. It's about the brand we build for the party that I believe in, that we all fought so hard for, and honouring that to the grassroots that created this party. I will do that. I know many of my colleagues, most of my colleagues, will do that upon reflection. I think it's important if we want to keep this party together, if we want to build this brand. I'm an old branding guy. That's what I do. I look at the brand. Maybe take a look. The Rafter AB brand that sits in the lounge here: I look at that almost every time I walk past it. That's the brand that we need to talk about more, the brand of Alberta, the brand of Alberta energy, the brand of Alberta agriculture, the brand of us in this House. We will be judged on how we act and the principles we bring to the table on whether that brand is a trustworthy one, whether we are trustworthy people that are representing that brand, whether we are honouring that grassroots that put us here.

Mr. Speaker, it's an opportunity here, really, just to share my own principles in the way I view that, in the role that we play in this, the role we play in passing every piece of legislation in this building. I just believe that this amendment here is one that could be passed and brought forward so that we can actually take that time to cross that last t and dot the last i.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there others? The Member for Edmonton Ellerslie.

**Member Loyola:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me just say how incredibly hurt I am that the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland just doesn't like going back and forth with me, because I

love going back and forth with him, right? I'll say this. I have nothing but deep respect. [interjection] Oh, by all means, go ahead.

**Mr. Getson:** I appreciate that, Member. No. The comment I'd made, just to clarify, wasn't that I don't mind going back with you; it's just I don't really like you. The ones that I do like and have respect for – I'll point that out again – are the MLAs for Edmonton-Mill Woods, Edmonton-Castle Downs, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, and Edmonton-Decore.

**Ms Gray:** Point of order.

**The Speaker:** A point of order has been called by the hon. Opposition House Leader.

#### Point of Order Language Creating Disorder

**Ms Gray:** Thank you. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, under 23(h), (i), and (j), the language being used is absolutely likely to create disorder and is intended to disrespect other members in this place fairly deliberately. I would request that the member be more respectful towards colleagues in this place.

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw the comment. It's getting a little punchy in the morning here. What I meant to do is verify my earlier point. It's not that I don't mind going back and forth. Oh, sorry.

**The Speaker:** That's fine. I will accept your apology, but I will remind you that you ought to speak through the chair under any circumstance, and while what you said was unparliamentary, it was added to by the fact that you also weren't saying that unparliamentary thing through the chair. That can also add to the lack of decorum.

The hon. Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland has about 35 seconds left.

#### Debate Continued

**Mr. Getson:** Yeah. Again, Mr. Speaker, through you to the member opposite, you know, I retract the comment of saying I didn't like them. I was just clarifying that we would go back and forth, so I respectfully withdraw that comment. I do have respect for those other individuals that I had mentioned, because we can meet on middle ground. I find that the other ones are very difficult to do that with. Hopefully, that clarifies the item.

**Member Loyola:** Mr. Speaker, in sharp contrast, I would like to simply state that I have nothing but deep respect for every member of this House, because they were elected by Albertans to actually represent them in this House. Every member deserves the dignity and respect of that office, because when they're here, as I'm seeing from many members in this House, they're here to represent the opinions of their constituents. It deserves our admiration. It deserves our understanding.

The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek: I've had the honour of serving with this gentleman for a very long time. I have nothing but deep respect for him. Many times we've encountered one another in the hallways of this very building, and I know for a fact that with all the members of this House which I've had the opportunity to encounter in the hallways, I demonstrate nothing but respect. When we're inside this House, yes, we get into political debates, but when we leave this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, we are all human beings worthy of respect. It saddens me, really, to hear the comments by



the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, because I don't think I've ever done anything personally to him to acquire the admonishment that he has towards me other than just get up in this House and represent my constituents as I see fit. It's in that context that I think it's so important that this debate is actually happening tonight and why it gives me great pleasure to hear this reasoned amendment coming from the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

What I'm noticing through my experience – now, this is my experience and my own humble opinion. I'm not saying that it's the opinion of everybody, nor should you have the same opinion as me, but I'm saying this, Mr. Speaker. Now, last time I got up to speak to this bill, during second reading, I took our friendly Conservative members down memory lane, talking about actual Conservatives that supported brutal military dictators. They're on record for doing so. This saddens me, but what I'm seeing: how it is exemplified by the fact that the RCMP is actually doing an investigation about the actions of this Premier in his own leadership race, with allegations that there was a kamikaze candidate. The only thing that I can see from this experience is that there are Conservatives that respect democracy, that actually want to make sure to conserve democracy and preserve the honour of grassroots democracy like we just heard from the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek and we heard from other independent members here in the House, and then there are some Conservatives that go to the far other extreme, where they don't really respect democracy. [interjection] I'll cede to the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

1:20

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much, through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, respect for democracy is something we've heard throughout this debate. When it comes to grassroots democracy – and we've heard the terminology “grassroots” – I think that one of the major issues that we have this reasoned amendment is because of the change in Bill 81 from today, Albertans not being able to buy memberships for others, Albertans buy memberships for themselves, to post Bill 81, when someone will be able to buy many, many memberships, and the idea that an amendment to put some reasonable limits on that should have been able to be made. I'm curious, as the member is talking: when we're talking about nomination contests, when we're talking about leadership contests, if somebody can buy \$4,000 worth of memberships, how does that influence that process? Could that not be problematic?

**Member Loyola:** I want to thank the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods for her interjection because it's a great question, right? What we're seeing here, Mr. Speaker, is that there are some Conservatives that want to circumvent the grassroots democratic process of really respecting democracy. They try to find loopholes. I'm going to take us back to 2015, where . . .

**The Speaker:** I just might interject. Perhaps it would be helpful if the member would take us back to the amendment as opposed to 2015, unless 2015 is specifically relevant to the amendment before the Assembly.

**Member Loyola:** Mr. Speaker, I could assure you that going back to 2015 is exactly about this amendment, because the amendment here is actually causing us to reflect on how to get this bill right. We heard it from the independent members, we heard it from the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore, we heard it from the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek, we also heard it from the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, all members who I deeply respect along with every other member of this House, because they're bringing their opinion about this bill into debate.

Now, the reason why I'm taking us back to 2015, Mr. Speaker, is because we saw the fact that people were trying to circumvent democracy by actually buying memberships for other people, which is exactly what this bill will do. If you don't want to believe it coming out of my mouth, well, then believe it coming out of the mouths of the members that I just named here in this House. The reason why we need to support this amendment is because the bill is not a hundred per cent.

You know, I heard the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland. He's like: it's not perfect; it's not perfect, but we need to move it forward now. Well, this is where we differ in our opinions, Mr. Speaker. If I don't recognize that a bill is in tip-top shape and not all members in the House are in agreement, then let's debate it. Let's debate it. As the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek said, he's a stickler. He wants to make sure to get it right, and honestly I think that that's what we're here to do. That's our role as legislators, to make sure that any bill that comes into this House – we're going to make sure to get it as close to a hundred per cent right as possible. [interjection] I'll cede to the Member for Edmonton-Decore.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Thanks to my friend from Edmonton-Ellerslie. You know, Mr. Speaker, the amendment before us basically says that the language currently contained in Bill 81 is flawed. There's a problem with it. What I want to do is that I want it to tap into the Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie and his time in labour. He was alluding to how we might be rushing this bill forward too quickly. I'm wondering if he can think back to his time as a labour advocate when language might have been rushed, what kind of consequences that created, and how that ties to Bill 81 and the unintended consequences, as I remember from the 29th Legislature, which you served in as well, and the effects that that kind of thing could have simply because we're in a rush to check a box off to say: well, you know, promise made, promise kept. What that does is that it just works against people.

**Member Loyola:** Well, thank you very much to the Member for Edmonton-Decore. Yes. Most definitely. You know, having been the president of the Non-Academic Staff Association at the University of Alberta and actually going through labour negotiations, wording was everything. Wording could have made a big difference to the benefits that our members would have gotten in a particular instance, whatever that may be. Sometimes it was as simple as changing a word as simple as “as” that could have made all the difference. I want to thank the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, because I believe he said that seven words – seven words – could have made the big difference for the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul to actually vote in favour of this particular bill.

Now, the reason why I was taking us back to 2015, Mr. Speaker, again, was because at that time there were members of the Progressive Conservative Party who were seeking nomination in the riding of Edmonton-Ellerslie, and they were going out and then buying en masse memberships so that those people could then vote for them in the nomination meeting. It was already happening, regardless of the fact, I assume, that at that time the Progressive Conservatives actually had a rule in their own party that would state that it was one member, one vote, one membership. You buy your membership.

Regardless of the fact – see, what I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that when you give opportunity for people to circumvent the rules, unfortunately, there are going to be people that are going to take advantage of that, and that's why we need to make sure – and it's my opinion; I'm not asking you to have, to hold the same opinion as me – that we have a level playing field and that the rules around

nomination and around memberships actually be established in legislation because then, that way, it applies to all the political parties.

Now, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was saying that, oh, our parties are different. But let me tell you this, Mr. Speaker. When I ran, when I intended to seek the nomination back in 2012 for the Alberta NDP, it was suggested to me, you know: “You do a lot of activism. You’re involved in your union. Why don’t you give it a try?” At that time I knew that there were other people that were actually interested in the nomination of Edmonton-Ellerslie, so then what ended up happening is that I said to myself: okay; well, how is this process? I was new to the whole political process back in 2012. Then members of the party said: okay; well, if there are other people that are interested, this means that it’s going to be a contested nomination. And I took up the challenge.

I think I probably signed – I can’t remember the exact number. If I told you the exact number, I’d be saying a mistruth, Mr. Speaker, but it was a lot of members that I ended up signing up because I thought it was going to go to a contested nomination. I went out there, and I did the work. Much like the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, I went out there, and I talked to people on their doorsteps, and I asked for their endorsement and for them to become members of the Alberta NDP so that they could support me in a nomination race. I signed up a lot of members, Mr. Speaker.

**1:30**

The reason why I’m bringing this up, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that having a level playing field for all political parties – and that, yes, the state should be involved in prescribing specific rules when it comes to nomination races. This makes sure that everything is fair across the board, no matter what political party you’re in. You have to go through at least a similar process. It might be a little bit different if the party decides to add another rule here or another aspect in a different way, but essentially all political parties will have to succumb to the same rules when it comes to nominations, people getting memberships in the party so that we can have a stronger democracy at the end of the day.

So then the question that every member in this House needs to ask themselves is: am I going to stand by a grassroots democratic approach, or am I going to support Bill 81, which is essentially allowing a loophole by which people who want to circumvent the democratic political process, that actually respects and strengthens democracy, and allow people to buy memberships en masse for other Albertans without their consent and then say, “Okay; well done; those people are going to vote for me in a nomination meeting, and those people and the amount of membership dues that are brought in by that process will actually then go into the party?” [interjection] Member, would you like to intervene? Please go ahead.

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, through you, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague for Edmonton-Ellerslie. I know that he has been involved in our party for many years, and I was wondering if . . .

**The Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt. My apologies. We’ve already accepted three interventions during the member’s remarks, so the hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie has a minute and fifteen seconds left.

**Member Loyola:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, sir. So this is what it comes down to at the end of the day and what every member inside of this House needs to ask themselves if they’re going to end up supporting Bill 81.

Now, no disrespect to the Minister of Justice. I’m sure he did his homework to the best of his ability, consulted with as many people

as possible, people on his staff within the ministry that brought the ideas to his attention, put them in the bill, consulted with other members of the party, all of those things. There’s no disrespect. It’s not about saying that you messed up, but this is about how we can make sure that we can all agree that we are going to put our name to a bill that is going to be a hundred per cent the best for Alberta democracy. That’s what the debate is here in this House tonight. That’s what this debate is all about.

**The Speaker:** The hon. the Minister of Jobs, Economy and Innovation has risen.

**Mr. Schweitzer:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We’ve heard some riveting debate in here tonight, but I move to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

## Government Motions

(continued)

### Time Allocation on Bill 81

114. Mr. Schweitzer on behalf of Mr. Jason Nixon moved:  
Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2), 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 Speaker:** Hon. members, this is a time allocation motion. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford has up to five minutes to respond.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, this is absolutely incredible. In the middle of a debate on the biggest violation of democracy we’ve seen in this province and its history, here we have time allocation being brought in by this government. I’m not quite sure what I’m going to do first when we leave the House later, in an hour apparently now, perhaps, if that’s the way the vote goes, but first I might stop by my grandfather’s grave, who fought in the First World War for democracy, just to apologize that we haven’t been able to protect that which he fought for. After I do that, I might just put in a call to Democracy Watch to see what they have to say about this kind of thing because this is absolutely appalling.

We have a government that is actually using voter suppression on their own members here in order to not hear them about the fact that they are subverting the democracy that they stood up for when they went to their nominations and when they went to their elections in their electoral districts. You know, this is absolutely incredible. We’ve been wondering what the purpose is for the government. Why are they doing all these things? So much of it has come to light this evening here. One thing I’ve been wondering a little bit about is why the government hasn’t called a by-election in Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche in all this time, and now I finally understand that they knew they had to pass a bill that would allow them to subvert democracy before they went into that by-election. That’s what we’re seeing here.

We’re seeing a concerted attempt to actually ruin the process that has been created in this province by MLAs for over a hundred years to make sure that we live in a country that is the envy of all the world. And now we have a government that has decided that that doesn’t matter, that only their own personal well-being and their future is guaranteed when they can see the writing on the wall, that Albertans are fed up with them, Albertans do not trust their leader,

and Albertans do not trust this government. And now we can see why they don't, because we can see that there was an intent to move this bill first so that they can engage in the process of subversion of democracy in this province.

Given the fact that it isn't that long ago that members of that very party expressed concern with the process, the electoral process that resulted in their leader being elected and that resulted in an investigation by the RCMP, that is ongoing today, three years later: all of that is being totally ignored. Yet now we learn that that is not accidental, but that is intentional. That is what we're seeing today. Bringing in this closure is a part of a very devious antidemocratic process that we should be ashamed to watch happen in this House.

I, for one, want to be on the record for when my grandchildren read what happened in this House, that I was against it and the members of my party were all against it. We stand united in a way that this party will never understand in terms of being united, this divided party that fights itself, that suppresses its own members. We absolutely will stand here as long as we are allowed to do so to tell you that what you are doing is unacceptable in a democracy and that you should be ashamed for being part of it. The record will show that.

1:40

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. I hesitate to interrupt. I understand this is a very passionate issue, and members have the right to be passionate. What they don't have the right to do is direct their comments directly at individuals inside the House. They ought to direct those comments through the chair. I just might add that I offered my services to all members of the Assembly last week with respect to pointing at other members in the Assembly. If you need to point at someone, you're welcome to point at me.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford has 40 seconds remaining.

**Mr. Feehan:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My intention isn't to point but to accentuate.

**Mr. Eggen:** To the sky.

**Mr. Feehan:** To the sky. I will keep my hand up that way.

I think I have made my point. We on this side are fully against this closure. We are fully against the antidemocratic procedures of this government. We know that within their own party they are recognizing and reflecting the antidemocratic nature of this bill, of this decision by this government, and we are on the record for all of history to say that we oppose you, and you are wrong.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** "We oppose them" and "they are wrong" I think would have been through the chair, but I'll leave it at that.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 114 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 1:42 a.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	LaGrange	Rosin
Amery	Lovely	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Luan	Schow
Copping	Madu	Schweitzer
Dreshen	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Ellis	Nally	Singh

Fir	Nicolaides	Toews
Frey	Nixon, Jason	Turton
Getson	Orr	van Dijken
Gotfried	Pon	Walker
Horner	Rehn	Wilson
Hunter	Reid	Yaseen
Issik		

Against the motion:

Barnes	Gray	Nielsen
Dach	Hoffman	Sabir
Eggen	Loyola	Shepherd
Feehan		

Totals: For – 37 Against – 10

**The Speaker:** I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre has risen. I'm not sure what he'd be rising for given there's nothing to speak to but . . .

**Mr. Shepherd:** Oh, sorry.

**The Speaker:** Okay.

### Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

#### Bill 81 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2) (continued)

**The Speaker:** The hon. member does have 15 minutes remaining should he choose to use so.

**Mr. Schweitzer:** Mr. Speaker, in this House we've had an immense amount of debate on this bill. I just want to provide some context and clarity for a lot of those folks here, particularly on the other side of the House that have an immense amount of interest on the grassroots efforts of this side and as to how we handle our nominations in the UCP. This is an activity that we do door by door, earning trust of voters one person at a time. Our Minister of Justice has gone through this in great detail, working with people on this side of the aisle to hear their concerns, address their concerns.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to vote on this matter to ensure that we can have these Election Act amendments put through. It's the right thing for Alberta, and I'm proud to vote in favour of this bill when I have the opportunity.

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

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak at third reading to Bill 81, the election statutes act. Indeed, we've heard from a number of members here tonight. Not too long ago – well, a little while ago we heard from the Minister of Justice, and he expressed at length and repeated many times that this is not how our system is supposed to work, particularly in reference to his colleagues who have brought forward amendments and indeed this reasoned amendment that we are speaking to now.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be absolutely clear. This is precisely how our system is supposed to work. This is precisely how private members are supposed to take opportunity in this House to engage in debate, to bring forward amendments, ideas, and indeed to challenge their own colleagues at times if they feel so fit. So while I recognize that on, I think, probably a very wide breadth of things, whether it be policy, legislation, or even philosophy, you will

probably find a lot of disagreement between myself and the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore – of course, we have many things that we do share in common, I think, but in this here, though, I absolutely support her reasoned amendment and her reason for bringing so, and I absolutely disagree with the Minister of Justice that this is somehow inappropriate or a waste of time. This is elected representatives doing precisely what we were elected to do.

I would also disagree with the Minister of Justice in terms of his chosen views on how this legislation handles memberships. Now, Elections Alberta has been abundantly clear about this bill – or, well, pardon me, not about this bill but about how they interpret the existing elections finance act in the province of Alberta. They say:

Section 25 prohibits an individual from paying for annual membership fees for political parties and constituency associations on behalf of others . . .

In short, only individuals can buy annual political party and constituency association memberships and individuals can only buy memberships for themselves.

**1:50**

Now, the minister spoke at length about how his colleagues should not be bringing forward these amendments or these things because it is missing the spirit of the bill, Mr. Speaker, yet when it comes to the act, he is insistent that he is an originalist. There is nothing that can be interpreted that is not directly explicitly written here, yet he is insistent the bill must be passed immediately tonight because of the spirit of the legislation.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this is a concern I've had with many actions of this government repeatedly on many bills, going back as early as before even we had the election in 2019, the minister of labour offering his opinion that despite the opinion of Elections Alberta and many others that two political parties when they merge to create a new entity could not simply transfer their money over, the minister of labour then put out his own opinion that all of those experts were wrong. We then saw him in his role as the Minister of Health introduce Bill 22, which awarded himself the power to tear up government's agreement with Alberta doctors on a whim. He argued that that power already existed in the legislation. He was just clarifying it by writing in something that was never there before, again, precisely what we see this minister doing here with this bill in terms of memberships, writing his personal view into the law and claiming that it always existed there.

Just over six months after Bill 22 the Minister of Health brought forward Bill 10, another bill that awarded himself sweeping powers to, in the event of a public health emergency, not only change or alter any existing legislation but create an entirely new legislation without ever setting foot in the Legislature. He again argued that, in his view, that power already existed in the legislation. He was just clarifying it. We saw how that ended, Mr. Speaker. That ended with incredible push-back from many of this government's own supporters, calling a special committee of the Legislature to go back and look at what they had done and refused to back down on, and then them eventually backing down on it and removing all of those provisions entirely. Again, we have a repeated pattern of this government deciding what they think should be in legislation, going and making that change, claiming it has always been there, and then seeing that push-back from Albertans.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think of Bill 46, the Health Statutes Amendment Act. Speaking of consultation, speaking of listening to expertise, which is the concern here in regards in particular to this section on memberships, Bill 46 came forward, put forward by the then Minister of Health, with no consultation with the Information and Privacy Commissioner while making vast changes to the legislation . . .

**Mr. Dreeshen:** That's irrelevant.

**Mr. Shepherd:** The Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake is concerned about the relevance. I can tell him that I am speaking to, again, this government's decision to change the membership rules because they believe they have a better interpretation of the legislation than the experts.

They did not consult with the Information and Privacy Commissioner on sweeping changes to health information and privacy law in the province of Alberta. No conversation whatsoever when she responded and raised a wide number of concerns, suggested changes, some of which I brought as amendments here into this House. They were all rejected by the minister. He stated that he or his staff would follow up with and consult with the commissioner afterwards. Just last week at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices the commissioner revealed that more than a year later there has been no outreach, no conversation from either the former or current Minister of Health.

That, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell is why I support this reasoned amendment. There have been concerns that have been brought forward by the opposition, and there have been concerns that have been brought forward by government members. I recognize the changes that were introduced by the Minister of Justice. I will give him credit for, after having doubled down repeatedly, reversing course in removing the opportunity for unlimited donations. Now, I disagree that we need to have a way for individuals to donate another \$4,000 on top of the \$4,243 that they're already able to contribute to political ends, but it is a good sight better than allowing unlimited donations to flow through.

Those remain my main concerns, Mr. Speaker, and those are the reasons that I will be voting in favour of this reasoned amendment and against the bill. I will be continuing to talk with Albertans about these concerns and watching closely what the behaviour of this government is in the upcoming by-election and certainly in the months to follow as we see further nominations amongst the UCP.

Oh, that is one other thing I will note, Mr. Speaker. The minister claimed that there are no nominations with the Alberta NDP. Going into the 2019 election, the Member for St. Albert, who sits in this House, won a contested nomination in her constituency. The Member for Edmonton-Meadows won a contested nomination in his constituency. We just had a contested nomination with multiple candidates in Lethbridge-East. We just had a contested nomination in Calgary-Currie, with much engagement from many new members who – those individuals went out and found and signed them up one member at a time. They didn't buy them in bulk.

That isn't to say that we have no faults, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do. We certainly do as a party, and we continue to work to get better. We have certainly seen incredible growth, and much of it is thanks to the behaviour and decisions of this government. [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Order.

**Mr. Shepherd:** I certainly look forward to many more contested nominations, Mr. Speaker, and the next election.

Thank you very much.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to speak in support of this reasoned amendment. You know, let me put it this way. I have seen this government fail to read the room, but to say that they failed to read the room on this is a spectacular understatement. The job of opposition: we criticize legislation that comes forward, we try to point out where the mistakes are made,

we try to offer some solutions and how to fix it. That's just the way it goes. But you have members of your own caucus telling you what, of course, I keep trying to tell you on an ongoing and regular basis, that your language that's proposed is failed.

Having had the opportunity, again, like I said, to sit in the 29th Legislature and be a part of the Ethics and Accountability Committee with some of my colleagues and remembering some of the opposition at that time walking out of the committee room, every last one of them, because they thought elections were getting rigged. Yet here we are with language that – I bet you, again, if roles were reversed, you'd be setting your hair on fire. I'm almost certain of it.

I remember the opening comments – I did pay attention earlier this evening – from the Minister of Justice when he opened up third reading of Bill 81, and I remember the part where he was, you know, quoting from the constitution of his party. I asked my friend from Edmonton-Ellerslie earlier this evening about language and what kind of impacts that has, so it's surprising that a lawyer would stand up and say: well, look; our language in our party is better. Then why would you bring forward language that's inferior to that? If anything, you would either want to equal that bar if not move it higher, not move it lower. That's completely counterintuitive, and some of your colleagues realize that.

2:00

You know, when I'm campaigning, Mr. Speaker, and I'm knocking on a door and I'm asking for a lawn sign, I honestly will not deliver a lawn sign unless I'm convinced that the individual knows why it is they're hosting that lawn sign. I just don't accept: "Oh, yeah. Yeah. Go ahead. Put one there." "No. Do you understand why you're putting it there? If you don't, then you really shouldn't put it up there." Yet here we are proposing to allow somebody to buy multiple – multiple – memberships on behalf of somebody.

I'm sorry, but given the track record that we've seen – and, you know, it's funny listening to the Minister of Jobs, Economy and Innovation, who is one of the individuals that hit the alarm button around voting: "Oh, there's a problem with voting. Where are these memberships?" Yet here we are now, instead of trying to fix something like that from ever happening again, enabling it to be able to happen. That is not how you bring forward better language. So a pro tip here: you always aim to try to move the bar up, not down. Just like I had said earlier in debate on this, you wonder why Albertans, when you show up at some of their doorsteps, go: well, I don't trust politicians. It's because of this language that's contained in Bill 81 that gives them that reason not to trust, frankly, anyone.

I want to thank the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore for bringing this forward, because she's right. The language is flawed, and it needs to be fixed. It sounds like – and I missed this part, unfortunately – seven words. We couldn't fix seven words, and now here we are on time allocation, something that members of the government bench and members of the government caucus, when they sat in the 29th Legislature, had a really, really large problem with. I remember it, yeah. The NDP government brought in time allocation – what? – three times. I actually thought it was four times. You all beat that just today, let alone what we've already seen in the 30th Legislature.

**Member Loyola:** Twenty-five.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Twenty-five. Thanks to my friend from Edmonton-Ellerslie for bringing me up to date. Twenty-five.

I'm curious about what you all would have done back then if the NDP government had done that. I bet you, Mr. Speaker, there would have been some really loud voices in this House if that had occurred. As I said, we've seen a pattern. This is about silencing people, including members of your own caucus.

I'll leave you with this thought: if the government is prepared to put your own team at risk, which one of you all is next?

**The Speaker:** My apologies. I thought you were intervening, which wouldn't require my assistance. The hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

**Mr. Sabir:** Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak against Bill 81 and to the closure motion, because I believe that this bill and the means employed by the government to pass this bill are both heavy handed, are both undemocratic, and they erode our democracy. From 2017, the Premier's leadership campaign, there are many allegations still under investigation. One of those many allegations was that there were many people who made memberships with their own money here in Calgary, here in Edmonton as well. The Member for Calgary-Falconridge knows those people. The Member for Calgary-Cross knows those people. The Member for Calgary-North knows those people.

Essentially, what the government is doing with this piece of legislation: they are legalizing all that. So after this change, all those wrongdoings will now be legal. The Member for Calgary-Falconridge is pointing towards the Member for Calgary-East. I think that he went even one step further, but let's not go there. What's happening with this piece of legislation is that someday it's possible that anyone from that side, even the Minister of Justice, might buy a UCP membership for me – God forbid – and that will be still legal. The Minister of Justice or anybody from that side won't need my consent to buy a membership in whatever party they think they need to buy that membership. This is what this bill is doing to our democracy.

Earlier I was listening to the Minister of Justice. He said that the changes we are making to nominations have nothing to do with the NDP because they don't have nominations. That's the best argument that the Minister of Justice could give in favour of this flawed piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, that's really shameful.

This bill is an attack on our democracy, and as it's now been time allocated, in five minutes or so we will be voting on it. That's an important vote for everyone. Will they stand by this government and their plan to attack democracy, or will they stand with democracy? That's what we will be voting on. The changes contained in this legislation are allowing for big money to be used to hijack democracy, to cling on to power. With the current limit of \$4,300, now anybody will be able to buy 430 memberships, and with three or four rich friends, you can buy up to 3,000 memberships. That's what this bill is doing.

I guess I'd thank all the members, a couple of members from the government side as well, who spoke against these changes. I think people will remember the names and faces of those who stood by democracy and those who were supporting this attack on democracy.

2:10

Earlier the member for – I'm forgetting the name of the constituency, a member from the UCP side. He was talking about one of the former NDP members, how that member felt, while part of the government caucus, not part of the decision-making. He didn't need to go that far. He should have looked at his colleagues, some sitting in that legislative Siberia, some sitting here. They were talking against the government bill. They were talking about how

they felt about how the government is making decisions. Even when time was allocated in Committee of the Whole, the government still used its own ministers, its own members to filibuster that time so that nobody could bring forward any amendments. All it has come down to for the government is issue management.

All those who are going to vote in favour of this bill: I guess we will call them complicit in this attack on democracy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

**Ms Hoffman:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think that when we rise in this place, we often talk about bills and the impacts that they're going to have on everyday families and individuals outside of this place, and that is certainly the case with this bill. But it is also going to have a direct impact on members inside this Chamber, and I think that's why a number of people from within the government caucus have raised concerns. We've already seen time and time again the way this Premier has handled politics and the types of questionable behaviours, at best. We've seen kamikaze candidates stepping forward. We've seen allegations of, you know, hundreds and thousands of memberships being purchased illegally in leadership races, and now we see a Premier bringing forward a bill through his cabinet that is going to make some of that legal.

I have to say that I think there are a number of people in this place who are probably thinking: "Yeah, but that won't apply to me. This won't negatively impact me." I hate to say that I suspect it probably will. I think some members of the government caucus have already come to that conclusion on their own, and that's why they've rightfully brought forward amendments like the one we're considering at this time.

I sincerely hope that members of this House, on all sides, stop to take a moment to pause and reflect on conscience, to determine if this is indeed a move that will improve democracy in Alberta, because many arguments have been made as to why it won't. To the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, who mentioned that, you know, the minister is doing his best: I hate to say that the minister's best is not good enough. Our job in this place isn't to pat somebody on the back and say, "Well, you did your best" and move their bill forward. It's to make laws, laws that govern our province, and we will not be doing our best if we defeat this amendment.

I hope that members take this opportunity to support the amendment to actually put forward a bill that we can all stand by and to create laws that will actually support democracy instead of eroding it and creating more opportunities for the Premier and his insiders to buy more memberships and have more races end in their preferred fashion rather than in the fashion that is most democratic, one member, one vote, consenting to a membership, being active in the choice to actually become a participating member or not.

I hope members will support the amendment as proposed by the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Are there others? The hon. Opposition House Leader.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the reasoned amendment from the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore as well as so many people who have already spoken in support of this. What will happen is that today the Chief Electoral Officer, who's been very clear in his guidance – Albertans need to buy their own political party memberships. He's clarified this in a bulletin, and this is how it has been working.

After Bill 81 passes, that will no longer be the case. Someone can spend \$4,000 and buy 400 memberships and influence a nomination contest or a leadership race, behaviour that Albertans are not supportive of. In fact, we know that there have been, in recent

memory in leadership races, large concerns about the legitimacy of the results as well as official investigations and a lot of concern about the ethical behaviour of those who engage in such activities. Bill 81 is going to do that.

Now, in this case, not only, I think, is the will of Albertans when it comes to protecting their elections being ignored but the will of this Premier's own government members when it comes to this. We've heard quite clearly that concerns were raised about this membership clause at caucus meetings, that concerns were raised to the minister well in advance, yet rather than deal with those concerns and address them legitimately with amendments, by working with his own caucus, we saw this government limit debate to a single hour and essentially block those amendments from being able to be introduced. We saw the outrage by those impacted.

Now, not only can that amendment not be passed, but we have a bill that is going to be passed that is going to introduce great big loopholes, that is going to allow \$8,000 of donations within a single year if someone is donating to the nominations and to parties. I think we see, really, just shameful behaviour when it comes to protecting our democracy because this bill does the opposite of what this government has said that they were interested in doing and purported to do.

So I certainly support the reasoned amendment that we are now debating, and I do not support Bill 81. In its current form it will continue to eliminate and make worse freedom of speech for a number of organizations, with the third-party advertising rules which, while improved, continue to be an overreach.

It removes the need for quarterly reporting for constituency associations, a lack of transparency on something as vitally important as our elections as well as when we're dealing with such large amounts of money, that we are when it comes to the fundraising happening at constituency associations. That lack of quarterly reporting is going to be a problem, particularly when people are donating to more than one constituency association and Elections Alberta is trying to adhere and enforce donation limits. That is an issue that this government chose not to resolve although it was raised repeatedly in debate.

Most problematic of all, of course, is the change to memberships, and it is a change; it is not a clarification. It is not anything other than – today an Albertan can only buy a membership for themselves, and after Bill 81 passes, someone with money will be able to buy memberships for other people and influence nomination and leadership races. I just have to be completely crystal clear about that because I think there's been an attempt to confuse this conversation about what is happening in this bill. It's really important to make that clear.

The attempts by government members and by independents to move amendments to improve this bill were thwarted deliberately, with an attempt to suppress their thoughts and an attempt to leave this government, this Premier, this caucus with the ability to control future nomination races and leadership races in a way that they find utility in. This is not the first time, of course, that this government has been called out for trying to set elections up in their own favour. I think this has been pretty blatant, though. Certainly, I've heard my colleagues referring to it as hijacking democracy and attacking democracy, and I have to agree because this is absolutely going to diminish trust in our democracy by the Alberta public, especially as Albertans see these rules in action and realize the busloads of new people brought out to nomination meetings, why that is happening, and how that is happening.

2:20

We've talked in this House about why this is being rushed through so quickly. We know that we have the nomination process

happening for the Fort McMurray by-election right now. We know that's a highly contested nomination process, and I am very curious to see how the changes in Bill 81 are going to impact that very important nomination race, particularly for the UCP.

Obviously, this government was willing to have almost three hours of debate at third reading but only a single hour in Committee of the Whole this afternoon and, during that single hour, only allowing government members to stand and block the ability to pass an amendment so that future amendments could be added in. That was deliberate. It was called out by the members who were watching it happen. Those who participated in it will need to own up to that. The reason for that happening, I think, will become more and more clear as we go forward.

What's happened here with Bill 81 is incredibly explicit. The rules today are going to be changed by Bill 81, and democracy is going to be damaged by it. Faith and trust in democracy will be eroded. I do not support Bill 81 in its current form. I do support the reasoned amendment that has been put forward by my hon. colleague, and I would encourage all members to consider the state of this bill and the opportunity the reasoned amendment presents for us to do better.

With that, I will conclude my comments. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-North West.

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak very briefly on this reasoned amendment to Bill 81, and I thank the hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore for bringing this forward. In fact, it's a bit of an instruction to so many members that are sitting right here in this House tonight – right? – to know that with Bill 81, as it's written, there is a way by which other people can buy memberships and thus subvert the democratic process and subvert your ability to actually get re-elected in this House, quite frankly.

You know, democracy is a bit of a tough game, and quite frankly the very member who is probably most responsible for this bill, the Member for Edmonton-South West, is probably the person that's most vulnerable to this very bill, because you know what'll happen, Mr. Speaker? If someone is not looking as though they can win an election in a nomination or a general election, then with this bill as it's written, they will buy memberships so that you will be subverted.

Mr. Speaker, through you, the hon. Member for Edmonton-South West must be very concerned about this, or is he even writing his own resignation form, quite frankly? If he's not producing, as he clearly is not – I mean, I'm not a student of the polls, but I can look at trends. Let's say, for example, that Edmonton-South West over the last 10 polls is definitely not going to win the next election, then the powers that be will quite frankly buy memberships under this current form of this bill, and he's gone even before he is actually even going to be able to run. He will not even win the nomination. [interjection] I will bow to the Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for yielding, Member. I know that as almost the longest serving member in the House, pretty close to that, the Member for Edmonton-North West has certainly seen his share of antics in his day in this Legislature, but I'm wondering if indeed he has witnessed anything so crass as this use of time allocation for a bill so fundamental to our democracy as the election statutes act and the reasoned amendment that we are now, under time allotment, debating. Indeed, it's shocking that we are actually here under time allotment.

I'm wondering how many times this member has actually witnessed such an abuse of the democratic exercise as we're seeing tonight in the House, where the government will filibuster its own bill, its own amendments so that its own members who are bringing in those amendments won't have an opportunity to debate. It would be very interesting to see if he's witnessed something like that in his time as a member, and I wonder if he might comment on what it makes him feel as a one of the longest serving members in this House when he thinks about the distortion of democracy that we're witnessing here tonight and whether indeed we're setting some kind of record for mutilating the democratic process that we all are here to support, yet indeed this is not what's happening tonight.

**Mr. Eggen:** Well, thank you, for those comments from the hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung. Yeah. I mean, you know, quite frankly, I've not seen this in all the years that I've been here. I was happily ensconced in my home – right? – maybe I was even sleeping a little bit, and then I came back as an instructive moment to some of the members that are sitting in this House right now. This bill will be used against you, right? The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow, for example: this bill will be used against you, through the Speaker, of course. If you're not performing properly, if you're not getting the numbers that you need, they will use this bill against you to not even allow you to get that nomination.

Make sure that seat feels warm and comfortable right now for many of you because, quite frankly, it's all about the polls and it's all about what's going on in electoral politics. The government is bringing this bill specifically to aim at you, right? The Minister of Health, which is one of the major ministers in the government: again, you're only as good as the next thing you do, quite frankly. The polls are as you can read them. I'm sure you have been, right? Quite literally, with this bill, with this provision in the bill they will use it against you. Suddenly you feel so very fancy and brave, and you have so many workers with you and so forth, and then suddenly – boom! – a nomination meeting, and you're gone. Simple as that, right?

I mean, think about it. The whip, one of the assistant whips from Leduc: same thing, right? You know, you might think that you've just got promoted by this same government, but you know what? It's only as fast as they can pull the rug from under you, and this provision of this bill will pull that rug from underneath you at that very circumstance, right? It's as simple as that.

I came here as a cautionary tale. Quite frankly, I was happily sleeping in my bed, and I came back to just remind you. The hon. Member for Sherwood Park: same thing, right? Poll numbers aren't looking so good. They will use this provision of the bill to buy memberships to make sure that they put somebody else in place. It's as simple as that. Calgary-East, Chestermere, all of you, Red Deer: same thing, right? You think that you are so, you know, put on a pedestal of what you happen to be doing now, but quite frankly this government, this Premier have built this provision into this bill to subvert anything that you have done over time. Mr. Speaker, I hate to suggest that maybe you are in that same situation, but you are, quite frankly. [interjection] Oh, there we go. I'm sorry. I will.

2:30

**Mr. Barnes:** Thank you, hon. member. I appreciate the chance for the intervention and to ask you a question. I appreciate the years of experience that you've had in this Legislature working on behalf of your constituents as well. Tonight it was really, really odd. We saw a government filibuster itself. We saw a government filibuster itself on closure and voter suppression. Now, to me, that's like in the next question period the government standing up and asking the Official Opposition a question. Now, I know the government loves to stand

up and rail about something you guys did as government three years ago, but can you tell me your thoughts on: have you ever seen when the government has filibustered their own members? Have you ever seen a situation where they have forced closure on their own backbenchers and their own voters?

**Mr. Eggen:** No. No. I appreciate that question and the hon. member. I think it's a very telling point in the history of this current government and how, you know, there's obviously a problem. There is obviously a problem of communication, and instead of communicating inside of the caucus or inside of the cabinet, instead they're communicating and sending you a message through this bill, quite frankly. The bill says: "Yeah. You know what? We have an administrative, a legislative way by which we can take you out." Simple as that, right? And take you out in a very undemocratic way: buying memberships for somebody else.

I mean, can you imagine just describing that to a grade 6 class or anybody in a high school class around democracy and saying: "You know what? Hey, we've built a new bill, and we've decided that you can buy memberships for somebody else in a political party." The Member for Calgary-East is looking suddenly very interested in this, for sure. You know what? They will do that against you. It will actually happen in your area if you are in any way subverting the party line, right? It's not only antidemocratic, but it subverts the whole rationality of the way by which we conduct ourselves. You know, I mean, let's not send a message. I know that this same UCP government has written a very poor curriculum, right? But the best way by which you can understand, Mr. Speaker, these things is not just by what they write on paper in laws but by their actions. So this action: I mean, the Minister of Education is sending, if she votes for this thing, quite frankly, a message about the subversion of democracy here in the province of Alberta as well.

You know, honestly, I'm really glad that we have this amendment from the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore, and I really appreciate her considered opinion on this. I know that the Minister of Justice knows implicitly and explicitly that this is wrong, and I know that this is a desperate attempt by the UCP to try to control their party. They can do, I guess, whatever they want with their party, but when they're sending messages like this outside of just their own party malevolence and confusion, otherwise sending a message to the larger community about, say, buying memberships and, you know, trying to control the democracy inside their own UCP Party, which seems not functional at best at this moment, Mr. Speaker, it also sends a message out to the larger community in regard to democracy writ large.

I hope that all of us understand this. I hope that every member, every MLA, understands what the implications are. Mr. Speaker, you know, you're – and I bow to your position – an MLA as well, right? And they're going to use this same tool in the wrong way . . .

**The Speaker:** The hon. Member for Edmonton-North West, being the second-longest serving member in this Assembly, knows he ought not bring the Speaker into debate for whatever purpose that he may be desiring to do so.

The hon. member.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yes. I do understand that, and I do retract that. That being said, I'm glad to remind myself of being the second-longest serving person.

Again, I just do make an impassioned plea to everyone in this House to look to a way by which to support this amendment. [interjection] Yes.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for allowing the intervention. I wanted to once again ask the

Member for Edmonton-North West to impart upon us some of his historical knowledge of this place, when he alluded earlier to not ever actually hearing the like of the attack on democracy that we've witnessed here tonight, if he, in fact, understands what the government has actually done tonight in terms of halting the democratic process and preventing its own members from presenting amendments to the legislation and indeed using up and wasting the time that was allotted by their own invocation of the closure amendment to members to debate this measure and subverting the democratic process. I don't know if he's ever seen such a display.

**Mr. Eggen:** Yeah. No. Thank you, hon. member. No, I don't think so. On two different levels, I mean, we have a subversion of democracy by using closure, but you also see an undermining of the democratic process by which individual MLAs can assert their sovereignty over their election, quite frankly. You know, if I was to try to explain that you could buy memberships for other people to get involved in any level of election – it could be a school sort of thing or whatever – then conventional wisdom, common sense would say: no, you can't do that. Of course you can't do that. I mean, it's ridiculous. It's absurd, right? Here we are in the highest level of governance in this province debating that very thing. This bill has done that.

We did see the government pull back on a ridiculous loophole by which people could donate to a nomination process. We saw them pull back. You know, last night I was very moved and interested to see that the Justice minister would choose to bring a government motion to pull back on that, allowing just a limit of \$4,000. We supported that, right? Then this same Justice minister tonight – I mean, I know he must know in his heart of hearts that this same bill, this same provision of buying memberships for other people would be used against him in Edmonton-South West. Simple as that. That literally would happen. It's like this obvious tool that the government would use against him.

You know, I defer to the common sense of others to vote for this amendment.

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

**Mr. McIver:** Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to rise on this amendment before the House to essentially kill the legislation in front of us. I've been listening, and frankly I don't think that I'm likely to support the amendment. On the debate on that, I have to say here's the good news: I think the opposition is out of gas. I know they're complaining the entire time, but they actually haven't really spent more than a sentence in the last 10 minutes actually talking about the bill, which tells me that they haven't got anything else to say to it anyway. We probably are relieved.

**2:40**

I'm supposing that the motion that the time allocation is on – because, Mr. Speaker, here's what's really interesting. Despite all the angry protests from across the aisle about democracy the fact is that every vote that has been made in this House tonight has been a democratic vote, full stop. How do we know that? The definition of democracy is that the majority rules. Whether it's for time allocation, for accepting an amendment, for turning down an amendment, every single vote that has taken place in this Legislative Assembly tonight has been a democratic vote.

Now, the folks on the other side can try to deny that, but I guess all they're really saying is that they're angry with Albertans because they don't have the majority. The fact is that . . . [interjections] See how angry they are, Mr. Speaker? They're so angry that Albertans didn't give them the majority. The fact is that every vote that took



place in this Legislative Assembly tonight was a democratic vote, where the majority of the voices in this place – every voice in this place has value. Every voice in this place was a member, no matter what party they're with, that was sent by the voters of their riding. Every voice of every member, when that member showed up here to vote, their voice was counted not more than some other voice from a different party, not less than some other voice from another party but exactly equal, just the way democracy is designed to be. Despite all the protests about there's no democracy happening in here, the fact remains that nothing but democracy has happened here tonight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not everybody is happy with the result. I get it. I'm not always happy with the result when there's a vote made. That's also part of democracy. We all get our say; we don't always get our way. That's just a part of the democratic process if you happen to be on the side of a vote where more people vote the way that you're not happy with, but it's still democracy. It's still democracy despite what the folks on the other side say.

Now, some of the other things that they say are – the fact is that people could have bought memberships before this legislation went through. The folks on the other side are trying to make it sound like something big has changed. No, Mr. Speaker. Essentially, what they're most complaining about hasn't changed. What else hasn't changed is that when it comes to winning your nomination next time, for all of us, the same as last time, we have to get more people to buy a membership and vote for us than somebody running against us gets to do. Nothing has changed that way. The folks over there are trying to make it sound like there's some scary thing, but – I don't know – we all succeeded in getting here two and a half years ago with this scary process, and I guess we'll all be up against the same thing a year and a half from now with this scary process. [interjections]

See how angry they are? They can't stand that Albertans didn't send them here in the majority. They're still angry with Albertans for not giving them the majority in this place, Mr. Speaker. In fact, they're protesting against – they're actually the ones that are being antidemocratic by complaining that they're not winning a vote when the party they belong to didn't get sent here in the highest number by Albertans. So I guess they're really angry with Albertans. I guess I understand that. They got fired after four terrible years of government, where they drug Alberta to a lower level than Alberta has seen in decades. They had more than I think it was 180,000 jobs lost when they were here, a couple of hundred billion dollars' worth of investment that went out of this province, and Albertans also exercised democracy and fired them out the door at the first opportunity that they had. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, the anger: I can just hear the anger, so angry coming from over there, so very angry. They shouldn't be angry about democracy. We are blessed to be here in democracy. No matter how much we like or dislike each other, no matter how much we disagree, we get to settle our differences in the most peaceful of ways, by voting. That's what democracy gives us. It's a beautiful thing. Again, we don't always get our way, including me, including any of us, but we always get our say if we just show up here and exercise the right that the voters that elected us gave us to do. That's what's before us here, a bill to make sure that democracy goes forward now and in the future in the most fair way possible.

The hon. Justice minister has done his best. In fact, Mr. Speaker, here's the thing. The folks on the other side actually got their way through this democracy on some of the changes that they asked for, and they're still not happy. So it goes to show that apparently they can't put any water in their wine. If they don't get their way on everything, they're angry, and I can hear it. I can hardly hear myself speaking because of all the angry yells – the angry yells – from the

other side of the House. They're so very angry over there because the democracy that they cry for is happening, and they don't like it.

**The Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but pursuant to Government Motion 114, agreed to earlier this evening, it states that after one hour of debate all questions must be decided to conclude debate on Bill 81, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2).

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment RA1 lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 2:46 a.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Aheer	Gotfried	Loyola
Barnes	Gray	Nielsen
Dach	Hanson	Sabir
Eggen	Hoffman	Shepherd
Feehan	Loewen	

2:50

Against the motion:

Amery	Lovely	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Luan	Schow
Copping	Madu	Schweitzer
Dreeshen	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Fir	Nally	Singh
Frey	Nicolaides	Toews
Getson	Nixon, Jason	Turton
Horner	Orr	van Dijken
Hunter	Pon	Walker
Issik	Rehn	Wilson
LaGrange	Reid	Yaseen
Long	Rosin	

Totals: For – 14 Against – 35

[Motion on amendment RA1 lost]

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 2:51 a.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Amery	Lovely	Rutherford
Armstrong-Homeniuk	Luan	Schow
Copping	Madu	Schweitzer
Dreeshen	McIver	Sigurdson, R.J.
Fir	Nally	Singh
Frey	Nicolaides	Toews
Getson	Nixon, Jason	Turton
Horner	Orr	van Dijken
Hunter	Pon	Walker
Issik	Rehn	Wilson
LaGrange	Reid	Yaseen
Long	Rosin	

Against the motion:

Aheer	Gotfried	Loyola
-------	----------	--------

Barnes	Gray	Nielsen
Dach	Hanson	Sabir
Eggen	Hoffman	Shepherd
Feehan	Loewen	
Totals:	For – 35	Against – 14

[Motion carried; Bill 81 read a third time]

**The Speaker:** Prior to calling the hon. the Government House Leader, I would just like to say thank you to all members of the Legislative Assembly Office, who make the democratic process possible, whether it's members here that sit around the table and endure all of our riveting debate, whether it's members of the LASS, who work day and night to keep us safe, pages who serve the Assembly so diligently, the *Journals* clerk, bills and *Journals* in 315, *Hansard*, or, quite frankly, all of the other members that serve

the LAO in their duties to ensure that we can fulfill our roles as members of the Assembly.

This is the longest legislative session in Legislative Assembly history, at 139 days or something, and I know that each and every one of you have certainly served your constituents well, and I value and appreciate that. If you're travelling home, please go home, get some rest, and do that safely tomorrow. From the bottom of my heart and my family, have a very merry Christmas, a safe and healthy, prosperous new year.

The hon. the Government House Leader.

**Mr. Jason Nixon:** Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise to advise the Assembly that pursuant to Government Motion 108 the business of the 2021 fall sitting is now concluded.

[The Assembly adjourned at 2:57 a.m. pursuant to Government Motion 108]

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

**Activity to Tuesday, December 7, 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 49\* — Labour Mobility Act (Kenney)**

First Reading — 5647 (*Oct. 25, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5680-95 (*Oct. 26, 2021 aft.*), 5709-17 (*Oct. 26, 2021 eve.*), 5728-37 (*Oct. 27, 2021 morn.*), 5802-07 (*Oct. 28, 2021 morn.*), 5951-61 (*Nov. 2, 2021 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 6175-85 (*Nov. 16, 2021 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 6293-95 (*Nov. 18, 2021 aft.*), 6358-65 (*Nov. 23, 2021 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation, except section 27, which comes into force on December 2, 2021; SA 2021 cL-0.7 ]

**Bill 50 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2020 (S) (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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cC-13.2 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cR-5.7 ]

**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)

Royal Assent — (Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2021 c11 ]

**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)

Royal Assent — (Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2021 c12 ]

**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)

Royal Assent — (Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force September 1, 2021; SA 2021 cF-25.4 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2021 c16 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c14 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 17, 2021, except sections 1, 3 and 7, which come into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c10 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2021 c15 ]

**Bill 67 — Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship Education Act (Nicolaidis)**

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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cS-7.88 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, except section 1, which has effect January 1, 2021; SA 2021 c9 ]

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

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

Second Reading — 5288-89 (*Jun. 7, 2021 eve., passed*)

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

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

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2021 c13 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force March 1, 2020; SA 2021 cC-31.3 ]

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 1, 2021; SA 2021 cP-21.51 ]

**Bill 73 — Infrastructure Accountability Act (Panda)**

First Reading — 5647 (*Oct. 25, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5675-79 (*Oct. 26, 2021 aft.*), 5697-5709 (*Oct. 26, 2021 eve.*), 5719-28 (*Oct. 27, 2021 morn.*), 6011-23 (*Nov. 3, 2021 eve.*), 6099-6104 (*Nov. 15, 2021 eve.*), 6185-86 (*Nov. 16, 2021 eve.*), 6202-05 (*Nov. 17, 2021 morn.*), 6274-80 (*Nov. 18, 2021 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 6691-6703 (*Dec. 1, 2021 aft.*), 6824-29 (*Dec. 6, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 6868-75 (*Dec. 7, 2021 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 8, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 8, 2021; SA 2021 cI-1.6 ]

**Bill 74 — Advanced Education Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (Nicolaidis)**

First Reading — 5673 (*Oct. 26, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5773-93 (*Oct. 27, 2021 eve.*), 5807-12 (*Oct. 28, 2021 morn.*), 5826-34 (*Oct. 28, 2021 aft.*), 5895-5908 (*Nov. 2, 2021 morn.*), 6027 (*Nov. 3, 2021 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 6230-40 (*Nov. 17, 2021 aft.*), 6241-44 (*Nov. 17, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 6421-30 (*Nov. 24, 2021 morn., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force December 2, 2021, except section 1, which comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c17 ]

**Bill 75 — Arts Professions Recognition Act (Orr)**

First Reading — 5673-74 (*Oct. 26, 2021 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 5752-71 (*Oct. 27, 2021 aft.*), 5936-39 (*Nov. 2, 2021 aft.*), 5963-70 (*Nov. 3, 2021 morn.*), 6023-27 (*Nov. 3, 2021 eve.*), 6061-70 (*Nov. 4, 2021 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 6226-30 (*Nov. 17, 2021 aft.*), 6341-49 (*Nov. 22, 2021 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 6607-08 (*Nov. 30, 2021 morn.*), 6628-37 (*Nov. 30, 2021 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force December 2, 2021; SA 2021 cA-44.2 ]

**Bill 76 — Captive Insurance Companies Act (Toews)**

First Reading — 5750 (Oct. 27, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 5825-26 (Oct. 28, 2021 aft.), 5944-51 (Nov. 2, 2021 eve.), 5986-6003 (Nov. 3, 2021 aft.), 6145-52 (Nov. 16, 2021 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6415-20 (Nov. 23, 2021 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 6498-6505 (Nov. 25, 2021 morn., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 2, 2021 aft.) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cC-2.4 ]

**Bill 77 — Municipal Government (Restoring Tax Accountability) Amendment Act, 2021 (McIver)**

First Reading — 5823-24 (Oct. 28, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 5928-36 (Nov. 2, 2021 aft.), 6039-48 (Nov. 4, 2021 morn.), 6112-17 (Nov. 15, 2021 eve.), 6244-50 (Nov. 17, 2021 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6349-51 (Nov. 22, 2021 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 6665-73 (Dec. 1, 2021 morn., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 2, 2021 aft.) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c22 ]

**Bill 78 — Alberta Housing Amendment Act, 2021 (Pon)**

First Reading — 5845-46 (Nov. 1, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 6029-39 (Nov. 4, 2021 morn.), 6126-32 (Nov. 16, 2021 morn.), 6187-97 (Nov. 17, 2021 morn.), 6335-41 (Nov. 22, 2021 eve.), 6582-95 (Nov. 29, 2021 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6753-59 (Dec. 2, 2021 morn.), 6808-09 (Dec. 6, 2021 aft.), 6811-12 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve.), 6831-37 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 6837 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve.), 6838-44 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 8, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c23 ]

**Bill 79 — Trails Act (Nixon, JJ)**

First Reading — 5919 (Nov. 2, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 6104-12 (Nov. 15, 2021 eve.), 6460-66 (Nov. 24, 2021 aft.), 6650-64 (Nov. 30, 2021 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6716-25 (Dec. 1, 2021 eve.), 6845-52 (Dec. 7, 2021 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 6877-79 (Dec. 7, 2021 aft.), 6881-87 (Dec. 7, 2021 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 8, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation, except section 5, which comes into force on May 1, 2022; SA 2021 cT-6.2 ]

**Bill 80\* — Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2) (Fir)**

First Reading — 6060 (Nov. 4, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 6119-26 (Nov. 16, 2021 morn.), 6353-58 (Nov. 23, 2021 morn.), 6436-38 (Nov. 24, 2021 morn.), 6569-74 (Nov. 29, 2021 eve.), 6597-6607 (Nov. 30, 2021 morn.), 6673-80 (Dec. 1, 2021 morn., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 6725-31 (Dec. 1, 2021 eve.), 6829-31 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve.), 6852-56 (Dec. 7, 2021 morn., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 6875-77 (Dec. 7, 2021 aft.), 6889-95 (Dec. 7, 2021 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 8, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2021 c25 ]

**Bill 81\* — Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2) (Madu)**

First Reading — 6060 (Nov. 4, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 6144-45 (Nov. 16, 2021 aft.), 6167-75 (Nov. 16, 2021 eve.), 6405-14 (Nov. 23, 2021 eve.), 6480-87 (Nov. 24, 2021 eve.), 6575-82 (Nov. 29, 2021 eve.), 6642-50 (Nov. 30, 2021 eve.), 6703-10 (Dec. 1, 2021 aft.), 6733-40 (Dec. 1, 2021 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6812-24 (Dec. 6, 2021 eve.), 6901-08 (Dec. 7, 2021 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 6908-26 (Dec. 7, 2021 eve.), 6927-34 (Dec. 7, 2021 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 8, 2021 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation, except sections 3 and 8, which come into force on December 8, 2021; SA 2021 c24 ]

**Bill 82 — Mineral Resource Development Act (Savage)**

First Reading — 6060 (Nov. 4, 2021 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 6152-65 (Nov. 16, 2021 aft.), 6261-68 (Nov. 18, 2021 morn., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 6493-98 (Nov. 25, 2021 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 6527-33 (Nov. 25, 2021 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 2, 2021 aft.) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 cM-16.8 ]

**Bill 83 — Environmental Protection and Enhancement Amendment Act, 2021 (Nixon, JJ)**

First Reading — 6084 (*Nov. 15, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Second Reading — 6250-58 (*Nov. 17, 2021 eve.*), 6268-74 (*Nov. 18, 2021 morn., passed*)  
Committee of the Whole — 6466-70 (*Nov. 24, 2021 aft.*), 6471-73 (*Nov. 24, 2021 eve., passed*)  
Third Reading — 6505-11 (*Nov. 25, 2021 morn., passed*)  
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force December 2, 2021; SA 2021 c21 ]

**Bill 84 — Business Corporations Amendment Act, 2021 (Glubish)**

First Reading — 6084 (*Nov. 15, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Second Reading — 6392-97 (*Nov. 23, 2021 aft.*), 6430-36 (*Nov. 24, 2021 morn., passed*)  
Committee of the Whole — 6620-28 (*Nov. 30, 2021 aft.*), 6746-50 (*Dec. 2, 2021 morn., passed*)  
Third Reading — 6750-53 (*Dec. 2, 2021 morn., passed*)  
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c18 ]

**Bill 85 — Education Statutes (Students First) Amendment Act, 2021 (LaGrange)**

First Reading — 6143 (*Nov. 16, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Second Reading — 6399-6405 (*Nov. 23, 2021 eve., passed*)  
Committee of the Whole — 6473-80 (*Nov. 24, 2021 eve., passed*)  
Third Reading — 6487-91 (*Nov. 24, 2021 eve.*), 6524-27 (*Nov. 25, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2021 c19 ]

**Bill 86 — Electricity Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (Nally)**

First Reading — 6218 (*Nov. 17, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Second Reading — 6449-60 (*Nov. 24, 2021 aft., passed*)

**Bill 87 — Electoral Divisions (Calgary-Bhullar-McCall) Amendment Act, 2021 (Nixon, JJ)**

First Reading — 6620 (*Nov. 30, 2021 aft., passed*)  
Second Reading — 6711-16 (*Dec. 1, 2021 eve., passed*)  
Committee of the Whole — 6731 (*Dec. 1, 2021 eve., passed*)  
Third Reading — 6741-46 (*Dec. 2, 2021 morn., passed; division deferred*), 6772-73 (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft., passed on division*)  
Royal Assent — (*Dec. 2, 2021 aft.*) [Comes into force December 2, 2021; SA 2021 c20 ]

**Bill 201 — Strategic Aviation Advisory Council Act (Gottfried)**

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

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 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.), 5653-56 (Oct. 25, 2021 aft.), 5850-59 (Nov. 1, 2021 aft., passed; amendments agreed to)  
Third Reading — 6088-96 (Nov. 15, 2021 aft., passed on division)  
Royal Assent — (Dec. 2, 2021 aft.) [Comes into force December 2, 2021; SA 2021 cR-16.6 ]

**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.), 6800-05 (Dec. 6, 2021 aft., passed on division)

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

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 (Smith)**

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., debate on concurrence motion*), 5471-73 (*Jun. 14, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion*), 5652-53 (*Oct. 25, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion*), 5846-49 (*Nov. 1, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with*)

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 17, 2021; SA 2021 cP-18.3 ]

**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., debate on concurrence motion*), 5653 (*Oct. 25, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion*), 5849-50 (*Nov. 1, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion*), 6084-88 (*Nov. 15, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with on division*)

**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., debate on concurrence motion*), 5653 (*Oct. 25, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion*), 6316-21 (*Nov. 22, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with on division*)

**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*), 5985 (*Nov. 3, 2021 aft., Committee recommendation that Bill proceed reported to Assembly; debate on concurrence motion to take place Monday, November 15, 2021*), 6321-27 (*Nov. 22, 2021 aft., debate on concurrence motion; proceeded with*)

**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*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 17, 2021 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force June 17, 2021; SA 2021 ]



**Table of Contents**

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 80 Red Tape Reduction Implementation Act, 2021 (No. 2) ..... 6889  
Division ..... 6894  
Bill 81 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2) ..... 6908, 6927  
Division ..... 6933

Committee of the Whole

Bill 81 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2021 (No. 2) ..... 6901  
Division ..... 6907  
Division ..... 6908

Government Motions

Oil and Gas Pipeline Opposition ..... 6895  
Division ..... 6897  
Division ..... 6897  
Division ..... 6898  
Select Special Committee to Examine Safe Supply ..... 6898  
Time Allocation on Bill 81 ..... 6900  
Division ..... 6901  
Time Allocation on Bill 81 ..... 6926  
Division ..... 6927

*Alberta Hansard* is available online at [www.assembly.ab.ca](http://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](mailto:AlbertaHansard@assembly.ab.ca)