



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature  
Fourth Session

# Alberta Hansard

Wednesday evening, December 14, 2022

Day 10

The Honourable Nathan M. Cooper, Speaker

# Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 30th Legislature

Fourth Session

Cooper, Hon. Nathan M., Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC), Speaker  
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie-East (UC), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees  
Reid, Roger W., Livingstone-Macleod (UC), Deputy Chair of Committees

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

Nicolaides, Hon. Demetrios, ECA, Calgary-Bow (UC)  
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)  
Nixon, Hon. Jason, ECA, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre  
(UC)  
Nixon, Hon. Jeremy P., ECA, Calgary-Klein (UC)  
Notley, Hon. Rachel, ECA, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),  
Leader of the Official Opposition  
Orr, Hon. Ronald, ECA, Lacombe-Ponoka (UC)  
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)  
Panda, Hon. Prasad, ECA, Calgary-Edgemont (UC)  
Phillips, Hon. Shannon, ECA, Lethbridge-West (NDP)  
Pon, Hon. Josephine, ECA, Calgary-Beddington (UC)  
Rehn, Pat, Lesser Slave Lake (UC)  
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)  
Rosin, Miranda D., Banff-Kananaskis (UC)  
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)  
Rutherford, Hon. Brad, ECA, Leduc-Beaumont (UC),  
Government Whip  
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, ECA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP),  
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader  
Savage, Hon. Sonya, ECA, KC, Calgary-North West (UC)  
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, ECA, Calgary-North East (UC)  
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, ECA, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)  
Schow, Hon. Joseph R., ECA, Cardston-Siksika (UC),  
Government House Leader  
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, ECA, Calgary-Shaw (UC)  
Shandro, Hon. Tyler, ECA, KC, Calgary-Acadia (UC)  
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP)  
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, ECA, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)  
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UC)  
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UC)  
Smith, Hon. Danielle, ECA, Brooks-Medicine Hat (UC),  
Premier  
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UC)  
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UC)  
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP)  
Toews, Hon. Travis, ECA, 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),  
Deputy Government Whip  
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., ECA, Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UC)  
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UC)  
Yaseen, Hon. Muhammad, ECA, Calgary-North (UC)  
Vacant, Calgary-Elbow  
Vacant, Calgary-Lougheed

## Party standings:

United Conservative: 60

New Democrat: 23

Independent: 2

Vacant: 2

## Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, KC, Clerk  
Teri Cherkewich, Law Clerk  
Trafton Koenig, Senior Parliamentary  
Counsel  
Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and  
Director of House Services

Nancy Robert, Clerk of *Journals* and  
Committees  
Janet Schwegel, Director of Parliamentary  
Programs  
Amanda LeBlanc, Deputy Editor of  
*Alberta Hansard*

Terry Langley, Sergeant-at-Arms  
Gareth Scott, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms  
Lang Bawn, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

### **Executive Council**

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Danielle Smith       | Premier, President of Executive Council,<br>Minister of Intergovernmental Relations |
| Kaycee Madu          | Deputy Premier, Minister of Skilled Trades and Professions                          |
| Nathan Neudorf       | Deputy Premier, Minister of Infrastructure  |
| Mickey Amery         | Minister of Children's Services   |
| Jason Copping        | Minister of Health  |
| Devin Dreesen        | Minister of Transportation and Economic Corridors                                   |
| Mike Ellis           | Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services                                    |
| Nate Glubish         | Minister of Technology and Innovation   |
| Pete Guthrie         | Minister of Energy  |
| Nate Horner          | Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation  |
| Brian Jean           | Minister of Jobs, Economy and Northern Development                                  |
| Matt Jones           | Minister of Affordability and Utilities   |
| Adriana LaGrange     | Minister of Education   |
| Todd Loewen          | Minister of Forestry, Parks and Tourism   |
| Jason Luan           | Minister of Culture   |
| Nicholas Milliken    | Minister of Mental Health and Addiction   |
| Dale Nally           | Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction                                  |
| Demetrios Nicolaides | Minister of Advanced Education  |
| Jeremy Nixon         | Minister of Seniors, Community and Social Services                                  |
| Brad Rutherford      | Minister without Portfolio  |
| Sonya Savage         | Minister of Environment and Protected Areas   |
| Rajan Sawhney        | Minister of Trade, Immigration and Multiculturalism                                 |
| Joseph Schow         | Minister without Portfolio  |
| Rebecca Schulz       | Minister of Municipal Affairs   |
| Tyler Shandro        | Minister of Justice   |
| Travis Toews         | President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance                                 |
| Rick Wilson          | Minister of Indigenous Relations  |

### **Parliamentary Secretaries**

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| Tracy Allard              | Parliamentary Secretary for Civil Liberties              |
| Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk | Parliamentary Secretary for Ukrainian Refugee Settlement |
| Tanya Fir                 | Parliamentary Secretary for Status of Women              |
| Shane Getson              | Parliamentary Secretary for Economic Corridors           |
| David Hanson              | Parliamentary Secretary for Procurement Transformation   |
| Martin Long               | Parliamentary Secretary for Small Business               |
| Miranda Rosin             | Parliamentary Secretary for Tourism                      |
| R.J. Sigurdson            | Parliamentary Secretary for EMS Reform                   |
| Devinder Toor             | Parliamentary Secretary for Multiculturalism             |
| Glenn van Dijken          | Parliamentary Secretary for Agrifood Development         |
| Tany Yao                  | Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health                 |
| Muhammad Yaseen           | Parliamentary Secretary for Community Outreach           |

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

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

Chair: Mr. Orr

Deputy Chair: Mrs. Allard

Eggen  
Gotfried  
Gray  
Hunter  
Issik  
Phillips  
Pon

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

Chair: Mr. van Dijken

Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Allard  
Armstrong-Homeniuk  
Barnes  
Bilous  
Carson  
Feehan  
McIver  
Rowswell  
Stephan  
Walker

### **Standing Committee on Families and Communities**

Chair: Ms Lovely

Deputy Chair: Ms Sigurdson

Armstrong-Homeniuk  
Carson  
Dang  
Fir  
Gotfried  
Long  
Sabir  
Smith, Mark  
Yao  
Yaseen

### **Standing Committee on Legislative Offices**

Chair: Mr. Smith

Deputy Chair: Mr. van Dijken

Ceci  
Dach  
Hunter  
Loyola  
Orr  
Panda  
Rehn  
Shepherd  
Toor

### **Special Standing Committee on Members' Services**

Chair: Mr. Cooper

Deputy Chair: Mr. Williams

Deol  
Fir  
Goehring  
Gray  
McIver  
Pon  
Rowswell  
Sabir  
van Dijken

### **Standing Committee on Private Bills**

Chair: Mr. Williams

Deputy Chair: Ms Rosin

Irwin  
Lovely  
Nielsen  
Nixon, Jason  
Panda  
Rehn  
Sigurdson, L.  
Singh  
Sweet

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

Chair: Mr. Reid

Deputy Chair: Mr. Gotfried

Aheer  
Allard  
Armstrong-Homeniuk  
Deol  
Ganley  
Loyola  
Nixon, Jason  
Rehn  
Renaud  
Yao

### **Standing Committee on Public Accounts**

Chair: Ms Phillips

Deputy Chair: Mr. Turton

Hunter  
Lovely  
Pancholi  
Panda  
Renaud  
Schmidt  
Singh  
Stephan  
Toor  
Yaseen

### **Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship**

Chair: Mr. Hanson

Deputy Chair: Mr. Feehan

Aheer  
Dach  
Ganley  
Getson  
Issik  
Nielsen  
Orr  
Sigurdson, R.J.  
Singh  
Turton

## Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Wednesday, December 14, 2022

### Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mr. Reid in the chair]

**The Deputy Chair:** I'd like to call the committee to order.

#### Bill 6 Police Amendment Act, 2022

**The Deputy Chair:** We are on amendment A2. Would anyone like to add comments or questions to the amendment? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

**Ms Pancholi:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to rise and speak in Committee of the Whole on Bill 6, the Police Amendment Act, 2022, and specifically to speak to what I believe is amendment A2. If I'm correct, the number of it is A2. For those who may not be aware yet or maybe are just joining us on live TV wanting to watch what's happening in the Assembly tonight, which I do encourage everybody to do, we are speaking to an amendment that was brought forward by my colleague the hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall, which is an amendment related to, essentially, when complaints can be brought and who they can be brought against under the police.

I want to begin – I haven't had an opportunity yet, Mr. Chair, to actually speak to this bill. I know that we're on the amendment, and I certainly will be speaking to the amendment; it's very related. But just more generally for those, you know, who are interested in knowing what's happening, Bill 6 is taking what I believe are some very positive steps towards providing some more independent oversight over the police, really, by establishing a commission that will be responsible for reviewing complaints made against police officers. This is really important, of course, because we have significant concerns, as many Albertans do, about, you know, the fairness of a process when it is police essentially investigating themselves. We've heard those concerns raised loud and clear, that police shouldn't be investigating police. There are conflicts of interest there. There are skewed perspectives that have challenged, really, the credibility of some of the decisions that have happened.

More than ever I believe it's important for Albertans to have trust and have faith in their police. We also know that there are so many really fantastic police officers who are doing incredible work, and, you know, that relationship and that credibility should not be undermined because of the actions of some. One of the steps to ensure that we have a process in place that's perceived as as well as is fair is to provide that civilian oversight of complaints that are made against police.

Bill 6 does a great deal in terms of establishing the police review commission and processes for handling certain complaints that are made. In particular, I noted that it's established what they kind of call level 1, 2, 3, 4 complaints. Certain complaints, level 1 complaints, are, you know, an allegation that – actually, I'm not going to try to paraphrase it, Mr. Chair, because I think it's important to be accurate. It does say that a level 1 complaint is where

An incident has occurred involving serious injury to or the death of any person that may have resulted from the actions of a police officer, or a complaint alleges that

- (a) serious injury to or the death of any person may have resulted from the actions of a police officer, or
- (b) there is a matter of a serious or sensitive nature related to the actions of a police officer.

Those are level 1 complaints. They will continue to be investigated by what we all know as ASIRT, but it will now be done under the auspices of the police review commission. There are a number of other levels of complaints that can be made, as set out in this bill, based on the seriousness and the nature of the allegations.

Again, very supportive of the idea of an independent body reviewing complaints made against police. That's actually good for everyone. It is good for Albertans. It is good for police officers. It is really the best outcome. This is really something that, you know, had been initiated when we began the review of the Police Act as the NDP back in I believe it was 2017 or 2018. I may have my dates wrong. My apologies, Mr. Chair. But this was really one impetus behind that review of the Police Act: how do we provide better oversight of police, but also, how do we ensure that Albertans have confidence in those processes to make sure that they are fair?

In that spirit, Mr. Chair, really, the amendment that was put forward by my colleague the Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall was really to go further than perhaps what the act has suggested, to ensure that a police officer cannot sort of escape a complaint being made or being investigated by the police review commission by virtue of either quitting the police force or moving to another police force. Essentially, what the amendment does is, you know, clarifies and proposes an amendment to the proposed section 42.2 of the bill by adding the following, which would be subsection (10):

For greater certainty, a complaint may be filed with respect to a former police officer under this section if, at the time the subject matter of the complaint occurred, the former police officer was a police officer.

And it goes on by adding in section 43 another subsection (10), which reads:

For greater certainty, the chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission may not dismiss a complaint under this section with respect to a former police officer if

- (a) at the time the subject matter of the complaint occurred, the former police officer was a police officer, and
- (b) there is no other basis for dismissing the complaint.

It's pretty straightforward. It's simply to say that if an allegation and a complaint is made against a police officer, they can't just quit and that's the end of the complaint. That doesn't provide resolution to the complainant or the individuals who may have been affected by simply saying: oh, we can no longer look into this complaint because that police officer is no longer employed.

I would say there is precedent for this in many other, you know, settings, which is that simply because an employee is no longer employed does not mean that the conduct by which a complaint is made – and let's be clear. We're talking about very potentially serious issues, and when we're talking about police, we're talking about individuals who are in a great position of public trust and of power.

The reality is that the police serve Albertans. They serve the public, and if the conduct of one police officer, you know, would merit a complaint and would be found to be legitimate by a complaint process, you would not want that person to just escape sort of any investigation or outcome or resolution simply because they have either been fired or they have resigned from their position. That conduct doesn't just fall – it's not just a matter that affects that individual police officer. If a police officer has engaged in conduct that is worthy of a complaint, that's calling into question the very trust that Albertans have in that police force more generally. It's why the complaint process must still be able to apply to police officers even if they've stepped down.

So this is what the intent of this amendment is about, and I'm really hopeful that – you know, this is not a partisan issue. In our

view, this is something to simply clarify the language of the bill, to be clear that they're still going to be held, some accountability held, when somebody steps down as a police officer. Again, very similar to what happens in the medical profession: simply, if a doctor stops practising, it doesn't mean that their conduct is no longer investigated. It is important to have that trust. That is what I believe the intent is behind Bill 6, to actually encourage trust in our police, provide that oversight, and the intent of this amendment is simply to provide clarity for Albertans.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, I think we have an example that is very top of mind for many Albertans, particularly Albertans who are in Calgary, where they have a sitting city councillor who has actually not even disputed that he engaged in inappropriate conduct with a minor when he was a police officer. In fact, he tried to imply that there was some kind of consent, at least, or something. You know, it is quite egregious that we have a sitting city councillor who as a police officer sexually assaulted, really – let's be clear – a minor while performing his duties as a police officer. We would not, I think, feel satisfied that that person, that individual, should be not held accountable for what they've done simply because they're no longer a police officer. In fact, that is a breach of public trust, and we certainly deserve, Albertans deserve, I can say Calgarians deserve to be able to hold Mr. Sean Chu accountable not only as a former police officer but, of course, also as a city councillor.

I will take this opportunity to note that we are still seeing no movement from this government on taking action to remove Sean Chu as a sitting city councillor in Calgary, and that continues to send a profoundly insulting and disturbing message not only to Calgarians but particularly to those who may have already been survivors of sexual violence. Really, it's this message that women in particular should not feel safe around their city councillor. So I encourage once again – and I use this opportunity, when we're talking about public trust in police officers and complaints made against police officers, to encourage this government, its cabinet, particularly its Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Justice, to take action, because I think Calgarians have spoken out loud and clear that they expect Sean Chu to be held accountable, and I can say I certainly do as well, Mr. Chair.

7:40

The other piece I want to add to this, which is not necessarily part of this amendment – but I hope we will have an opportunity to bring forward another amendment to address the limitation periods that are in Bill 6. Currently in Bill 6 it talks about – I want to just get the section correct here, Mr. Chair. I know I tabbed it. Apologies. Here we go. It is in section 29 of the bill, and it is set out in the new section 43 proposed for the Police Act. It says that

The chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission shall dismiss any Level 2 or Level 3 complaint that is made more than one year after

- (a) the conduct complained of occurred, or
- (b) the complainant first knew or ought to have known that the conduct complained of had occurred, whichever occurs later.

In plain language it essentially means that the complaint must be brought against a police officer within a year. If it's not brought within that year of when the event occurred or when the complainant became aware of the circumstances leading to the complaint, then it will be dismissed.

I want to remind Albertans that level 2 complaints include those where a police officer may have committed an offence under an act of the Parliament or the Legislature, or level 3 is "a complaint alleges that a police officer has committed a contravention of the regulations governing the discipline of police officers." These are

still significant concerns, and right now Bill 6 puts in a one-year limitation period on that. I would suggest, Mr. Chair, particularly when we're talking about allegations of sexual violence against a police officer, that there should be no limitation period.

Honestly, I think we all know in this House enough about the challenges, both emotionally, psychologically, administratively, all the reasons why there are challenges in bringing sexual assault allegations and claims forward in a timely fashion, not the least of which is, of course, that too often those who bring forward sexual assault or sexual violence allegations are not believed. They are treated very poorly through the whole process. Honestly, Mr. Chair, since we are talking about the context of police, we do know that many fear bringing allegations to the police itself. That is actually where we often see that women in particular but any person who has been subject to sexual violence will be hesitant to go forward to police because the very process can be incredibly traumatizing.

Let's add on, Mr. Chair, that we're talking about allegations of sexual violence potentially being brought to police against a police officer. We can imagine that that provides a huge additional barrier for individuals to bring forward those complaints. Of course, we often know that there are so many emotional factors that go into why a person may not be able to bring an allegation immediately after the event takes place. We know that there is a multitude of complex factors that go into that. I do think it's important that the government consider reviewing the limitation period as set out in Bill 6 and consider removing the limitation period for allegations or complaints against police officers that relate to sexual violence.

In fact, I'm very proud that the NDP government, when they were government, brought forward changes to the limitation periods for civil claims of sexual violence and actually removed the limitation period, recognizing exactly what I just spoke about, Mr. Chair: the challenges of bringing forward those complaints. I bring that in the context of this amendment because when we're talking about a former police officer, we want to ensure that simply no longer being employed as a police officer should not prohibit somebody from bringing a complaint.

Likewise, if the allegation is about sexual violence, that may take place somewhere long after the fact. I think those two amendments are pretty important to consider together because they certainly would apply to the example of Sean Chu in Calgary. You know, he is no longer a police officer, and those claims and allegations, which actually were founded, occurred many, many years ago. We do not want to see another situation where a police officer escapes accountability simply because they're no longer a police officer and the allegation of sexual violence happened many years ago.

I think we understand in this Assembly how important it is to offer those protections to individuals who may be subject to that kind of violence and enable them to access this process, which I again go back to believing was brought with the intention of providing greater transparency, accountability to the public for the actions and conduct of police. If that is the objective, Mr. Chair, I'd argue that the members in this House should vote in favour of this amendment, and if they are not going to vote in favour, I would really, genuinely like the members of the government caucus who may vote against to stand up and express why, why they would not support an amendment that would say that former police officers are also going to be held accountable.

I genuinely hope – we often have the situation, Mr. Chair, where we bring forward thoughtful amendments and they're voted down, and we don't even hear why. I think Albertans need to have an explanation. I certainly would not like it to be that it is voted down simply because it was brought forward by the Official Opposition. This is a thoughtful amendment that is intended to improve

accountability, to meet the objectives set out by this government in this bill, and it should be given due consideration. I do hope that the members of the government will vote in favour of this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, Member.

Others wishing to speak to amendment A2? I see the hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that. I just wanted to add that you can't quit your job and run away from criminal allegations. If a crime has occurred, simply resigning as a police officer doesn't absolve you of responsibility. You can still be investigated for that.

I just wanted to make sure that that was clear for everybody here, because I think it sounded like – if somebody, you know, say, 20-plus years ago had committed a sexual assault, they could still be charged for that, whether they're employed as a police officer or not or if it's under the Police Act. You've still committed a Criminal Code offence. You could still be held responsible for that. I just wanted to clarify that as well. I think that's the only thing I really wanted to touch on, because I think it insinuated that you could somehow do something criminal while a police officer and just simply resign and you've absolved yourself of that responsibility, that you can walk away from it.

The other part of it, the one-year limitation: it does exist. It is to make sure that complaints are handled in a timely manner. I think it's important for people to understand how complaints should be made. I think that having a provincial body as proposed in the main bill is important so that people understand how to make a complaint, how to do it quickly. I think we should get to those complaints and investigate them well to make sure that if any discipline needs to happen, it does happen, that if any training needs to happen, it does. Changes in practices are also important. There are many lawyers who wait one year less a day simply for their favour as well.

So having that one-year limitation: it does exist. I don't see any problem with that. I hope that anybody who has a complaint against a police officer knows where to go and how to make that complaint and also knows that if it's a criminal complaint, that can be investigated regardless of their employment.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, Member.

Others wishing to speak to the amendment? I see the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

**Ms Pancholi:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the member speaking and responding. I just want to clarify: the police review commission is not a criminal body. I don't think that anything in Bill 6 suggests that this is proving criminal allegations. The purpose of the police review commission is to carry out investigations and conduct disciplinary hearings.

What we're saying is that a former police officer should not be able to avoid a disciplinary hearing and a review of their conduct simply because they are no longer employed. It's very different than criminal provisions. That's not what this bill is about. It cannot be establishing a criminal process. The police review commission is about disciplinary hearings.

What we're saying is that certainly it is possible, under the reading of the bill that's currently before us, that a member who is no longer a police officer, who has stepped down, has resigned, has been terminated, cannot have their conduct reviewed for disciplinary purposes as a result of the way Bill 6 is drafted. What we're suggesting is that that former police officer should still be able to, within the

time limitation period set out in the bill, be subject to disciplinary investigation and a hearing.

We're also saying – and I want to go back to the limitation period – that we're not necessarily objecting to one year as a limitation period. What we're saying is that there should be an exception made for those who are making allegations around sexual violence. That was my point, Mr. Chair. We're saying that in those circumstances where an allegation is made around sexual violence and the additional barriers that exist to bringing those claims in a timely fashion, many of which are compounded when those complaints are being made against a police officer, we're expecting somebody who's experienced sexual violence to go to the police to complain about conduct done by a police officer. Those are compounding issues which would create additional barriers. For sexual violence, for which we have recognized in civil law that the limitation period should not apply the same way as other allegations, we're simply suggesting and I put forward – it's not in an amendment right now before the House, but I certainly hope it will be – that that is the consideration.

I just want to be very clear that I do appreciate, though, members of the government standing up to respond, because I think this is the purpose of Committee of the Whole, to have this opportunity to engage back and forth. This is a well-intentioned amendment, simply to make sure that the police review commission, in its authority to conduct a disciplinary hearing, can include former police officers.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

7:50

**The Deputy Chair:** Anyone else wishing to ask questions or make comments on amendment A2?

Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question.

[Motion on amendment A2 lost]

**The Deputy Chair:** Committee, we are back on the main bill, Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022. I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre has risen.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak to Bill 6, the Police Amendment Act, 2022. This is an important bill, and I'm very happy to see it arrive at long last in front of the House. This is a process that, we know, began in 2018, and this is an act that has not seen significant review or a full-scale update since 1988. Certainly, in the years between 1988 and today we have seen significant shifts in many aspects of our society, how we view the treatment of many members of our population. We have learned a lot about inequities that exist in many of the systems that each of us lives under every day. Certainly, we have seen that there are disproportionate impacts within the justice system, and that also affects policing.

Of course, the changes we are making today are not solely about addressing those sorts of inequities and concerns around systemic racism, but they are certainly a large part of the conversation we've been having over, I'd say, the last decade, certainly as we've seen the conversations that arose as we began to see the conversations around Black Lives Matter, with the killing of a number of young, unarmed Black men in the United States, concerns that we have seen that have occurred here. Indeed, you know, we have seen that here in Alberta, the death of Latjor Tuel in Calgary in the last year. His family was just recently here, I believe, just arrived this week from Africa to pay tribute at long last.

I recognize, Mr. Chair, that this has become a very politically fraught conversation. It is wrapped up in what can only be termed a larger culture war, a lot of people wrapping themselves in a lot of

flags, a lot of sloganeering. It has made it difficult in many ways to have the conversations that we really need to have about important changes that need to be made. But what we have in front of us in this bill is, hopefully, some steps that can help to reduce some of that tension. This conversation has been going on for some time, but certainly one point on which all in this conversation are agreed is that police should not be making decisions about police when it comes to a discipline and investigation process. This is one of the most politically fraught aspects of these situations.

When a citizen brings forward a complaint or a concern – indeed, again, this has been a big topic of conversation as we have had these conversations about the impact on racialized communities of policing, the concern that when a citizen brings a complaint forward, that complaint then is considered within the same police department in which the individual to which the complaint is addressed is working. Frankly, what we have heard clearly is that police themselves no longer want to be put in that position, where police officers have to think about how their decision on one of their fellow police members is going to be taken by others within the force. What is the impact that's going to have on relationships? What are the repercussions going to be within there?

They would prefer that this is taken out of their hands and put within an independent body to remove that challenge. Certainly, that is what we hear from citizens and others who have raised concerns about policing, that this should be in the hands of an independent body who themselves will not be influenced by relationships that they may have already and that are pre-existing or biases that may come from being in similar circumstances or knowing these individuals.

That is one of the pieces we indeed see coming forward in this bill, the creation of an independent police commission here in the province of Alberta to handle these complaints. I absolutely support that, Mr. Chair. That is an important and essential step. As I said, I think this is one step that can help to reduce some of the tension in this conversation, if when we have a complaint brought forward, it is considered by a fully independent body that has no connections to the police service or the police officer that is being investigated or against whom the complaint is addressed. That allows for a far more open conversation, that allows for more trust and faith in the decisions that are made, and that allows, hopefully, then, for a better quality of justice and certainly the feeling of a better quality of justice.

Again, Mr. Chair, what we talk about so often when we talk about concerns around conflicts of interest – and that's really what this boils down to – when police are investigating police and holding police accountable, the concern of conflict of interest, is that we must not only have justice be done, but it must be seen to be done. So that means that we go above and beyond to ensure that all involved can be sure that there is no bias in this system. This is important.

You know, when we talk about this, it's easy for, I think, folks to speak up and misconstrue or misunderstand and suggest that by having these conversations or bringing these things forward, people are denigrating police or that by suggesting that there needs to be a heightened level of accountability, we are targeting police. We should be clear. Police are given extraordinary power. In their duty to enforce the law, they are given a wide latitude regarding the use of force, regarding being able to restrain someone, to arrest someone, to place that person in prison. I recognize that there are a number of constraints that are built into that, but the fact is that, if I may revert momentarily to my comic book nerd roots, with great power comes great responsibility.

So if police are granted extraordinary power, there should be an extraordinary system of oversight and accountability. What we are

talking about today is what that accountability looks like. I think we are likely all in this Chamber in agreement with having an independent oversight body. That is an important step, and I'm glad that that is being taken.

Now, I would note that there have been some comments about the way this has been structured. A friend of mine, Dr. Temitope Oriola – again, if we're going to talk about and be honest about conflicts of interest, I'll note that Dr. Oriola is a friend of mine. I have a lot of respect for him. We have some good conversations. He provided advice to the previous Minister of Justice, now the Deputy Premier. He was tasked as a special adviser, and he provided a report to the minister at the time. He is speaking now and giving his opinion on this particular bill, and what he has stated about this independent oversight body is that he has raised a concern that, unlike other jurisdictions, unlike what he says is the standard amongst our peer countries around the world, there is no provision that will prevent a former police officer from serving on this commission. Now, again, that is not to suggest it is impossible for a former officer to impartially assess the actions of a current officer.

8:00

Again, if we are talking about wanting to ensure that we are eliminating even the appearance of a conflict of interest, if we want to ensure that all communities who were affected by the extraordinary power that is granted to police trust in this independent oversight body, there is a question of whether the involvement of police in that oversight body, whether they are former police officers is appropriate. What we see in other jurisdictions is that they have taken steps to have that not be the case. In this case the government is not choosing to do that. I think that's something that should be under consideration, and Dr. Oriola agrees. The reason is, Mr. Chair, that we have a public perception.

I note a recent story which just came out about an officer in Calgary who was charged and under investigation for his treatment of an individual who was in a wheelchair. Video was released in the court, and just released recently this week, which shows that officer pushing over the gentleman in a wheelchair. He was handcuffed in the wheelchair. The officer pushed him over, stepped on his bare foot, and kicked him in the face. I think we're all in agreement, Mr. Chair, that that is unacceptable behaviour under any circumstance. That is an abuse of the power that is granted to a police officer, so it was appropriate that that was reported then by staff at AHS and that was duly investigated.

Now, that officer has been given, in my understanding, a suspended sentence, but the thing is, Mr. Chair, that at that court trial, where this officer was summarily found guilty of inappropriate behaviour, the news report says that at least 15 Calgary police officers attended the court that day to support that officer. Half a dozen of them were in uniform, and after the court ruling they greeted the officer with smiles, hugs, and handshakes to celebrate the fact that he did not go to prison.

Now, Mr. Chair, the judge noted that at the time of the incident that officer was going through a difficult divorce. I think we've all been in circumstances where we are emotionally vulnerable, where we are in a bad state, where our anger may get the better of us, but in this case this, again, was a police officer with extraordinary power, and he allowed that to override and to physically assault an individual who could not fight back.

The appearance of this, that his fellow officers would arrive at a court case where he was found guilty of that assault and congratulate him on escaping a prison sentence: what message does that send to the broader public? What message does that send to others who have experienced potentially abusive police powers? We know it



does happen and it does exist. That is not impugning all police. It is just simply being factual about what we have seen in stories we have seen reported and, unfortunately, reported more often than really should be occurring.

Again, when we have these sorts of situations, one can understand why members of the public who are vulnerable and who statistics show are more likely to experience these sorts of circumstances at the hands of police would have difficulty with the idea that an independent oversight commission that investigates these sorts of incidents should be allowed to have police officers sit on it. When we see, at times, the kind of culture and camaraderie – again, it may simply be a question of these officers not understanding how their actions and their choices in this matter appear to members of the public and people from outside of that culture and that circle. I think we're all familiar with the idea of dome disease, how we ourselves can get caught up in our political culture here and forget sometimes how our actions and words and behaviour can appear to people who are outside of this. Again, I absolutely support the idea of an independent oversight commission, but I indeed share Dr. Oriola's concern that he raises regarding police officers being allowed to serve on this independent oversight commission.

The other piece I would note here is that this government is awarding itself the power to appoint members to municipal police commissions. This is something that some municipal leaders have raised concerns about. Tanya Thorn, the mayor of Okotoks and a board member with Alberta Municipalities, has said that she doesn't love the idea of provincial politicians being able to appoint members of their local police commissions. She notes that those groups need people who understand the local area and its people and policing needs, and there's certainly nothing in the provisions the government is giving itself that says that they have to appoint anybody locally or who knows that community or is involved with that community. What she said was: anything that takes away from our local autonomy as municipalities we always have a concern about.

Of course, Mr. Chair, we've been having some very robust conversation in this Chamber about autonomy and sovereignty and certainly this government's deep concern about anyone taking away its sovereignty and autonomy over areas over which it feels it should have sole jurisdiction, to the point that we have ministers shooting videos using some very interesting old literature that certainly has some questionable commentary about racial history in the province of Alberta. The fact is that I can't help but feel that in some senses this is a government which says one thing and then does another, which sets one standard for itself and has another expectation for others.

Now, the minister did note that in B.C. that is the case – the B.C. government has the ability to appoint members to local police commissions, and that is true – but I would note, Mr. Chair, that it is a very different process. The minister did not note that. It is not the minister by regulation, sitting in his office by stroke of a pen, that simply appoints them; they go through a process, just like we do for independent officers of the Legislature, where a motion is actually brought into the Legislature and in front of all MLAs for consideration before an appointment is made.

We have seen again, repeatedly, that this is a government that likes to try to look for opportunities to give its ministers more power to make these decisions behind closed doors, by the stroke of a pen, without the oversight of the Legislature. Now, this isn't quite the circumstance that we had under Bill 10 or recently was originally in Bill 1, denied by the government for a good while before they finally admitted it was there and amended and took it out, but that said, it is still a circumstance where I think there's reason to question whether this is the appropriate way for the government to

do this or even to have the discussion around whether the government should be appointing members of local police commissions at all.

Certainly, I can say, Mr. Chair, as a representative here in Edmonton's downtown and having seen some of the recent conversations at our local city council and with a number of members in our community about the role of policing in our community and how funding is allocated to police or to other folks who may provide similar services or oversight or other options, we have seen a tendency from this government to weigh in with a bit of a heavy hand. Certainly, their recent appointment of a task force to deal with some issues here in the city made it very clear what their opinion is of a good majority of our city council and certainly our mayor. I was accused today by the Minister of Mental Health and Addiction of politicizing the issue. Let me be clear, Mr. Chair. This government chose to politicize that task force by the means by which they put it together and who they chose to include and exclude.

Certainly, I would have some concern that when we have had the sort of government we have had, who has not been afraid to go in and try to interfere with, say, the College of Physicians & Surgeons of Alberta, which has targeted the Alberta Medical Association, which has gone on a great crusade about the need for greater oversight of the Alberta teachers and taking those things away from them, certainly treating them much different from how it's choosing to treat police officers, this government could choose to use the powers that it wants to give itself to appoint members of a police commission to attempt more interference.

**8:10**

That said, I do appreciate some of the other aspects that are brought forward in this legislation and some of the other pieces that are being put in place: certainly the requirement for police to develop community public safety plans, report annually on their progress on achieving their goals, report greater public transparency and accountability. Indeed, that's what we attempted to bring forward for our health care system in Bill 201 recently, which this government chose to defeat. Certainly, in principle I agree with having greater data and accountability, the requirement to develop a diversity and inclusion plan, again, having better representation.

I've had the opportunity to attend and speak at a number of police graduations as the MLA for Edmonton-City Centre during the time we were in government and certainly always appreciated seeing growing diversity in the ranks, having the opportunity to be there to see folks from diverse communities stepping up as police officers and seeing the difference that makes. For people to see themselves and have people there who understand those communities can make a real difference in building bridges and building trust between our officers of the law and our local communities.

I think, certainly, the provincial guiding principles respecting human rights, recognizing the history and culture of First Nations, et cetera – I'm sorry the government did not want to accept some of the additional suggestions we had, but certainly those are important, too. I look forward to further debate.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Others wishing to speak to Bill 6? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadows.

**Mr. Deol:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm pleased to rise once again in the House to speak to Bill 6, the Police Amendment Act, 2022. I just wanted to state for the record that I know many of my colleagues have said similar words, that the Alberta NDP supports civilian oversight of law enforcement in order to ensure policing is responsive to the needs and diversity of our communities. There

was a time we took some initiatives in this House, and I regretfully remember those moments were not supported by the government House members.

This legislation includes some positive steps, and we welcome this bill in the House. In that regard it is, however, very thin on details regarding how they plan to achieve these goals we are discussing in this bill. The Police Act review was started under the NDP government, and in general this legislation is on the right track, but there are a number of issues that will have to be addressed in a committee for us to support it. There are some questions, concerns. I know many of my colleagues and my colleague from Edmonton-City Centre highlighted those in the House. I just wanted to as well, you know, on behalf of my constituents in Edmonton-Meadows who'd like to be on the record.

This bill leaves too many questions to regulations that are not developed. The bill creates new rules and new compositions for police commissions but allows the minister to appoint up to 50 per cent of provincial representatives to the commission, which, in turn, set local policing priorities. One of the main stated goals for the bill is independent oversight, but this bill technically, looking at what it proposes, is centralizing too much power and discretions with the provincial minister.

As I said, the review of the Police Act started under the NDP government, and the UCP state that this legislation is a result of the findings of that review and subsequent report. Interestingly, we did not see the findings of the reports. We will be happy to see if the UCP will share the findings of those reports or just make those reports public. The question is there: what is the rationale for stacking commissions with up to 50 per cent provincial representatives appointed by the minister? A number of the details on the composition of the policing committee are left, again, up to the regulations. Will the impacted communities and municipalities be consulted on regulations as they're being developed? That is the exact same concern we tried to address when the previous, you know, Justice minister actually promised in the House that they will share the Police Act review very soon.

We brought forward a motion addressing a similar mandate, that the antiracism panel should be constructed to talk to, you know, minorities and consult with racialized communities and Indigenous communities and provide a report back to the Legislature, and that was defeated by the government members.

The powers and the duties of the provincial police advisory board will have the duties and functions set out in the regulations. Why is this important work, why are these being left to regulations and therefore subject to the particular will of the government? The advisory board is intended to represent communities served by the RCMP under the provincial police service agreement. According to the materials provided by government, it is not clear how this representation will happen. How many communities are covered under this service agreement? Will the government be consulting with representatives, communities on regulations that will determine eligibility for requirements? Will there be formal changes to require an Alberta agreement with the RCMP K Division?

Proposed section 21 of the bill proposes an amendment to section 30, ministerial intervention, which would allow the minister to intervene with the council. This section of the act already allows the minister to intervene in the instance that adequate or effective policing services are not being maintained or contravening the act or regulations. What other areas does the minister envision needing to direct the council on regarding policing that is not already covered? Would this include requesting the council to amend funding decisions even when there is no increase in funding? Can you point to best practices and examples from jurisdictions where a

provincial minister has broad discretion to reach in and set local policing priorities.

Proposed section 22 of the act would amend the responsibilities of a police commission to include two new reporting requirements, reporting of policing priorities and annually or on request reporting of the programs and services to implement these priorities. Will the government be increasing financial support for policing to ensure that councils have the ability to provide adequate resources to the commission to meet the requirements of the act? We have seen that many times the government has brought bills forward and passed the legislation, even in many cases setting the timelines, but did not provide the required amount of resources to implement those legislations.

With that, Mr. Chair, I would like to move an amendment on behalf of my colleague the hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall. I think you could probably call this amendment A3. Moved that Bill 6 . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. member, I'll just have you send copies to the table, please, and then we'll have you read it. Thank you.

**Mr. Deol:** Sure. That Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022, be amended as follows . . .

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. member, just wait a moment, please. Thank you.

**Mr. Deol:** Sure. Okay.

8:20

**The Deputy Chair:** Hon. members, this will be amendment A3.

Hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadows, please go ahead and read it into the record.

**Mr. Deol:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Amendment A3 reads that Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022, be amended (a) in section 17(b), in the proposed section 25, by striking out subsections (1.1) and (1.2) and substituting the following:

(1.1) The Minister may appoint additional members to a regional police commission if the Minister considers it necessary, provided that the total number of members appointed by the Minister does not exceed 25% of the total number of commission members.

(b) in section 18 in clause (a), in the proposed section 28, (A) by striking out subsection (2.1) and substituting the following:

(2.1) A commission shall consist of not fewer than 3 nor more than 12 members appointed in accordance with subsections (2.2) and (3).

(B) by striking out subsections (2.3) and (3) and substituting the following:

(3) The Minister may appoint additional members to a commission if the Minister considers it necessary, provided that the total number of members

(a) appointed to the commission does not exceed 12 members, and

(b) appointed by the Minister does not exceed 25% of the total number of commission members.

(ii) in clause (b), by striking out "subsection (2.3)" and substituting "subsection (3)."

Mr. Chair, this amendment reduces the ability of the minister to appoint 50 per from the bill, down to 25 per cent to the police commission. This appointment of authority over the operation and oversight of policing should not be centralized with the minister. In particular, it makes no sense to limit municipal representation so significantly, especially given the cuts to municipal funding and downloaded policing costs.

This amendment also reverts to the 12-member police commissions. We do not support the blatant overreach of the power that the bill in its current form is proposing. This amendment ensures that local voices are the majority at the table in police commissions.

With that, Mr. Chair, I would request all House members to support this amendment A3. Thank you.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Anyone else wishing to speak to amendment A3? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung has the floor.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to rise this evening to speak to such an important amendment and important piece of legislation. As has been mentioned by previous speakers, it is a piece of legislation that has been long coming and one that was initiated by a review that was begun under the NDP in 2018. The UCP, of course, has stated that this legislation is a result of findings of that review and subsequent reports, so we certainly would like to see that report being made public by the UCP and finding out if indeed that report did show what the rationale was for stacking the commissions with up to 50 per cent of provincial representatives appointed by the minister.

The basics of the amendment, Mr. Chair, are to actually get at the concern that we have in the opposition about the percentage of commission members that the minister would be able to appoint, thus affecting the perception of the public in terms of the impartiality of the commission. That's at the root of the concern, I think, of all parliamentarians here in the Legislature when it comes to amending the Police Act, because we are in a time of extreme stress on the reputation of the police not only in our province and our country but throughout the western world, where it is deemed that the police need to really take a close look at how they relate to the public in terms of protection of rights versus the perception of somebody is guilty before – you know, everybody seems to be a guilty party till proven innocent.

Mr. Chair, the police have a rather special obligation – and it seems to have been lost in recent years – to uphold to a higher level a perception of impartiality to the public, and that, I think, is something we're revisiting, hopefully, with this amendment by ensuring that the minister is limited to a 25 per cent total number of commission members that he or she has the ability to appoint. Public trust is absolutely sacrosanct when it comes to many things, and it really, really includes the police. The public has to know that when they are subject to any type of disorder, when criminal activity is found in their neighbourhoods, when indeed we find that there's a threat to our democratic rights, the police can be counted on to be impartial protectors of the law.

When it gets to a police commission hearing, Mr. Chair, if indeed the component membership of a police commission is not deemed in its inception to have been fair, then, of course, the public faith and public trust in the outcome of the commission's findings when they are considering the conduct of police and disciplinary actions will be suspect as well, and that's something we cannot allow to happen. So it's very, very critical that we make sure that we don't do anything that's going to cause the public to have misgivings about the very process we are about to formulate here in this House by setting the terms of membership for police commissions. Giving the minister the ability to appoint up to 50 per cent of the provincial reps is, I think, too much. This amendment serves to restore public faith in the process and to ensure that they believe the police commission will be an impartial body.

We've gotten to a point, Mr. Chair, where when we hear on the news that a police officer has been either charged or has been

accused of misconduct in a particular incident, the public doesn't expect the police officer ever to be found guilty, where there's an expectation of innocence, not necessarily of innocence but the expectation that the officer will be absolved of responsibility or guilt. The expectation of the conviction of a police officer is not something the public has. There's no surprise expressed by almost any member of the public now when a police officer is absolved of responsibility in a situation where they were accused of misconduct. We can look at the case law and look at the numbers and find that it's pretty well documented that the highest percentage of cases do not result in convictions or findings of wrongdoing against police officers. That in and of itself has led to a diminished level of public trust in the whole system of police oversight, public oversight of police officers. That, I hope, is something that the government is really wanting to address and rectify, because it's something that I can't imagine the police would want otherwise as well.

**8:30**

Police officers are part and parcel of many families of members of this Legislature, and you don't have to go very far beyond anybody's family to know that there are police officers close to one's family. They live amongst us, and we are grateful for their service, but they would be the first ones to know that the public trust is what they need to have in order to function properly. Often you hear it said that the police officer's best defence is their mouth, in other words talking. You don't gain somebody's trust without being able to communicate properly. At the very basic street level – I'm sure most police officers will agree – if that initial trust isn't there, then you've got a much more difficult job ahead of you to form relationships which will help you in your policing on the street or at higher level investigations.

The limitations that we are proposing in this amendment, Mr. Chair, will go a long ways to ensuring that the public trust in the whole process is encouraged or is augmented by the changes to the Police Act that we are contemplating under Bill 6. I hesitate to say that this in and of itself will cure the lack of trust that many people have in the oversight system that we have in this province of the police services. I think that if indeed we would have had a different composition of police commission members, we might have ended up, potentially, with different outcomes and findings in some of the cases that have been before them in the most recent years and even in past years. We shouldn't be in a judgment situation in a police commission hearing where the outcome is almost going before it, where there is no expectation that there may be a finding of guilt.

I know that those who are in more vulnerable populations than myself certainly have about zero faith in ever having a police officer found guilty of misconduct. The cases are so rare that they actually make much bigger news than the cases of police acquittal. That's not to say that the system is totally broken, but it certainly has lost the public trust that it needs to have in order to function properly.

As has been noted by the Member for Edmonton-City Centre, police officers will be the first ones to say that they are not comforted by being judge and jury. They don't want to have an overabundance of members on a commission, and they want the public trust in the whole process. The last thing that police officers want is a disconnect between themselves and the public, because once that trust is gone, their job is almost impossible to do.

Their job is a difficult one. I've been on a ride-along. That was a one-day contract for a dollar when I was a volunteer in the Solicitor General's court intake unit. That in and of itself was a bit of an eye-opener. But there are police officers in my family. My sister is married to an RCMP officer who is retired now after 25 years, so I've had that through him and his experiences and those of his

brother, who's a city constable, now retired, and many others who I grew up with in Edmonton. I think half of the recruited members for the years 1975 to 1980 probably came from my neighbourhood of Wellington Park under the Edmonton Police Service, because as we go down the street, there were – I don't know – 10 or 12 members from my graduating class that actually went into the Police Service.

There's a large understanding that, you know, police officers are us and that we are them but not necessarily in communities that are found closer to the inner city. We certainly see that the police officers are underrepresented when it comes to people of colour, minorities, Indigenous populations, and that's an ongoing problem that police organizations are attempting to address. But there's a lot – a lot – of work that needs to be done, and part of it is because of this trust issue, Mr. Chair, that we need to address and that we hope to address in part by the amendment that we're contemplating this evening by making sure that the complement of individuals that can be appointed by the minister to police commissions is limited to 25 per cent rather than the 50 per cent that the bill has in place currently.

I encourage members to take a serious look at this amendment, realize that it is put forward in very good faith, that it is an idea that wasn't drafted up over coffee just before we got here. It's something that we feel strongly about on this side of the House, and I think that it should be accepted by other members of this Legislature and the government members as a very respectful and carefully considered amendment that will help heal the trust issue that exists in Alberta between the public and the police.

The attempts that have been made in the past to do this perhaps have been stymied by some of the issues of the membership makeup of police commissions, and I hope that the goal of the government isn't to centralize the appointment process so that it rests primarily with the minister to appoint police commissions although that seems to be part of the underlying philosophy. The local nature of police commissions, I think, is their strength, is something that they have a long-standing tradition of, and I don't think it's a problem that needs to be solved. I think that the minister is perhaps creating another problem that didn't have to be created and creating another source of distrust with the public by reserving unto himself or herself the ability to nominate or appoint 50 per cent of the members of a police commission. I can't think that it was anything but a deliberate attempt, and I hope they will reconsider, chat amongst themselves as a caucus, and come up in support of this amendment and look at it in the spirit in which it was brought forward.

I don't know if there are any other members who wish to speak to this amendment. I'd like to encourage members on the other side to do so because I'd like to hear their opinions as to our well-considered offer of limiting the percentage of members to a police commission that a minister might appoint. I think I see members opposite rushing to stand to speak, so I'll yield my seat.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

I see the hon. chief government whip has risen.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Oh, the many titles tonight, Mr. Chair. Thank you. First off, I just want to agree that public trust is extremely important, that being impartial is extremely important, but when we're talking about public trust, I think that you can damage public trust by openly speculating that if only there were different people at the time, there would have been different outcomes in a conviction. Without more examples – I don't doubt that they exist, but I think that talking about it like a disciplinary hearing or going before a judge is a predetermined outcome just isn't accurate. There

probably are examples of it, but I think that to say that they are all like that just isn't true.

**8:40**

People's perceptions, though, may be of that, and I think we need to work on that. But I think that how we phrase it we need to be somewhat careful on so that we're just not perpetuating that misconception. I know officers who have been before disciplinary hearings, who have gotten in trouble, who've had additional training, who have been fined, who have been fired – that all exists – people who have been convicted of crimes. These things all happen, and I think we need to make sure that the public is aware that when somebody is performing poorly or they do something egregious or something criminal, they should be held accountable for that. I think we can all agree on that.

I just want to highlight, though, that in regard to this amendment it says that if they're appointing more members, it has to remain less than 50 per cent. In section 17 it already lays out the number of members that the minister can appoint. It keeps it below 50 per cent. I don't agree that the minister of public safety – we know who it is today – five years from now or 10 years from now is simply going to use that mechanism to be able to skew outcomes. I just don't agree with that. I think that there are enough checks and balances in our system to make sure that those people who are appointed to that are vetted, are watched, and that if there are issues, it is dealt with. I just wanted to add that.

I think that having provincial appointments to these boards is important as well because we are looking at a province-wide complaints system. Having some provincial input and feedback to the province can be helpful in making sure that the system is working for the public.

**The Deputy Chair:** Other members wishing to ask questions or add comments to amendment A3?

[Motion on amendment A3 lost]

**The Deputy Chair:** We are back on the main bill, Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022. Anyone looking to add to the debate? I see the hon. Member for St. Albert has risen.

**Ms Renaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's my pleasure to rise and speak in committee to Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022. It's unfortunate that these amendments continue to be defeated. It was my hope, I think, that this new front bench and new sort of collection of people that are in charge would be a little bit more open to making their legislation better or working with the opposition to try to make it better, and that just doesn't seem to be the case, which is unfortunate.

In any event, what I would like to say and add my voice to what my colleagues have said is that it is profoundly disappointing, Mr. Chair, that this government has once again demonstrated that they basically have earplugs or earbuds or whatever you want to call it in their ears and that they are just not listening to Albertans. I think Albertans have been very, very clear over the last while – I don't recall the exact date where the UCP started to talk about a provincial police force, but I think Albertans on the whole have been fairly clear that it's not something they're interested in. I think organizations like Alberta Municipalities, Rural Municipalities of Alberta have been fairly straightforward and fairly clear that this is not their priority. So it is unfortunate but not too surprising that we see once again that the UCP is just unwilling to hear from Albertans and hear what they want.

It's been significant opposition, so let me just put on the record once again that in the community that I represent, which is St. Albert, the mayor and council and the people of St. Albert have been crystal clear that this is not something that they're interested in pursuing. They are quite satisfied with the way things are right now in St. Albert, and they have some really heavy priorities for the next few years, over the next few years, as all municipalities do. They have numerous challenges, and they recognize, as do others, Mr. Chair, that there's a huge cost, there's a huge price tag to this.

But this UCP government doesn't seem to be too concerned about spending a lot of money, spending a lot of taxpayer money on things that Albertans, taxpayers don't actually want, you know, like a pipeline to nowhere because they're betting on Trump getting re-elected or a ridiculous war room, yet they'll tell disabled Albertans that they need to tighten their belts because we're having rough financial times right now, so they're going to deindex their measly little disability pension, and they just need to suck it up. But you know what? Provincial police force? No problem; we got the money for that. That is unfortunate.

St. Albert has been very clear, the mayor and council have been very clear that this is not something they're interested in. I think they've also been very clear that there has been very little to zero consultation with the communities that will be impacted, and St. Albert is one of those communities. We don't have a St. Albert police force. Well, we actually use the RCMP, and there's actually a terrific relationship with the RCMP on the whole.

I think they have done a lot of work over the last few years, and as I'm going to sort of touch on some of the work that they've done, I would just like to thank the women and men who serve in St. Albert, the RCMP detachment in St. Albert. I have had a chance to meet with their commander and the women and men that work there, and I think they do extraordinary work. Certainly, it's always in the news when we hear about problems or those bad apples or officers that are choosing to do things that are against the law. But for the most part the people in St. Albert, anyway – I'm deeply grateful for their service, and I'm thankful that they're there when we need them, and they're always there when we need them in St. Albert. Again I thank the women and men who serve with the RCMP.

One of the things that this bill purports to do – as I was looking through some of the notes about this particular bill, you know, it almost seems like a bit of an afterthought, Mr. Chair. I like it. I'm not going to say that I don't like it because I actually appreciate that it's in here. One of the things that the legislation – it would require police to develop diversity and inclusion plans. That's awesome. That's fantastic. I think that developing diversity and inclusion plans is terrific. But I find it really, really strange that this particular government has paid so little attention to supporting diversity and inclusion in their other work, yet this is something that they feel is so important.

Now I'm just going to give you a really small example of that. Now, inclusion can include all kinds of things. I guess that's the whole point of the word: it's a bit of an action word; it's a verb in some instances. But it requires measurement. It requires a goal, and it requires measurement, and it requires thoughtful evaluation, and then it requires more work. In the portfolio that I am fortunate to be critic for, Seniors, Community and Social Services, inclusion is vitally important. It is vitally important in education, in health care, in every area, really.

But what this government has failed to do – and we know this because we have been repeatedly asking questions to different ministries through Public Accounts for years now, Mr. Chair. When we're in session, every single Tuesday morning there we are, asking

questions of officials of different ministries. Of course, as you can imagine, frequently my questions are around inclusion and diversity and about measures. "You say that you have spent this many millions in Advanced Education to promote the education and therefore future employment of people with disabilities. That's terrific that you're investing all these millions. Where are your metrics? Are they getting employed after finishing, after graduating? Are they graduating? At what rate?" But we don't get any of that because this government doesn't seem really interested in doing a deep dive. Certainly, to see this mentioned in a piece of legislation, diversity and inclusion: great idea, love it, love it, would love to see it everywhere. But, Mr. Chair, I'm a little disappointed that their track record is so sad.

I will have a chance to stand up a little later and chat a bit more, but I'm going to talk about the policing committee in St. Albert. This act proposes a number of changes to work with committees, but St. Albert is so far ahead in this work in terms of their goals and their plans and their monitoring and their reporting. Their reporting to council and the community is transparent and open. Why I will spend some time focusing on that is because it is very clear, when you see what is in this bill and the plans that this government has, that they have not done the consultation they need to do. Otherwise, they would know better.

With that, I will take my seat. Thank you.

8:50

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Other members wishing to add to debate on the main bill? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has risen.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to rise and speak to Bill 6 in Committee of the Whole. This is my first opportunity to speak to this bill, so I'm just going to make some broad comments initially, and then I do have an amendment to introduce.

I'll make some comments to begin with, starting with: Bill 6 does have some positive steps inside of it. Certainly, the Alberta NDP supports civilian oversight of law enforcement. We need to make sure that policing is responsive to the needs of our community. The Police Act and its revisions is something that's been a priority both under the NDP government, when a review was started – and that work has continued through under the UCP government, where this legislation has been introduced. Now, there are a number of issues with Bill 6 that, through the Committee of the Whole process, the Official Opposition is trying to address. Now, often we see legislation that leaves too much to regulations that are not yet developed – that is a common theme with the government in the legislation we've seen introduced over the last three years – and we see that again here.

We've introduced a number of amendments that I think would have materially improved Bill 6 and done some very important things, starting with amendment A1, which we talked about earlier today, enshrining the principles of intersectionality, antiracism, and trauma-informed practice into Alberta's police services, making sure that these principles are included, because we know they are key to creating a safe community for everyone. That amendment would have ensured that intersectionality, antiracism, and trauma-informed practices were a cornerstone for community safety and policing structures. Certainly, I know a lot of my colleagues spoke significantly towards that earlier today.

We also offered amendment A2, talking about making sure that the jurisdiction of police commissions for review of the conduct of a police officer is protected as well as just recognizing that, in line with other professions and other regulated bodies like, for example,

the medical profession – making sure that an individual cannot avoid justice by quitting, being fired, or moving to a different police force: that was amendment A2.

Amendment A3, which I thought my hon. colleagues from Edmonton-Meadows and Edmonton-McClung did an excellent job putting forward – really, seeing the minister appoint up to 50 per cent of the members of these boards is quite concerning, particularly in an environment where municipal governments are having some of their influence damaged by the downloading of costs and the budget pressures that are being put on. Having that oversight and operation centralized to the minister does not make sense. That amendment would have reverted to the 12-member police commission and not really put forward some of the overreach we see, because we really want local voices to be a majority at the table of the police commission.

Again, there are some positive steps that this bill is attempting to move forward on, but there's a lot of concern about the details in the implementation.

With some of those introductory comments, I would like to put an amendment on the record, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you.

This will be amendment A4.

If you could read it into the record for us, please.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that Bill 6, Police Amendment Act, 2022, be amended in section 29, in the proposed section 43, as follows: (a) in subsection (1) (i) by adding "Subject to subsections (2) and (2.1)," immediately before "The chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission shall" and (ii) by striking out "one year" and substituting "2 years"; (b) by adding the following immediately after subsection (2):

(2.1) The chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission must not dismiss any Level 2 or Level 3 complaint under subsection (1) if the complaint relates to

- (a) sexual assault or battery,
- (b) any misconduct of a sexual nature, other than a sexual assault or battery, if, when the subject matter of the complaint occurred,
  - (i) the complainant was a minor,
  - (ii) the complainant was in an intimate relationship with the person who is the subject of the complaint,
  - (iii) the complainant was dependant, whether financially, emotionally, physically or otherwise, with the person who is the subject of the complaint, or
  - (iv) the complainant was a person under disability.

(c) by striking out subsection (4) and substituting the following:

- (4) If a complainant in a Level 2 or Level 3 complaint refuses or fails to participate in an investigation, the chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission may dismiss the complaint if
  - (a) the complainant has been provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate in the investigation, and
  - (b) the chief executive officer is satisfied that the refusal or failure of the complainant to participate is not the result of intimidation by the person who is the subject of the complaint.

Mr. Chair, this amendment is doing two distinct things. First, you will note that in section (a) it is striking out "one year" and substituting "2 years," so aligning the time limit on filing a complaint against a police officer with the statute of limitations on similar conduct for wrongdoing that is not of a criminal nature. We are putting forward this amendment quite seriously and after a great deal of consideration because it's very important for Albertans to have access to justice in all its forms. Increasing the time limit for

the filing of complaints against police officers is in line with the values of ensuring there's access to justice as well as aligning with other time limits for filing complaints against a police officer.

Certainly, we understand that when someone experiences wrongdoing, it can take time to process a situation, to understand what's happening, to understand the impacts, or even to understand what the course of justice can look like, because it may not always be easily accessible or understood for someone who has been a victim or is involved in a complaint like this. I think that the move from one year to two years is a reasonable and measured choice to make. If the government is not supportive, I would be very interested in hearing any specific or detailed reasons on the difference between one year versus two years, because the extended timeline, to me, would provide access to justice, does assist someone who has potentially been a victim or is a complainant, and, I think, makes good sense.

Now, the second part of this amendment is also incredibly important – that is part (b) – because it essentially removes the timeline entirely when there is a complaint that relates to sexual assault or battery or misconduct of a sexual nature when the complainant was a minor; when the complainant was in an intimate relationship with the person who is the subject; when the complainant was a dependant, whether financially, emotionally, physically, or otherwise; or a person under disability. Specifically talking about someone who was the victim of sexual assault or battery or misconduct of a sexual nature, I think we need to recognize and acknowledge the distinct trauma that happens to an individual who has been victimized by these types of crimes and the reasons why sometimes it can take years before someone is prepared to come forward and to report these crimes. This is known, and we have adjusted legislation in this very Chamber to acknowledge the trauma that can happen and to extend timelines when it comes to the criminal nature of these types of incidents.

**9:00**

Here we are asking for those timelines to be removed when we are talking about this complaint process as part of Bill 6, and this again, like I said with section (a) and section (b), aligns the complaint procedure time limits with the same statute of limitations that ensures police officers are held to the same standards of justice as lay people.

I know I have other colleagues who would like to speak to this, so I will conclude my remarks with that, only to say that I hope that the government will seriously consider the context and the situations that we are talking about with this amendment A4, because I think this is one where we can come to an agreement and improve Bill 6 when it comes to the complaint timelines. We'd be pleased to work with the government to be successful with amendment A4.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Others wishing to speak to amendment A4? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has risen.

**Ms Pancholi:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to rise and speak in support of the amendment just proposed by my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods. I've already placed on the record this evening my thoughts about why it's critically important that we remove any limitation period related to allegations of sexual assault, sexual battery, sexual violence against a police officer. This is a very thoughtful amendment that's meant to align with, really, measures that were already taken when we were in government to remove limitation periods for complainants to bring forward claims

of sexual violence in civil court. It does not need to be said again that it is very clearly established, the multiple layers of challenges of bringing timely sexual assault allegations, for a variety of very complex reasons.

I will come back, Mr. Chair, to the example of Sean Chu, a city councillor. If this Assembly will note, the allegations that actually were founded and were the basis of reprimand of councillor Chu when he was a police officer were because of sexual conduct that was made against a minor, a 16-year-old, in 1997. Now, I believe in this circumstance that young woman was incredibly brave and came forward with those allegations quite quickly, but one can imagine a 16-year-old may not be in a position to be able to bring forward such an explosive allegation against a police officer, somebody in a position not only of trust but of power. I think we can all imagine how many young people would not be able to bring forward an allegation like that, particularly not within a year. A year from when this incident took place, that young woman was only 17. We cannot expect that somebody who has suffered sexual violence from a police officer should only have a year to bring forward that complaint, again, not for criminal proceedings but for disciplinary purposes against a police officer.

This is simply, I believe, a common-sense amendment. As my colleague mentioned, we are absolutely willing to work with government to make this happen. We are simply wanting clarity that there is no limitation period for a complaint to be made against a police officer on the basis of sexual assault or sexual battery. This is the decent thing to do. Again, it is about ensuring that the public can have trust in its police, that there is accountability, and that we continue to respect those police officers who do conduct themselves by professional standards and perform their duties well to serve Albertans and their local communities as well. We owe them as well an obligation to make sure that when there are police officers who do not conduct themselves in that way, there is accountability. It ensures that the public has faith in those who are protecting them.

I just simply wanted to add my comments once again to say, please – I sincerely hope that the government members will consider this amendment in the thoughtful way that it has been presented and that they'll work with us to find a way to make this happen.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, Member.

Anyone else wishing to speak to amendment A4? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

**Member Irwin:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, truly, to my colleagues who have spoken tonight on Bill 6 and on the amendments. I tweeted about it. I just noted that – just really proud to be able to serve with colleagues who are, you know, just sharing such eloquent thoughts. My colleague from Edmonton-City Centre brought forth a lot of really powerful ideas related to the impacts on racialized communities, and of course he's done some really great work, which you can find at Alberta's Future, including his work on race-based data, and my colleague from Edmonton-Whitemud, of course. Yeah. I'm going to echo a few of her comments here shortly but, again, particularly her comments around police accountability and her very apt and timely example of city councillor Sean Chu.

Okay. This amendment that we have in front of us is a really, really important one. Like my colleague to the left of me, I too want to urge the members of this Chamber to collaborate with us and to really consider the power of this amendment. As was noted, this amendment aligns the time limit on filing a complaint against a police officer with the statute of limitations on similar conduct and

increases the time limit for two years that is not of a criminal nature. What that essentially means is that, you know, there won't be a time limit at all when it comes to, say, sexual assault.

I want to just bring this Chamber back to conversations that we had in this very House starting in about – I should've checked the timing on this, but for sure starting in early 2021, related to victims of crime. Bill 16, I believe – I still don't remember the bill name, but time is confusing, as you all know, being in a pandemic. Victims of crime was a piece of legislation that we pushed back against because one of the things that it did was it narrowed the window for survivors to report. We talked about it. We stood up. We had people – I remember I talked to two young women on social media who were willing to share their stories, and they basically said incredibly powerful stories. One of them, who'd never shared her experience of horrific sexual assault, shared it publicly in the hopes that this government would change their mind, so that they would remove that window. They didn't. They didn't.

However, fast-forward two-plus years, we've seen, through some of the consultations that have been done on victims of crime, that they've reversed that decision, which was the right thing to do. It should never have been done in the first place. But the point is, bringing it back to this amendment, that we know that survivors need time. They need time, and that's a fact. You know, this government, this current minister responsible for status of women, that fellow has gone on the record even just today talking about gender-based violence and talking about how his government is taking this seriously, and I applaud that. I support that. We need to see investments. We need to see investments in housing, in prevention. The list goes on. I support that. But this is an opportunity today to show that you really are serious about sexual violence and sexual assault.

I assure you, Mr. Chair, that I won't refer to the presence or absence of members, but I must say that, you know, today I've seen the Member for Calgary-Glenmore, the Member for Chestermere-Strathmore, both of whom held the role of minister of status of women. I would love – I haven't heard them speak. Again, not saying whether or not they're in this Chamber right now. I haven't heard them speak, however, and I'd love to hear them stand up and speak to the importance of this amendment. They might not hold those titles now, but they can be leaders. I know both of them. I remember speaking to both of those individuals in their roles, and I'm not putting it just on them as women – absolutely not – but they both held those roles. I spoke to both of them about the importance of addressing sexual violence and gender-based violence, and I know both of them took that seriously. That's my call to folks who I know care about these issues, to put a little bit of action behind the words that they've shared with me.

The case of Sean Chu is a horrific example, and I don't want to talk about him too much more, but what a perfect case study in why we need to amend Bill 6 and why all of us working together can do the right thing, not just for the survivor involved in that situation but for future survivors as well.

Like I said, I've had the opportunity to hear from a lot of survivors in my role as the critic for status of women and 2SLGBTQ-plus people. That's a reminder to me as well that, again, we're not just talking about women who are survivors or victims of sexual assault or sexual violence. We know that members of the 2SLGBTQ-plus community are disproportionately impacted.

**9:10**

We know, as an example, that racialized trans folks experience the highest levels of violence and discrimination. We know that Indigenous women experience far higher levels of violence and discrimination than their Caucasian counterparts here in Canada.

We know that Alberta has the second-highest number of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls, right? So we've got a lot – we've got a lot – we need to work on here in Alberta. We do. I know that everybody in this House is aware of that.

I heard the Minister of Indigenous Relations stand in this House and deliver a powerful statement, and in his statement he, too, talked about the need to address violence against Indigenous women, and using the words – I think the words that I've used way too many times in this House and many of you as well who've delivered either ministerial or members' statements, saying that words aren't enough. We need action, right? I know I'm a broken record on that.

Fortunately, in my role as an opposition MLA I do have to use words a lot, and I do have to urge this government to do the right thing and to, in this case, accept our amendment. I'm hopeful they will. I've heard a rumour that they're looking at it and that they are assessing it. I won't presuppose the outcome of this House, but that makes me hopeful. I'd also love to see, you know, perhaps more members speak to not just this amendment but the bill broadly. I've heard both in second reading and in committee as well a lot of really important questions being asked around Bill 6 and, you know, not getting a lot of answers.

I can again say – and I know that I'm obviously biased – that, you know, on this side of the House we've done a lot of consultation. We've done a lot of consultation with racialized communities, with women, with the 2SLGBTQ-plus community. So it's not just us. It's not just me, a White cisgender woman with a whole heck of a lot of privilege, asking you to do the right thing; it's all of us.

Mr. Chair, I would just really urge this entire House to do the right thing tonight and to support us in this amendment. Thank you for listening.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you to the hon. member.

Looking for others wishing to speak to the amendment. I see the hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think that the members opposite have made some good points. I don't disagree with that. In my time in policing it can take victims of sexual violence many years if not decades to come forward and to report an incident that has occurred to them. Some early on don't want to be retraumatized. They are intimidated. There are many factors for that individual that might dictate when and how they decide to come forward.

I'd like to just point out that subsection (2) says, "Despite subsection (1), the chief executive officer of the Police Review Commission may extend the time for making a complaint in accordance with the regulations." I know that the members opposite often say, "Well, we don't see the regulations" or "We don't trust what the minister is going to put in the regulations." Okay. I would, you know, take those arguments back. But at the same time, when they bring up the Sean Chu incident, would two years have been enough at this point? Are we looking for something further or something broader in regulation that can be more flexible in making sure that we are capturing different circumstances that are coming up as well?

I think the purpose of this is to address this in regulation, as I understand it, and that would provide further flexibility later on as well to be able to make changes as needed, keeping and respecting the fact that there are many victims who take a long time to come forward. It also doesn't absolve anybody of a criminal charge either. If they've committed a crime, this one year does not apply to that. Those charges can still come at any time.

With that, Mr. Chair, I will take my seat.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you.

Others wishing to speak to amendment A4? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the government responding on this. I will say that what it sounds like: rather than removing timelines for someone who is potentially the victim of sexual assault or battery, they are asking that person to go through additional hoops to get an exemption to a process that by default they would potentially try to make a complaint, be told that the timeline has expired, and then have to do additional work. That's the type of barrier that this amendment is trying to avoid, in line with what we've seen for other court processes in other legislation. I appreciate the government's response, but it does not address what we are trying to do here: increasing access to justice and recognizing the impact of these types of traumatic incidents when it comes to somebody reporting and seeking that justice.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you.

I see the hon. Member for Leduc-Beaumont has risen.

**Mr. Rutherford:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't want to see the regulations put in additional hoops either. I think it needs to be clear what the expectations are so that that is also clear to the public.

The one to two years: making that the cap, then, would put additional – if there are additional hoops, they would then come at the two-year-plus mark. The regulations need to cover these kinds of things off – I don't disagree – but I think that the regulations could provide the flexibility necessary to ensure that if there are barriers that are coming up, they can be quickly changed, and we are respecting the fact that intimate partner violence or sexual violence can take people a very long time to come forward with. They will come forward in their own time, in their own way, and we just need to make sure that we are as flexible as possible and make sure that that can still be reported, respected, and dealt with as well.

**The Deputy Chair:** Others wishing to speak to amendment A4? The hon. Member for Chestermere-Strathmore.

**Mrs. Aheer:** Thank you. I'll just be quick. Thank you very much for this discussion, and thank you to our government members for answering back to you.

I think one of the things that is really important, particularly when we're talking about the Sean Chu incident, is that multiple times this person went back to try and actually change the course of that situation. What's happening right now is that we're actually giving parameters around the work that actually has to be done initially, which I think actually changes the outcome, particularly in that situation. She was 16 when it first happened, so she had no advocacy. On top of that, we have coercive control, which means that you have a person in a position of power holding that over a young person.

There are several things that need to happen, but if we don't have timelines and parameters to actually make this happen – the regulation, in my opinion, will actually help to set the standard for how it is that we come forward with this information. The biggest issue we had in that particular situation and others who are dealing with domestic violence and sexual assault is like the member said: they come forward in their own time. But for those who are coming forward, who find the strength to come forward initially, at that beginning part there has to be a way for the system to be actually able to manage and help out initially. That's how the system failed this particular person who was assaulted when she was 16.



I really think that this is a great jumping-off point to understand, and I think as we go forward and understand how it's going to – I mean, unfortunately, when we're dealing with this, the person is already a survivor. The act has already been perpetrated. There have to be parameters around being able to actually get action done initially, because that's how we failed this person initially.

Thank you.

**The Deputy Chair:** Other members wishing to speak to amendment A4?

Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion on amendment A4 lost]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:19 p.m.]

[Fifteen minutes having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mr. Reid in the chair]

For the motion:

|      |          |          |
|------|----------|----------|
| Dach | Irwin    | Renaud   |
| Deol | Pancholi | Shepherd |
| Gray |          |          |

Against the motion:

|        |            |             |
|--------|------------|-------------|
| Aheer  | Loewen     | Singh       |
| Allard | Long       | Smith, Mark |
| Amery  | Lovely     | Stephan     |
| Fir    | Milliken   | Toor        |
| Getson | Nally      | Turton      |
| Horner | Neudorf    | van Dijken  |
| Hunter | Rowswell   | Walker      |
| Issik  | Rutherford | Yao         |
| Jean   | Schow      |             |

|         |         |              |
|---------|---------|--------------|
| Totals: | For – 7 | Against – 26 |
|---------|---------|--------------|

[Motion on amendment A4 lost]

**The Deputy Chair:** We are now back on the main bill, Bill 6, the Police Amendment Act, 2022. I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre has risen.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity just to say a few brief words. As I mentioned earlier, I was looking forward to this legislation coming forward. It's been a long time coming. There are some very important things here for many communities I have spoken with in terms of addressing some long-standing issues and making some very important updates in how we approach policing in the province of Alberta.

It has been disappointing to see government members turn down every amendment we have brought forward, some reasonable amendments around providing more time for folks who are in particular situations such as having suffered sexual assault or are a minor or other things to add more time to be able to report, to making changes to the number of individuals the minister would be able to appoint to a commission, to ensuring that a police officer could not simply choose to move to a different jurisdiction to escape a disciplinary hearing.

Ultimately, other concerns have been raised by folks in the community. Indeed, I know that one Treaty 6 chief has spoken out saying that this bill would alter their relationship with law enforcement and that they had not been consulted by this government on that. So while there are elements of this bill that certainly I support, I feel that at this point in principle I cannot vote

in favour. Certainly, I recognize that this government has a majority and has the ability to move forward with those portions, so things like an independent investigatory body, despite the concerns I have, will still have the opportunity to move forward in the province of Alberta. But, again, on point of principle, I feel that I cannot vote in favour of this legislation. But should we have the opportunity to form government in the next election, I certainly would look forward to being able to make some of those changes and improve on this act.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Other members wishing to speak to Bill 6?

Seeing none, I'm prepared to call the question.

[The remaining clauses of Bill 6 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Chair:** Opposed? That is carried.

## Bill 2

### Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022

**The Deputy Chair:** Anyone wishing to provide comments, questions, or amendments? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud has risen.

**Ms Pancholi:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to rise again in Committee of the Whole, this time to speak to Bill 2, the Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022. You know, I mentioned this in my comments in second reading, and I think it needs to be said again, because there is no doubt about it that this is one of the most pressing issues that Albertans have been speaking about, which is affordability. When we think about the rise in inflation – and this is not a surprise. We've seen this happening for well over a year now. There are lots of complex reasons for that. One of the things that, when I'm door-knocking in my constituency and, actually, many other constituencies across the province, I talk about: we need to be having thoughtful and more fulsome conversations about what exactly are the causes and sources of inflation as well as what we can do to address them. I always say that any provincial politician who's going to stand at your door and tell you that they're going to solve global inflation is not being honest with you. These are complex issues as a result of lots of geopolitical factors, including, obviously, the horrific war on Ukraine, the supply chain issues going back to the pandemic. There are lots of complex reasons.

9:40

But what provincial elected officials can do are two things, Mr. Chair. It's what I keep telling my constituents. One thing is that we can certainly ensure that we do not make things more expensive for Albertans. We do not increase the things that we have control over such as things like car insurance, things such as utility. Where we have the capacity to make things less expensive, we should also do that. The two things are: don't make things more expensive, and when you can make them less expensive, do so. Pretty simple. Put more money into the pockets of Albertans. That's what they care about right now. They are not seeing their wages and income go up the same way. We have to be really certain that we are focused on those issues right now because that's what Albertans are focused on.

Knowing those two things, you know, we have to look at the various choices that this government has made to date that have added costs on. They did not cause inflation – I'm not going to stand here and say that because that is not true – but this government has done a number of things to make things more expensive for Albertans, not just in this high inflationary period that we've seen over the last year but prior to that, in many, many ways that we've all spoken about quite often in this House.

You know, we saw, of course, the removal of the tuition cap freeze. We saw the removal of utility caps, of car insurance caps. I know Albertans and I know Edmontonians are feeling this right now and Calgarians are feeling this because of the massive underfunding and cuts to municipalities. Albertans across this province are seeing their municipal taxes go up because municipalities do not, and should not, have the ability to be able to carry debt. Because of that, they do not have enough revenue to provide services. Therefore, they are in many situations forced not only to increase property taxes but to now cover through their taxes things that the UCP are no longer funding. We've seen downloaded costs onto municipalities for so many things, including, you know, policing, which we were just speaking about in the previous bill debate, Mr. Chair.

We also know school fees have gone up. We had a limit on school fees when we were in government. We've seen all of these costs – oh, and tuition. Let's not even talk about tuition. Actually, let's talk about tuition because so many students are seeing their tuition astronomically increase over the last few years, Mr. Chair. Why is that? Because this government does not value and does not support and does not invest in our postsecondary system.

You know, this used to be a place where Alberta would have high-quality postsecondary institutions and they'd have low tuition. It was a perfect opportunity to really attract and draw people to Alberta postsecondaries for our outstanding programs. I myself am a proud graduate from the University of Alberta. It is heartbreaking for me to see not only the cuts that have been instituted by this government on the University of Alberta – I'm so proud to have graduated from there – but to see the effect that that has on so many of the staff who work at the University of Alberta and, of course, directly on students as well.

Affordability. I already think that this government has broken the first rule, which is: don't make things more expensive. They've done it in a number of ways. And then we said: let's bring down costs where we can. This is where I think Bill 2 comes into play, where it's clearly an attempt by the government to put some more money back into Albertans' pockets. Now, we've already indicated we support measures to do that, but it is our job to stand here and call to account how the government has chosen to deliver that. We see some serious challenges in the way that the affordability programs are proposed to be implemented and what's set out in Bill 2.

We have raised already in this House, and I will continue to do so, how many Albertans are excluded from these supports. So many Albertans, 2 million, don't receive the direct \$100 per month supports that are outlined in this bill. Now, some of those Albertans, of course, will be well over the \$180,000 income threshold. I think we can agree that that's probably not appropriate, to provide financial supports where it's not needed, but the problem is that there are a significant number of Albertans who are in need who do not qualify, who have single incomes but who don't have children. Maybe they even have double incomes but don't have children, so for some reason their struggles are not of value to this government. They're not seen. They're not even visible to this government. They're apparently told to make do. If they drive, because not all of them do – if we think about, for example, postsecondary students, they take transit – they may get some relief from fuel tax exemptions, but that's only if they drive. Many of them don't. That's not a direct

input into their bank account, which is what they need. They actually need to have some additional support.

I'll add, Mr. Chair, that we know that there are a number of seniors who do need this support, and that's fantastic, but there are some who don't, yet they're captured by this program. It is not responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars to be giving this money and this support to people who don't need it but excluding so many who do. So I will continue to raise those concerns about that issue.

Then, just as we saw with I believe it was Bill 4, which is before this House still – maybe it's passed. I'm not even sure. [interjection] It's still before this House. That's to reverse this government's terrible decision, which was, I would say, the first domino to really fall and have significant implications on the stability of our health care system during a pandemic and now in the worst pediatric health care crisis that we've seen in a long time in this province. That first domino was this government's decision under Bill 21 to unilaterally have the ability to terminate doctors' contracts. They're trying to reverse that now, but they've already exercised that authority. They've already unilaterally broken that contract. They were just trying to – well, I guess they've used it. They did what they wanted to do with it, and now they're expecting doctors to be happy that they've removed the ability to do that again.

So it is with Bill 2 as well, Mr. Chair. We're seeing once again that this government is trying to basically correct the mistakes that they made, but the mistake that they made by deindexing AISH wasn't just a mistake. It was cruel, it was heartless, and it was contrary to the stated position of a number of these UCP MLAs, who claimed that they had compassion and that they supported the idea of indexing AISH benefits. Let's remember that we're talking about a benefit that's just over \$1,600 a month. It is not a lot of money, yet they voted in favour three years ago of deindexing that support.

As my colleague the Member for St. Albert has said, you can't make up for that by doing what you're doing in Bill 2, because not only did those Albertans lose out on over \$3,000 in supports over the last couple of years while their supports were not indexed, but there is a more profound impact that it has on Albertans when you break their trust and you tell them that they're not valued. That is another consistency between this government's action when it broke the contract with doctors unilaterally and what they did to individuals on AISH: they broke the trust. They told severely disabled Albertans: "You are not valued. We will happily make your struggles worse to be able to crow about a balanced budget and to show that we're tough." The same government had no problem throwing away over a billion dollars on a pipeline that everybody knew was going to fail, with no apologies for that – no apologies for that – yet they looked to disabled Albertans and said: "Yeah, you're not worth it to us. You don't have the value of a pipeline that wasn't going anywhere."

What it says, as I mentioned, Mr. Chair, is that it is that broken trust. It means that when times are tough again, Albertans and those on AISH can be certain that this government will take from them again and will cut their supports again and that to try to balance a budget, they'll make terrible financial decisions on all fronts. But they'll look and they'll stand proudly and say, "I'm a fiscal conservative" when they cut supports for the most disabled Albertans. They will do it again. That is a trust that cannot be repaired.

9:50

When I spoke on Bill 4 and Bill 21, which was the bill that allowed for the UCP to unilaterally end doctors' contracts, I thought it was remarkable, when I went back and I looked at the debate on that bill, to see how many UCP members spoke out in favour of

being able to do that. I went through days and days and days of debate in *Hansard* on that bill, and I couldn't find a single time, other than the minister who introduced the bill at the three readings, where a UCP MLA actually spoke to the content of the bill. Not once.

It's not surprising, then, that when they want to try to fix their – it's not a mistake; they don't think it's a mistake. They did it. They used it for the doctors. They didn't really speak to that either, why they no longer think that was the right thing to do. I think that's the same here. We are not hearing any UCP MLA say: "I'm sorry. We got it wrong when we deindexed AISH. We actually did a cruel thing, and I voted in favour of it. I voted in favour of it because – I don't know – I didn't have the backbone or courage to stand up to a cabinet member or to the Premier or because I really, truly believed that the most vulnerable should pay for our poor political and economic decisions."

I don't know what that reason is, but it's not my job to give that explanation to Albertans. Every single UCP MLA who voted in favour of deindexing AISH: it is their responsibility to stand up and explain why they did that when they now try to, quote, fix their mistake. It can only be considered a mistake if they actually call it that and acknowledge that that's what it is. But if they don't and they say secretly, behind closed doors, "I expressed my concern about it" – how many leadership candidates do we hear whisper behind closed doors? Oh, what courage – what courage – to stand behind closed doors. We all hear the stories about what happens behind closed doors in UCP meetings. In fact, we used to know from the *Western Standard*. They used to live tweet it.

**An Hon. Member:** It's transparency.

**Ms Pancholi:** Well, the *Western Standard* never captured any of those MLAs standing up and speaking out against deindexing AISH. So if there is transparency – maybe it never happened, Mr. Chair. Maybe they never did actually speak out behind closed doors. Maybe they just lost a couple of winks of sleep at night. In any event, that is not an apology, and that does nothing for the individuals who are on AISH who lost out on \$3,000 during a pandemic, an incredibly stressful, inflationary time, where their money was going less far every single month and this government chose to ignore them.

Again, I believe it is incumbent upon each UCP MLA to stand up – and they all voted in favour of it, Mr. Chair – and explain why they're now supporting indexing. As they say, you can't begin to move anywhere towards reconciliation or to atone unless it begins with a heartfelt and meaningful apology. On that note, I just have to say that an apology does not constitute saying: I apologize if someone misconstrued my comments. I think I heard that today. That is also not an apology. But we'd be happy to counsel or – I don't know – edit their prepared apologies although I'm not going to hold my breath that they're coming.

With that, Mr. Chair, I've spoken, and I could speak at length on Bill 2 and continue to speak at length. What I want to say to Albertans is that for over a year the NDP caucus has heard your concerns. We have put forward countless proposals to this government to either reverse cuts that they have made, to put caps back in place on things like utilities and car insurance, to do things to raise your income, to support your wage increases. We have put forward countless measures to ensure that you do have more money in your pockets, especially those who need it the most.

We will continue to do that advocacy. We will vote to support affordability measures, but we want to make sure that all Albertans see the support that they need when they need it. That is our commitment to Albertans.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Other members wishing to add questions, comments, or amendments to Bill 2? I see the hon. Member for St. Albert has risen.

**Ms Renaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's my pleasure to rise and speak to Bill 2, Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022, in committee. I truly appreciate the comments of my colleague. I think she captured some of the frustration that we are feeling. For the people watching at home – and I actually know there are some folks with disabilities that are watching and who know what we're debating right now, Bill 2. They understand what this is about, and let me tell friends that are watching online: I can tell you that this UCP government has continued to ignore any amendments that we've tried to bring forward to make these bills better. In particular, I think there was only one for Bill 2. I'll tell you: they aren't speaking to this bill. They aren't defending this bill, particularly as it relates to AISH and income support and those income replacement benefits. In fact, I'd say that they're hard-pressed to make eye contact. Not surprising, but that's the way that it is right now.

Now, let me paint a picture for you, Mr. Chair, and this is where we are. Let's start in 2019 . . . [interjections] If you have something to say, stand up and say it. I'll let you go.

Mr. Chair, let me paint a picture for you, and you know what? It's rarely this simple that you can draw lines between points in time to say: this happened, and then this happened, and this happened. I think that we can do that with this particular situation.

Let me tell you that in 2019 one of the first things that this government did was decide that belt-tightening was required, but they didn't do that to themselves. They didn't say: "Let's just put our plans aside for the war room, that we're going to direct \$120 million to over four years. Let's put that aside because people are having a hard time." No. One of the very first things they did was shove the income support, AISH, and seniors' benefit into a huge omnibus bill that did a whole bunch of other things that were very damaging, and they instantly deindexed these benefits.

Now, all of these benefits, all of these income replacement or income augmentation programs – all of these programs – are for some of the poorest people in this province and some of the most vulnerable people in this province. I'll tell you: if you've never looked at AISH eligibility or the process to apply for AISH, do yourself a favour and look at it. It is not easy. It is time-consuming, and you know what? In many cases people describe it as humiliating to go through those difficult assessments. In any event, these are people that are poor, that are struggling, and that have disabilities, and these are benefits that this government decided to cut. They spent the next few years saying that they didn't cut it, but we know it was a cut.

So they did that in 2019. Poof. We get a global pandemic, all of these unknowns, all of these things that we were learning as we went. And what did we learn? One of the first things that we learned about COVID was who was very vulnerable. And who was vulnerable? People with disabilities, people with pre-existing health conditions, comorbidities. These were the groups of people that were extremely vulnerable, and of course we know they always have extra expenses. They have medical expenses. Instantly people were frightened to go to the grocery store. There were extra fees for ordering food, for having it delivered. They had difficulty with transportation; sitting on a packed bus wasn't really an option. Instantly these expenses went up. Instantly. Tack onto that generational levels of inflation that drove the cost of everything up – we know this – not to mention the things that the UCP made

worse. But, you know, I'm not going to speak to insurance and things like that, because for the vast majority of folks that wasn't an issue that I was hearing.

But they were struggling with expenses, and all along the Official Opposition stood up. We did press conferences. We brought in people to talk about: "Look at what's happening. I'm going to lose my apartment. I'm going to get evicted. I can't pay the rent. I'm going to the food bank every single week now, and they won't let me come more. I can't feed myself and my family." These were things that we heard all the time.

You know, I did something a few years back that I wasn't, like, super excited to do, because it wasn't about me, but I thought: "You know what? It's probably a good reminder." So for one little month – and I have enormous privilege – I tried sort of keeping my expenses down to be in line with what somebody on AISH would live with, how much they were spending on groceries. I took the bus for a month because I couldn't afford . . .

**Mr. Nally:** You worked from home.

**Ms Renaud:** To the Member for Morinville-St. Albert: if you have something to say – I mean, honestly. You know, just taking swipes at people is not cool. If you have something to say, stand up. I'll acknowledge you.

What happened in 2019? We saw COVID, we saw inflation, and then – surprise – we find out that homeless counts are doubling in rural communities that are struggling with homelessness that did not struggle like that before. We saw that happening. Why? People are losing their homes. It makes sense.

**10:00**

We saw food bank usage explode. Explode. People cannot afford food. You've got over 70,000 people on AISH. You have over a hundred thousand seniors that rely on that extra money. You've got around 60,000 people that rely on income support products. That's a lot of people. When you make life difficult for that many people that already are on the edge, they're going to be driven to food banks. They're going to be driven into homelessness. They are going to be at risk, and that's exactly what we're seeing. What is the solution that this government has, Mr. Chair? Incredibly disappointing. More half measures because they just can't seem to get it right the first time. Well, they shouldn't have cut it in the beginning, but they can't seem to get it right the first time.

They did not undo all the damage. Had they done that, they would've reindexed this right to the point that they cut it. They would have made these folks whole. Not only that; they would've looked at the other cuts that they did so sneakily through the last few years. Not only did they cut income support by deindexing; they also started kicking people off supplemental benefits that made income support even viable. Now, that's under \$900 a month that these folks are living on. Sixty thousand people. They were living on that because they got little bits of extra money, like rent. They got another \$307 for rent, or they got an extra \$99 for medical transportation. Particularly for people who live outside of large urban areas, they need that for transportation to get to doctors, to get to AISH assessments, to get to places where they can start to look for work, any of those things. But those things were cut.

Once again this government makes a big cut and gives a little back and says: look at us; yeah, I was always a big advocate for not cutting. That is bunk. That is bunk. If anybody here had the courage to actually say, "No, I vote against this; I am not supporting this," they would've said so publicly. They're politicians. They wouldn't

hide it. None of them did. None of them did. So, yeah, that's bunk. I can't say bad words in here.

There are a number of things wrong with this legislation. Obviously, you can tell that I'm a little upset about this particular piece because for the last three and a half years that's what I hear from people almost every workday. When I go in on Monday, it piles up. When I tried that little experiment trying to keep my personal budget at under \$1,700 a month, I couldn't do it. And I thought I was, you know, pretty good. I have enormous privilege, and I have a lot of skill to be able to budget like that, and I couldn't do it. I could not do it. So imagine somebody trying to live on that. They can't live on that. That's why this time of year is so dangerous for them.

Next time you talk to a constituent with a disability or somebody on income support, ask them about their interaction with places like payday loans. That's where they go or they take out credit cards that they can't afford, and they never dig themselves out. Yet this government wants to tell you that, yeah, they're supporting people with disabilities and low-income people. Sure. You're giving them a little bit, but it's not sufficient. This is a group that is vulnerable and that continues to struggle.

In that period of time where I tried living on that limited income, I actually had a group that I was working with. We did a bit of a survey, and we heard from around – I did table it with the Legislature, so it is part of the record – actually I think about 1,100 or 1,200 Albertans from right across Alberta who shared some of their own struggles. At the time they weren't deindexed to the point they are now – that was a while ago – but they were struggling before; let's be honest. At \$1,685 they were struggling. Try to live on that; it's very difficult. They were already struggling.

We heard from people from all over. This isn't just a city problem. I would suggest that actually people that live outside of the large urban areas have far more stress and far more difficulty than people that live in the bigger cities that have access to better programming, more programming, easier access. They're just used to the volume. It's just a different situation. Some of the most heartbreaking stories – still to this day I hear from smaller communities. People are saying: "You know what? I'm about to lose my apartment, my apartment that, you know, I used to be able to afford but the rent has gone up." Let's say that it's \$1,100 or \$1,200. Imagine you're living on \$1,700 and your rent is that much, and then you have to factor in food, just the basics. Food. Maybe a phone. You just can't do it. It's not doable.

So for this government to be unwilling – and they've demonstrated this for years, but they've demonstrated in this particular session their unwillingness to hear from anybody but their own little bubble. You know – I don't know – step 2 of dome disease, when you only listen to friends and insiders, is that you don't actually hear the scope of the problem. Let me tell you: the scope of the problem, which is poverty, is huge, and it's getting bigger. If you don't think that the growth, the explosion of the need of food banks isn't a symptom – and, honestly, I know this government will say: well, you know, we're making a big commitment to food banks.

Let's be honest about that, Mr. Chair. It's a \$20 million commitment over three years. When is the election? Five months. Five months, and it's going through FCSS or something like that, so there's a matching component, when food banks need money now. There are over a hundred food banks in this province. There are two massive food banks that really act as feeder food banks for many, many smaller food banks. What are they going to get? I'm hearing, like – what? – under \$300,000 each. That's insufficient. That is not going to cut it. That's not enough. This government

created the problem. It began in 2019, and it continues to this day. So, sure, make yourself feel better, maybe sleep at night thinking: oh, yeah, we undid the damage. You did not. You did not undo the damage. There is enormous damage, and it will take more than this little effort or, you know, putting money in a food bank. It is going to take far more than this.

Let me just say, Mr. Chair, that I think that we had a pretty good sense about what an antipoverty plan would look like, what a comprehensive antipoverty plan would look like, and why that is a benefit to any province. You are making people whole so that they can participate in the economy. They can contribute. They can be all that they can be. You build a stronger province, and that is something that we will get done. That is something that this government has continuously failed to do. Sadly, every workday we have to see examples of that. So snicker, laugh, you know, roll your eyes all you like. Albertans see the damage that this government has done, and they will not forget it.

I'll take my seat. Thank you.

**The Deputy Chair:** Thank you, hon. member.

Others wishing to speak to Bill 2?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question.

[The remaining clauses of Bill 2 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

**Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Deputy Chair:** Opposed? And that is carried.

I see the Government House Leader.

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that we rise and report bills 6, 2, 5, and 7.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Reid in the chair]

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

**Mr. Yao:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports the following bills: Bill 5, Bill 7, Bill 6, and Bill 2. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

**The Acting Speaker:** Does the Assembly concur in the report? All those in favour?

**Hon. Members:** Aye.

**The Acting Speaker:** And opposed? So ordered.

10:10

## Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

### Bill 7

#### Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2)

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

**Mr. Schow:** Good evening, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move third reading of Bill 7, Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2).

It's a good bill. I encourage all members to vote for it.

**The Acting Speaker:** Other members wishing to speak? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

**Ms Gray:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill 7 in third reading. This is a very straightforward piece of legislation, but I just want to make a couple of quick comments. The reason that this legislation has had to be put forward in this session is because our new Premier has made the decision to expand cabinet to such an extent that we now have 27 ministers, 11 parliamentary secretaries or associate ministers, and 24 ministries, changing a lot of the government structure.

Something I find very personally disturbing: removing the ministry of labour and instead trying to encapsulate that under the title of jobs, which I think completely misses the importance of workers and not just jobs. We need to be making sure that we've got that focus, which I think the government does not. My assumption that the government does not seem to be proven true when the OICs, the orders in council, to do the government reorganization came out and occupational health and safety and the Labour Relations Code were forgotten for many, many days. The importance of the ministry of labour and their files really slapped someone in the face, right off the bat, when I and stakeholders and people who find this ministry and their work critically important and valuable went to try to determine which of the two new ministers was responsible for what, and key pieces of that ministry had not been assigned. Fortunately, that information came out days later in a new OIC, but I think it proves the point that workers were forgotten in this cabinet shuffle.

Twenty-seven ministers, Mr. Speaker. To be very clear, the previous five Premiers have never had more than 20 ministers. Now we have 27 of them. Of course, having a minister comes with additional pay, additional benefits, additional staff. It certainly appears that this Premier has put about half of caucus into cabinet, has given themselves titles that no one in the public understands, and made it harder to know which minister to speak with.

I know political scientist Duane Bratt said, "When you need to satisfy two goals (party unity and rewarding loyalty) you get a large cabinet," and that's what we seem to see here. From a group who felt it was critically important that they all be called "honourable" for the rest of their lives, it strikes me – I would just simply like to quote, as Maximus said to Commodus in the Ridley Scott classic *Gladiator*: "Time for honoring yourself will soon be at an end."

I will conclude my remarks with that, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

[The Speaker in the chair]

**The Speaker:** Sure.

Hon. members, before the Assembly: third reading, Bill 7, Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2). Are there others wishing to add comment?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call on the hon. the Government House Leader to close debate. The hon. the Government House Leader.

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I rise to respond to members opposite with regard to Bill 7, the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2). Striking that this is one of the most controversial misc stats bills this Legislature has ever seen. In response to the movie quote: solid movie quote, but the reality is that this cabinet was selected by the hon. Premier in response to the needs that she feels Alberta has. That is the job of this government, to respond, and I think we're doing exactly that, recognizing that we are facing a number of issues in this province, particularly an inflation crisis created by our friends in Ottawa. The members opposite and their federal leaders have chosen to take a path that is

contrary to our conservative principles, and we believe it's the wrong path. In response to that, the Premier has chosen individuals to be part of her cabinet who she thinks are best fit to address the issues facing Alberta today.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, I do believe this is a good bill. I believe the members opposite are going to be supporting this bill. No need to grandstand and take opportunities to throw shots when the reality is that if you're going to be supporting it, might as well just get on with the people's business. With that, I will conclude my remarks and encourage all members of the Assembly to support Bill 7, Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022.

[Motion carried; Bill 7 read a third time]

#### Bill 4

#### Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 2022

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Copping]

**The Speaker:** The hon. the Minister of Health has 16 minutes remaining.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

**Mr. Shepherd:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We stand here at third reading of Bill 4, a bill whose sole existence – the sole existence of this bill is to undo this government's decision to award itself the extraordinary power to tear up the master agreement between the government of Alberta and physicians in our province. As I said when I spoke to this in second reading, this is an admission of the government's failure.

The Minister of Health has stood and he has attempted to mount a defence at multiple times during debate on this bill to say that this is a piece that is no longer required. As I said previously, Mr. Speaker, it was never required, because this government has achieved nothing for over two years of war on physicians, strife, Albertans not able to access care, creating chaos throughout the health care system, driving physicians out of practice and out of province. They have nothing to show for it. Every single piece that they insisted was absolutely essential has been walked back. Every principle that they said they absolutely had to stand on has been rescinded. There is nothing in the master agreement that was signed in September that could not have been signed at the negotiating table two years ago.

But, really, that is kind of the record, the history of this government on so many fronts, Mr. Speaker, coming in with incredible arrogance, buoyed by certainly a notable election win. Certainly, we'll give them credit for that. But based on that, having the idea that they could go ahead and bully and bulldoze their way through reform of the health care system with the idea that they could simply go in, tear things up by the roots, intimidate physicians, break their association, and somehow achieve savings on behalf of the people of Alberta, reform the health care system, again, they have failed.

They maintained this during the midst of a global pandemic. I won't go through the full history. I've already done that once on the record. I had a full 20 minutes to do so and needed most of it, because the number of petty decisions by this government, by the previous Minister of Health, who, I will say, showed incredibly disgraceful conduct repeatedly, a level of arrogance, entitlement, contempt from himself and staff in his office towards physicians in the province of Alberta – and we saw what the impact of that was.

The minister stands and talks. He says: "Well, you know, this is a situation we have in every province in Canada. Everybody is having challenges recruiting physicians right now. Everybody has an exhausted health care workforce." Mr. Speaker, you know, it's

true. Every jurisdiction is struggling right now. I will give this government credit: it didn't start the fire, but they sure heaped on the kindling and added fuel repeatedly. The situation in our province right now is worse in every way because of the decisions of this government. What we are now reversing in Bill 4 was the first and chief step of so many that they took that have done that damage to our public health care system in the province of Alberta.

10:20

Indeed, just today we saw a CTV article come out showing that emergency room wait times in Edmonton are at their highest level ever, Mr. Speaker. Ever. This is data that was obtained by a CTV reporter via FOIP because it is data that is not available from the government. Now, of course, we had a private member's bill from the Leader of the Opposition which would have made that data public, would have made it consistently public so we could track these issues in our public health care system. The government defeated that bill. They do not want that accountability. They do not want that transparency with Albertans because it would show, as this bill does before us today, the truth of the damage that they have done and continue to do to our public health care system in Alberta. They prefer to cherry-pick statistics.

When the minister stands and talks about "We have more doctors in Alberta than ever before," Mr. Speaker, well, we also have a larger population than we ever had before. We don't know exactly how many of those doctors are actually practising or where they're practising or what discipline they're practising in, so frankly it is a useless number when we know that we still have multiple rural sites across this province that have fully closed or partially closed emergency rooms – indeed, this government's own members stood and talked about it in question period today – because of a lack of physicians, when we still know that we have tens of thousands of Albertans in Lethbridge alone who do not have access to primary care, when we know – you know, this minister talked about recruitment and retention and he talked about how we're going to train more.

The fact is that because of what this government did in tearing up this master agreement and forcing through the physician funding framework, which they are now largely walking back, they undermined and did great damage to a number of our best rural training sites in the province of Alberta: in Sundre, in Pincher Creek, in Stettler. So we have less capacity now to train the doctors that we so badly need, again, because this government, starting with tearing up that master agreement, went to war with physicians and intentionally targeted family physicians, and of that we saw the greatest impact in rural health care and rural physicians.

The minister now is moving forward with some primary care task forces. That's good and important work and it's valuable, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we could have been doing that two years ago. We could have been doing that collaborative work. We lost two years of time, two years of work that we could have been doing, and we are having to start over at the beginning because this government chose to adopt this aggressive posture against physicians and try to bully and bulldoze its way through to a reform of the health care system.

And what this government had in mind to replace it? Just a couple of days ago the Premier was at the opening of a new pharmacist-led clinic in Brooks, one of a few sites that are opening. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that pharmacists are an important part of the health care system. They play an important role in conjunction with physicians, with family doctors, with nurse practitioners, with a number of others. Indeed, there is some independent work that pharmacists can

do, but a pharmacist does not replace a family physician. They cannot. But what we have with this government – it was quite clear with Bill 30 that they brought forward, giving corporations the ability to bill in the same way that an individual doctor could, that what this government had in mind was the replacement of family physicians with corporate care. We saw that with their investment in Telus Babylon, who they were paying twice as much as people's actual individual family doctors for a number of weeks at the beginning of the pandemic.

The fact is that this government did not think through its actions. The same arrogance and entitlement that, frankly, bedevils them today and indeed seems to be coming back in spades under the new Premier made them think that all they had to do was just simply tear up that contract, force their will through and break the will of physicians, and they would just be on their way to setting up a whole new health care system in the province of Alberta.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, as I said previously, that they have not saved a single dollar. Not one. Now, let's be clear. They actually did underpay family physicians during the course of the two years of the pandemic, folks who were dependent on having to use virtual appointments to see their patients and were being paid for 15 minutes regardless of how much time they spent with those patients. If they were providing complex care for seniors or mental health support or other things, they still got paid for a 15-minute appointment if they spent 30 minutes or 40 minutes or 50 minutes with that patient. And doctors were putting care first, so they did.

So, yeah, actually, you know what? This government did save a whole lot of money on the backs of family physicians, forcing clinics to close, forcing staff to be laid off, but I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker: every single one of those dollars they saved on the backs of family physicians is being lost now as we pay for people to have to go to receive care in the emergency room because they can't access a family doctor or because they weren't able to during the pandemic and now their chronic condition is considerably worse or their cancer has advanced. We are paying for this government's pennies saved with pounds on the other end in acute and emergency care.

Again, an incredibly short-sighted strategy on behalf of this government and one on which, unfortunately, they continue to double down, as we see them attempting to take the same sort of grand gesture that they did in bringing forward the original changes under Bill 21 to tear up the contract and impose their will. They are doing the same thing now, as they have fired the board of AHS and appointed a single administrator, answerable to the Health minister and the Premier, to try to force through their changes in EMS, in emergency rooms, and in surgeries. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, this government is going to be any more successful with that approach.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, our health care system is functional, is successful because of the collaboration of thousands of Albertans who step up to provide care. We don't succeed by attacking or belittling or demeaning or blaming those individuals; we succeed by working collaboratively. I will again give, as I have previously, the current Health minister credit in that he has done that for the last year and a half, repairing the damage that was done by his predecessor and was supported by every member of this government, who sat quietly and looked the other way.

But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, that was a year and a half of effort just to get us back to zero. We are not ahead. We are still substantially behind because of this government's decision to tear up that master agreement, symbolic of the bullheaded, short-sighted approach this government has taken to

our health care system. Unfortunately, as I said, I do not see this improving under the current Premier, who achieved the position she has by, again, denigrating the folks who operate our health care system.

This is the government that fired Dr. Verna Yiu, the CEO of Alberta Health Services, who my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Glenora awarded the Queen's platinum jubilee medal just this week. She was incredibly deserving of that, Mr. Speaker. This government fired her to set the course for their attempt to once again try to force their will on Alberta Health Services, much as the Premier has come in now having vilified then fired the board, having fired the chief medical officer of health, replaced her with a volunteer, and has lost now both the deputy chief medical officers of health. The chaos continues.

**10:30**

Bill 4: we will vote in support because it will undo that one piece of harm. The rest, Mr. Speaker, we will undo when we elect the next Alberta NDP government in 2023.

Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, Bill 4 is before the Assembly. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood has risen.

**Member Irwin:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Gosh, it is always very difficult to follow the Member for Edmonton-City Centre and, of course, the Health critic as well. I'm not sure how I can possibly follow that and do this justice, but I will make my best effort.

It's good to see some support from the members opposite over there. Thank you for your attention, Calgary-Hays.

I am honoured to rise and to speak to Bill 4 not because I'm deeply appreciative of this government's record on health care but because I, too, like the Member for Edmonton-City Centre, can't say enough about the health care providers, the health care workers in this province who day in and day out have just – yeah, they truly are heroes. It takes me back to, you know, banging pots and pans and all the things we did to really show them that.

It seems to me like we've forgotten, and it seems to me like we've – you know, just like we seem to have forgotten that a pandemic is still going on, that we still have health care workers who are working in the most challenging of times and really have not seen the respect that they so deserve, and, as the Member for Edmonton-City Centre pointed out, the incredible damage that was caused by previous members of this House who were in that role, the lack of willingness to work with those health care workers, the antagonistic approach that was taken instead of a collaborative one. To the health care workers out there – I know many of you are not able to watch tonight because you're working right now – thank you. Thank you for the work that you're doing.

While we will, perhaps somewhat begrudgingly, support Bill 4, I think my reflection tonight is that we didn't need to be here, right? It never needed to get to this place. I've got a lot I want to share in the time that I have, although I do have to acknowledge, as I seem to have acknowledged multiple times in this relatively short session, that it troubles me deeply that we're not hearing from UCP members about these bills because, as I've said in this House – and I know I'm a broken record – we're hearing about health care from our constituents. And – you know where this is going next – it's not just in Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood where I'm hearing from my constituents. I'm hearing from your constituents, right?

I won't go walking down every single riding that I've door-knocked being held by UCP MLAs, but there are a lot. And I say that to point out that health care is a huge concern for your constituents. I know that. It comes up. I'll be back in some of your

ridings this weekend, and I guarantee you that health care will be one of the top issues because that's how – when I go to the doors, when you go to the doors, Member for St. Albert, you know, you ask people what's top of mind for them, right? Yeah. You're there to listen as their representative or as somebody who's supporting a candidate in their area. Health care comes up all the time.

So for government why I'm concerned is that: why wouldn't we hear other than from the minister, why wouldn't we be hearing from these UCP MLAs on – you know, in my three and a bit years of being an elected official, I've learned from this government that I'm not going to hear: I'm sorry. I'm not going to hear an apology for the damage that's been done to health care and health care workers, but what an opportunity for some of you to rise and just talk about the fact that: “You know what? Some mistakes were made, but we're here; we're trying to rebuild trust.” But you're not doing that, which shows me that either you truly don't care about health care and health care workers or you've been muzzled. I'm not sure. You've got an opportunity still.

One of the things that I wanted to do, because I have had a chance to speak to this bill multiple times, was share. Like my colleagues, we've all been inundated by stories from folks on the front lines, from health care workers. I committed to somebody that I would share briefly – and it is connected closely to Bill 4 as well – a letter that she wrote to her UCP MLA, who may or may not be in this Chamber. I would not want to refer to his presence or absence, but perhaps he will have read this e-mail. She's given me permission to share. I'm not going to share her name, but I can table it.

Once again I find myself sending an email because I feel like it's the only thing I can do. Yet it continues to feel futile because very little response is received. But I do it because I feel like I owe it to my colleagues and most importantly our patients.

I've been a Registered Nurse for almost 16 years. Currently I work in ER. And over the past year we are watching our healthcare system crumble and no one in your party [the UCP] seems to care. The UCP continues to turn a blind eye and more drastically chose to fire the entire AHS board... literally the people who have been managing the failing system through a global pandemic. I'd love for you to rationalize that decision...

More importantly I want you to understand the absolute suffering that is taking place within the walls of our hospital. Over the past several months we have seen patients waiting upwards of 7 hours, sometimes [more than 12] hours to be seen by a physician. These people are in pain, vomiting, absolutely suffering. And unfortunately dying. We have seen unprecedented numbers of cardiac arrests happening in our waiting rooms over the past several months. Imagine the distress of those other patients waiting to be seen, watching someone collapse and receive chest compressions. Or how about the adults or child that began seizing in the waiting room. Or how about the patient undergoing Chemotherapy that presents with a fever... no immune system, now febrile and surrounded in a cramped waiting room by other infectious people. Would you wish that upon your wife, sister, mother, friend? What about the gentleman that comes in, in obvious distress passing a kidney stone. No care space for him to be seen and given pain control? Is that something you believe to be acceptable? Because the inaction from your party leads me to believe that.

This past week we had 15 pediatric admissions in our 18 care spaces in the Stollery ER. 2 of the available care spaces are Mental Health beds and not equipped to safely manage the acutely medically ill child. That gives our physicians 1 bed to see ER patients. I wonder how you would pick who gets that precious space at any given time. Would you choose the 2 week old who has feeding trouble, the 5 year old fighting cancer that is now febrile, or the 12 year old with appendicitis? Can you answer that

for me? I don't think you can, because you're not a trained medical professional. It's time to start listening to the people who are.

It's also not unheard of to have 60 adult admissions in ER with no place to go upstairs. Not to mention the pressure put on inpatient units upstairs getting pressure to discharge patients way too early. Or the fact that this causes EMS to be stuck in hospitals waiting to offload their patients so they can get back on the road. How would you respond if you called 911 for your child or wife and was told there was no ambulance in the area to respond?

We are trained medical professionals with years of experience assigned to sit at triage for hours, watching people suffer before our eyes. Knowing their condition is serious and they need to see a physician and yet knowing we have no place to put them. It is absolutely morally distressing and our mental health is suffering. [But] we continue to show up for Albertans each day because we know you and your party won't... There is no wonder nurses are quitting and leaving the profession. Eventually you... can't do it anymore...

As she closes, she would like both her MLA and the minister to help her understand

how you all think this is ok for our province. In the meantime, myself and my colleagues would welcome you to come sit in the waiting room for 8 hours to witness the suffering yourself.

She concludes by saying:

Over the past several weeks I have heard so many people say, “I've never voted anything but conservative, but I can't vote for them anymore”. I pray this province turns Orange because the UCP continue to fail every Albertan day in and day out.

Those are the words from a registered nurse here in Alberta.

**10:40**

**Ms Renaud:** That's a great letter.

**Member Irwin:** It is a really great letter. It was a hard one to read. I can tell you that myself and my colleague from Edmonton-City Centre, all of us, get letters like that. We get messages like that all the time. All the time. You might say: well, okay; is that member getting off track here from Bill 4? No. Think about what she says in her message there. It's time to start listening to the health care professionals, and we're not seeing that. We're seeing it too late with Bill 4. We didn't need to be here.

She touches on the crisis in pediatric health care. Crisis is almost an understatement. I think back to last Monday – it was two Fridays ago – when we learned of the discharging of pediatric respite patients from the Rotary Flames House in Calgary. I heard from nurses who work there, who aren't allowed to speak publicly for fear of reprimand, just how – and they even shared that, you know, it's even worse than what's being reported, right? It never needed to be there. It never needed to get to that place. What kind of province are we in where we're accepting the fact that we have to limit services for palliative children? How did we get here? We know how we got here. Bill 4 attempts to try to address some of that.

I think about the family doctors and the nurses that we've heard from who are also leaving this province in large numbers. We've seen, I believe it was in May – I pulled it up earlier. Earlier in the year they shared that as many doctors left Alberta in 2021 as in the prior two years combined. We saw government and the ministers start to realize that, like, their choices were having a tangible effect on physicians. It wasn't just the NDP fear and smear. The data was showing...

**Mr. McIver:** Oh, yes, it is.

**Member Irwin:** ... that doctors were leaving; 140 doctors left the province in 2021.



I don't know if the Member for Calgary-Hays, who's heckling right now, knocks on doors or talks to constituents. [interjection] But I guarantee you – I don't know. I don't know because he doesn't join debate. But I guarantee you that his constituents . . .

**Mr. McIver:** Fear and smear.

**Member Irwin:** . . . are concerned about health care. They absolutely are.

For folks watching at home who can't hear, he's saying "fear and smear." This kind of rhetoric does nothing to address health care in this province.

We are. The numbers are clear. The data is clear. We've lost physicians. We've lost nurses. We've lost health care providers.

One of the things that I think about is the loss of health care services as well, so not just the workers, but it's tied into that. For instance, the loss of obstetric services. We've seen obstetric services close across this province. My hometown of Barrhead – I'm pointing to the Member for Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock – is one example, Fort Saskatchewan, Bonnyville, Cold Lake – I don't have the list in front of me, but it is an extensive one – Rimbey, Rocky Mountain House. And hardly a peep from this government. When a family can't deliver a child in an area close to where they live, it's incredibly stressful.

**Ms Renaud:** In the winter.

**Member Irwin:** In the winter, exactly. At a time when you're already experiencing a great deal of stress and having to add on those extra layers of anxiety, it's simply not acceptable. Again, it didn't need to be there. Most of the times when releases were put out about the reason why: staffing issues, unable to staff some of those rural hospitals because people have left. Health care providers have left.

**Ms Renaud:** Fact.

**Member Irwin:** And that is a fact. I just wish that this government would start – and that's perhaps some of my closing comments here – not only listening to their constituents, to the experts, public health experts, to health care workers but not get us into a place where you're having to fix the mistakes of the past.

You know what? I won't conclude as eloquently as my colleague the Member for Edmonton-City Centre, but I think it's a clear, clear reminder that Albertans have seen a lot. It's hard to remember everything. It's hard to remember all the many attacks on health care in this province by this UCP government, but there's one thing that you can remember. That thing that you can remember is that a better future, a strong public health care system is in sight, and you'll get there through voting for the Alberta NDP.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there others?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question.

[Motion carried; Bill 4 read a third time]

## Bill 5

### Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2)

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

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise on behalf of the Minister of Justice and move third reading of Bill 5, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2).

This proposed bill, piece of legislation, changes six laws: the Legislative Assembly Act, the Provincial Court Act, the

Interjurisdictional Support Orders Act, the Referendum Act, the Sale of Goods Act, and the Trustee Act.

Mr. Speaker, changes to the Legislative Assembly Act will allow Legislative Assembly security to be considered peace officers. As a result, they would have the legislative authority to carry firearms. Before they are armed, they would receive necessary training to handle the use of firearms. This change will bring Alberta in line with many other jurisdictions.

Next of the proposed changes: the Provincial Court Act. Mr. Speaker, we are advocating to increase the civil claims limit of matters that can be filed through the Provincial Court. To be clear, what we are proposing today doesn't actually increase the limit; this is just about making sure the government has the ability to do so if it decides that the amount should increase. Currently the limit for small claims court is \$50,000. Changes will let the government adjust the limit up to \$200,000. This would give Albertans the option of resolving more civil legal disputes by filing their claim with the Provincial Court. This means that more Albertans could choose to represent themselves. At the same time, this would free up time and resources in the Court of King's Bench to focus on more complex matters.

To make it easier for Albertans to collect child and youth spousal support, Bill 5 includes recommended changes to the Interjurisdictional Support Orders Act. This would help families receive financial support they are owed from ex-partners and -spouses when they live in different parts of the country. This would also reduce the time needed to collect, exchange, and process information.

Bill 5 also proposes changes to the Referendum Act, specifically clarifying that only constitutional questions require a resolution to be made in the Legislature.

This will also be amending the Sale of Goods Act to acquire a good title to grain. Right now a buyer must keep a record of the kind of vehicle delivering the grain and its licence number. These changes were requested by the agriculture stakeholders. Changes will eliminate redundant record-keeping requirements for buyers when grain is sold and delivered to a grain elevator. The Sale of Goods Act dates back to 1919 – that's a while ago – and this provision regarding grain sales originated in English common law which was carried over into provincial legislation when Alberta became a province in 1905. This need is now met by other such records as the bill of sale.

The final change proposed to this legislation would amend the new Trustee Act, that comes into force next year. The proposed changes will make it clear that a trust will not fail if there is temporarily no trustee. We've removed the transfer of trust properties to the court, allowing the trust property to move directly to the new trustee once appointed.

Mr. Speaker, all these changes mean that Albertans will now have more choices and an improved experience when dealing with legal or court process, and you can look forward to a more safe and positive experience when visiting the Legislature. I'd also like to give a shout-out to the security officers here as they do a tremendous amount of work on our behalf. Thank you for them.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for support of third reading of Bill 5, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act.

10:50

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there others wishing to speak to Bill 5? The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief in my remarks this evening. Although I plan to support the bill, I do have reservations with elements of it, including, of course, the Referendum

Act portions of the legislation whereby it no longer will require . . . [interjections]

**The Speaker:** Order. Order. Order. Order. There's lots of opportunity for private conversations in either of the lounges or in the hallways. I encourage members to keep them to a minimum.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung.

**Mr. Dach:** Thank you. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that the part of the act that I do not feel comfortable with is the part that deals with the Referendum Act whereby, under the new changes to the Referendum Act brought upon by Bill 5, there would be no longer a requirement to have nonconstitutional referendums requiring a motion to be passed by the Assembly first. This, I think, is a mistake. Anything that is important enough to be decided by a referendum in the province I think needs to be formulated via the Legislature. I think that the Legislature should be formulating that question or at least speak to the issue of the referendum question at hand. Of course, the government will still have its majority, but indeed anything that's important enough to go before the province in a referendum question should be run through this House first. I really will be watching that carefully.

Of course, we've only seen two referendums in the time frame that I've been a member of this Legislature: a constitutional referendum on equalization, for which an order in council was issued on August 9, 2021, and then the daylight saving time referendum, a nonconstitutional referendum. Both of those were important. The daylight saving time was very, very controversial and engaged a lot of Albertans. Anything that is important enough to go to a referendum in our representative form of democracy should be run through this Legislature first. We don't have a direct democracy, and that is what a referendum is, an element of direct democracy. It's a bit of a clash with our representative system. Therefore, I think that when we do depart from a representative system and go towards the tool of a referendum, it's incumbent on us to make sure that the Legislature speaks to it by having it run through the Legislature first.

I'll end my remarks there. Thank you.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, others wishing to join the debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Meadows.

**Mr. Deol:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise in the House and speak to Bill 5, Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2), on behalf of my constituents and all those Albertans who came forward and shared their griefs or challenges in dealing with the justice system.

This bill amends six pieces of legislation and has some good changes. You know, I will acknowledge that. Certainly, some of the questions are around a few of the changes put forward in this bill. The bill amends the Interjurisdictional Support Orders Act and also the Provincial Court Act and the Referendum Act, as my colleague said, and the Trustee Act.

I do support changes to the Trustee Act as I have personally experienced some of the process going through the Trustee Act and the process to establish a trust and then also the provision of losing the trust due to the trustee retires or has passed away. The changes help to re-establish or appoint new trustees in this case.

Not going too much into detail, I do have questions around the Referendum Act as well as the Provincial Court Act. This act just increases the limit from \$50,000 to \$200,000 on civil court rulings, but there are questions like: what kind of support are they providing and resources are they providing to improve the capacity of the law court to handle these cases?

Interestingly – I really wanted to say this for the record – for the past almost four years, like more than three and a half years, under this UCP government and two Premiers we have discussed the justice act many times, but it's just surprising to see that every time what we're discussing is just the tip of the iceberg. It was not something, really, that Albertans are looking at the government to make changes to, particularly for those folks or Albertans who feel the pain and experience, fell through the cracks, or they're looking at the government to make changes to improve access to the justice system. Not only this; I remember those moments when the Justice minister himself was discussing the findings of this government, how the justice system requires improvements by investing into it, hiring more judges and Crown prosecutors. Furthermore, there's a lot more to do in the justice system by expanding the services into different languages or hiring more interpreters, hiring more translators. There's a lot more to do, but it was very discouraging to see the complete exhibits on this government's lack of understanding or, you know, lack of commitment or lack of humility to address the people's many issues, that they're aware of, I will say.

What I want to say on the record: we as Alberta's NDP conducted consultations for 10 months from 2020 to 2021 and heard from mostly the racialized and marginalized communities and business leaders. I want to say that we are determined to raise their voices and address their issues. If we can't do it and can't work with this government, then we're determined to do it given we form government in 2023.

With that, I conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the opportunity.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, are there others?

If not, I am prepared to call on the minister to close debate.

[Motion carried; Bill 5 read a third time]

## Bill 2

### Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022

**The Speaker:** Hon. members – oh, I'm sorry. Didn't see you there. The hon. the Minister of Children's Services to move third reading.

**Mr. Amery:** Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is both an honour and a privilege to rise this evening on behalf of the Minister of Affordability and Utilities to move third reading of Bill 2, the Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022.

This legislation will ultimately help millions of Albertans deal with the affordability crisis. Rising inflation is impacting all sectors of society, and I know that each and every member of this Legislature genuinely recognizes that we need to help make life more affordable. Mr. Speaker, if passed, this bill and the supporting regulations will allow this government to provide quick and effective relief supports. This means that it will help cut the costs of fuel, reduce taxes, protect Albertans from price spikes and increases, and increase supports to some of our most vulnerable citizens.

11:00

There has been a lot of good debate in this Chamber from all members of this House, and I appreciate the input that we've already received. Because of that input, we are already working on regulations and online systems to help facilitate and deliver those financial payments, but the passage of this legislation is absolutely critical and necessary to providing help right away. This bill and the \$2.8 billion in affordability measures will help enable and make real differences for hard-working individuals, families, and businesses

all across this province. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to urge all members to support moving third reading of Bill 2 as quickly as possible.

However, at this time I move to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

### **Bill 6 Police Amendment Act, 2022**

**The Speaker:** The hon. the Deputy Premier.

**Mr. Neudorf:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to be here today on behalf of the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services to move third reading of Bill 6, the Police Amendment Act, 2022, the first substantial changes to Alberta's policing legislation in 34 years.

One aspect, establishing the police review commission, replaces the system of police investigating police, which invites a perception of bias, with an independent body that will be responsible for receiving complaints, investigating them, and conducting any resulting disciplinary hearings. This would make the complaints process totally independent by changing these functions from being handled in-house by police services and putting them under the authority of an arm's-length organization.

Communities policed by the RCMP currently have the option of forming policing committees, but during the stakeholder engagement that informed this legislation, we learned that most communities have not done so. This legislation will help make them a reality. We also heard from many communities that the existing requirements to establish a policing committee in the Police Act were too onerous and came with too high a price tag for smaller municipalities. These amendments will fix that by eliminating the requirement to hire specific staff for the committee and by allowing smaller communities to share these administrative costs through regional committees.

This legislation will require diversity and inclusion plans that outline steps police are taking to reflect their communities and to educate officers about the distinct cultural needs of the people that they work with. We believe that improving those ties will result in better outcomes between police and the people they serve.

The provincial government has a legislative responsibility to ensure adequate policing in Alberta, and this is a logical extension of that mandate. The key proposals in this legislation are a product of listening to a broad range of Albertans from all corners of the province from a variety of backgrounds and occupations. It's important, if this legislation is passed, that we continue to listen to stakeholders as we move to implement it. For Alberta this bill is a fundamental shift that reimagines police as an extension of the community and provides a variety of practical and realistic reforms aimed at getting us there.

I hope that all members on both sides of this House will be able to support this legislation, which will ensure police are more accountable to the public and more responsive to its needs. Ultimately, police services that are more in tune with the people they serve will help build safer communities for everyone in Alberta, no matter where they live.

I ask that we move third reading of Bill 6, and with that I would also like to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

## **Government Motions**

### **Statutes Repeal**

17. Mr. Schow moved:  
Be it resolved that pursuant to section 3 of the Statutes Repeal Act, SA 2013, cS 19.3, the following statutes appearing on the list of statutes to be repealed which was tabled in the Assembly by the Clerk of the Assembly on behalf of the then Minister of Justice and Solicitor General on March 14, 2022 (Sessional Paper 24/2022), not be repealed:
1. An Act to End Predatory Lending (2016 cE-9.5) s5(2);
  2. Vital Statistics and Life Events Modernization Act (2016 c26) ss2(b), 11(a), 31, 41.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, this is a debatable motion pursuant to Standing Order 18. Is there anyone wishing to add questions or comments prior to calling the question?

**Hon. Members:** Question.

[Government Motion 17 carried]

### **Office of the Child and Youth Advocate**

18. Mr. Schow moved:  
Be it resolved that
- (a) the 2021-2022 annual report of the office of the Child and Youth Advocate be referred to the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices for review;
  - (b) the committee may, without leave of the Assembly, sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned or prorogued;
  - (c) in accordance with section 21(4) of the Child and Youth Advocate Act the committee shall report back to the Assembly within 90 days of the report being referred to it if the Assembly is then sitting or, if it is not then sitting, within 15 days after the commencement of the next sitting.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, this is a debatable motion pursuant to Standing Order 18(1)(i). Is there anyone wishing to join in the debate?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the Government House Leader to close debate.

[Government Motion 18 carried]

### **Alberta Property Rights Advocate**

19. Mr. Schow moved:  
Be it resolved that
- (a) the 2019-2021 annual report of the Alberta Property Rights Advocate office be referred to the Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future for review;
  - (b) the committee may, without leave of the Assembly, sit during a period when the Assembly is adjourned or prorogued;
  - (c) in accordance with section 5(5) of the Property Rights Advocate Act the committee shall report back to the Assembly within 60 days of the report being referred to it if the Assembly is then sitting or, if it is not then sitting, within 15 days after the commencement of the next sitting.

**The Speaker:** Hon. members, Government Motion 19 is a debatable motion pursuant to Standing Order 18(1)(i). Is there anyone wishing to join in the debate?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call on the Government House Leader to close debate.

**Mr. Schow:** Waived.

[Government Motion 19 carried]

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

**Mr. Schow:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A lot of good work was done tonight, and I think it's time that we all decide to leave this Chamber. You don't have to go home, but you can't stay here because I am moving that we adjourn the Assembly until 1:30 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, December 15, 2022, the ides of December.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 11:10 p.m.]





## Table of Contents

### Government Bills and Orders

#### Committee of the Whole

|        |                                 |     |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Bill 6 | Police Amendment Act, 2022..... | 409 |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----|

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| Division ..... | 421 |
|----------------|-----|

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| Bill 2 | Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 ..... | 421 |
|--------|---|-----|

#### Third Reading

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| Bill 7 | Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2)..... | 425 |
|--------|---|-----|

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| Bill 4 | Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act, 2022 ..... | 426 |
|--------|---|-----|

|        |   |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| Bill 5 | Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2022 (No. 2)..... | 429 |
|--------|---|-----|

|        |  |     |
|--------|--|-----|
| Bill 2 | Inflation Relief Statutes Amendment Act, 2022..... | 430 |
|--------|--|-----|

|        |                                 |     |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Bill 6 | Police Amendment Act, 2022..... | 431 |
|--------|---------------------------------|-----|

### Government Motions

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Statutes Repeal ..... | 431 |
|-----------------------|-----|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Office of the Child and Youth Advocate ..... | 431 |
|--|-----|

|                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Alberta Property Rights Advocate..... | 431 |
|---------------------------------------|-----|

*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)