



Province of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
First Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday afternoon, June 27, 2019

Day 21

The Honourable Nathan M. Cooper, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 30th Legislature

First Session

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

Aheer, Hon. Leela Sharon, Chestermere-Strathmore (UCP)
Allard, Tracy L., Grande Prairie (UCP)
Amery, Mickey K., Calgary-Cross (UCP)
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Jackie,
Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UCP)
Barnes, Drew, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Bilous, Deron, Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-West Henday (NDP)
Ceci, Joe, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Copping, Hon. Jason C., Calgary-Varsity (UCP)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
Dang, Thomas, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UCP)
Eggen, David, Edmonton-North West (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Ellis, Mike, Calgary-West (UCP),
Government Whip
Feehan, Richard, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, Calgary-Peigan (UCP)
Ganley, Kathleen T., Calgary-Mountain View (NDP)
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UCP)
Glasgo, Michaela L., Brooks-Medicine Hat (UCP)
Glubish, Hon. Nate, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UCP)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Goodridge, Laila, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche (UCP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Gray, Christina, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP)
Guthrie, Peter F., Airdrie-Cochrane (UCP)
Hanson, David B., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UCP)
Hoffman, Sarah, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Nate S., Drumheller-Stettler (UCP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., Taber-Warner (UCP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Whip
Issik, Whitney, Calgary-Glenmore (UCP)
Jones, Matt, Calgary-South East (UCP)
Kenney, Hon. Jason, PC, Calgary-Lougheed (UCP),
Premier
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, Red Deer-North (UCP)
Loewen, Todd, Central Peace-Notley (UCP)
Long, Martin M., West Yellowhead (UCP)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UCP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Luan, Hon. Jason, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)
Madu, Hon. Kaycee, Edmonton-South West (UCP)
McIver, Hon. Ric, Calgary-Hays (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Nally, Hon. Dale, Morinville-St. Albert (UCP)
Neudorf, Nathan T., Lethbridge-East (UCP)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, Calgary-Bow (UCP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UCP), Government House Leader
Nixon, Jeremy P., Calgary-Klein (UCP)
Notley, Rachel, Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Orr, Ronald, Lacombe-Ponoka (UCP)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Panda, Hon. Prasad, Calgary-Edgemont (UCP)
Phillips, Shannon, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Pon, Hon. Josephine, Calgary-Beddington (UCP)
Rehn, Pat, Lesser Slave Lake (UCP)
Reid, Roger W., Livingstone-Macleod (UCP)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rosin, Miranda D., Banff-Kananaskis (UCP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UCP)
Rutherford, Brad, Leduc-Beaumont (UCP)
Sabir, Irfan, Calgary-McCall (NDP)
Savage, Hon. Sonya, Calgary-North West (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, Calgary-North East (UCP)
Schmidt, Marlin, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Joseph R., Cardston-Siksika (UCP),
Deputy Government Whip
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, Calgary-Shaw (UCP)
Schweitzer, Hon. Doug, Calgary-Elbow (UCP),
Deputy Government House Leader
Shandro, Hon. Tyler, Calgary-Acadia (UCP)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP)
Sigurdson, Lori, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, R.J., Highwood (UCP)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UCP)
Smith, Mark W., Drayton Valley-Devon (UCP)
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UCP)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Toews, Hon. Travis, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UCP)
Toor, Devinder, Calgary-Falconridge (UCP)
Turton, Searle, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UCP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock (UCP)
Walker, Jordan, Sherwood Park (UCP)
Williams, Dan D.A., Peace River (UCP)
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UCP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UCP)
Yaseen, Muhammad, Calgary-North (UCP)

Party standings:

United Conservative: 63

New Democrat: 24

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, Clerk	Philip Massolin, Manager of Research and Committee Services	Brian G. Hodgson, Sergeant-at-Arms
Stephanie LeBlanc, Acting Law Clerk and Senior Parliamentary Counsel	Nancy Robert, Research Officer	Chris Caughell, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Trafton Koenig, Parliamentary Counsel	Janet Schwegel, Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>	Tom Bell, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms
		Paul Link, Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

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

Parliamentary Secretaries

Laila Goodridge	Parliamentary Secretary Responsible for Alberta's Francophonie
Muhammad Yaseen	Parliamentary Secretary of Immigration

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Gotfried
Deputy Chair: Mr. Orr

Allard
Eggen
Getson
Glasgo
Irwin
Jones
Nielsen

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. van Dijken
Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Allard
Barnes
Bilous
Dach
Dang
Gray
Horner
Issik
Jones
Reid
Rowswell
Stephan
Toor

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Goodridge
Deputy Chair: Ms Sigurdson

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

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Ellis
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

Goodridge
Gray
Lovely
Nixon, Jeremy
Rutherford
Schmidt
Shepherd
Sigurdson, R.J.
Sweet

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. Cooper
Deputy Chair: Mr. Ellis

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Dang
Deol
Goehring
Goodridge
Gotfried
Long
Sweet
Williams

Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills

Chair: Mr. Ellis
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

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

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Mr. Smith
Deputy Chair: Mr. Schow

Carson
Deol
Ganley
Horner
Issik
Jones
Loyola
Neudorf
Rehn
Reid
Renaud
Turton
Yao

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Ms Phillips
Deputy Chair: Mr. Gotfried

Amery
Barnes
Dach
Feehan
Guthrie
Hoffman
Renaud
Rosin
Rowswell
Stephan
Toor
Turton
Walker

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Hanson
Deputy Chair: Member Ceci

Armstrong-Homeniuk
Feehan
Getson
Loyola
Rehn
Rosin
Sabir
Schmidt
Sigurdson, R.J.
Singh
Smith
Turton
Yaseen

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1:30 p.m.

Thursday, June 27, 2019

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

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

Please be seated.

Introduction of Visitors

The Speaker: Hon. members, we have a number of guests or visitors joining us today. First and foremost, we have the hon. the former MLA and former member of Executive Council Dr. Lyle Oberg. Please rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: Hon. members, we have a number of guests as well joining us, guests of the Minister of Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women in the galleries. If you are part of any of these groups, I encourage you to rise and we will greet you upon the introduction of all members.

Members from the Edmonton Heritage Festival Association, members from the Edmonton Intercultural Centre, members from the Somali Canadian Cultural Society of Edmonton, members of the Alberta Somali Cultural Community Centre, the Balanbalis Downtown Islamic Association, and the Al Sabah mosque.

Also joining us are guests of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, public servants throughout the government of Alberta as well as Dr. Collins Ugochukwu, Dr. Marcus Edino, Dr. Bede Eke, Dr. Clement Agboma, Mr. Joseph Otitoju, Mr. Augustine Onwuegbuzie, and Ms Bolu Idowu. Welcome to everyone.

Just a couple more for us today: very close friends of the Member for Lesser Slave Lake. Welcome here today Emily and Tom Wanyandie.

There are also members of the Minister of Advanced Education: Sanjeev Kad; Dalip Cheba; Lee, Voula, Helen, and Billy Martin; Brandon, Stephanie, Josiah, and Lincoln Stutheit; Joanne Birce; Lynn Bangs; Bernie Goruk; and Kim Caves.

Last but not least, guest of the Member for Calgary-McCall, Umer Farooq. Please, members, welcome all of these folks to the Assembly.

Members' Statements

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

Canadian Multiculturalism Day

Ms Rosin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 2002 the government of Canada designated June 27 of each year as Canadian Multiculturalism Day. Canada was the first country to officially become a multicultural society in 1971, and Alberta adopted

multicultural legislation in 1984 with the passage of the Alberta Cultural Heritage Act. Multiculturalism Day is a day to recognize and celebrate the diverse cultures that Canadians have and to signify our unity in all aspects of life within Canadian culture.

Whether an Albertan is here by choice or by chance, we are a province built by people of many nationalities and faiths. We continue to welcome those who want to help write the next chapter of Alberta's story. People choose to come to Alberta because they know this is a place where hard work, enterprise, education, and skills are rewarded with economic opportunity and a warm welcome from our communities. Celebrating our differences helps us to understand each other and discourage hatred and violence. It is important to value the dignity of all Canadians no matter their race, ethnic group, or religion.

Although Multiculturalism Day is only on June 27, our province experiences many opportunities throughout the year to celebrate, such as heritage festivals, multicultural affairs, and many more festivities across the province. Alberta is proudly home to the world's largest multicultural festival, the UNESCO-designated Edmonton Heritage Festival, which showcases almost 100 different cultures and attracts half a million visitors every year. I encourage everyone to celebrate their culture and to go to a festival or celebration this year to learn about another culture in our diverse province.

Mr. Speaker, today I call on all Albertans to join me in celebrating the diverse roots of our province, which reach every country and every continent around the world, and all the people who continue to enrich it today. Thank you.

Government Policies and Parliamentary Debate

Member Irwin: Mr. Speaker, we're starting to see an interesting pattern in this House. Asking about outing gay kids? The government's response: fear and smear. Asking about picking the pockets of hard-working Albertans? Fear and smear. Asking about fighting climate change? Fear and smear. Asking about the harmful practice of conversion therapy? Fear and smear. Asking about racism and intolerance? Fear and smear. Asking about stripping away the constitutional rights of thousands of Alberta's workers? Yup. You guessed it. All together now.

Some Hon. Members: Fear and smear.

Member Irwin: Now, Mr. Speaker, it sounds like a bad joke, reiterating the same tired old line in hopes to deflect from their disastrous first session as government. But you know what? This is no joke. In many cases the fear is very real. I'm fearful for that queer student who's worried that they'll be outed. I'm fearful for that person who's struggling with addiction but not sure where she can go for support. I'm fearful for that worker whose overtime will now be cut. I'm fearful for that kid who's being pressured by his community to reject his sexual identity. And you know what? I'm fearful that this government will continue to dismiss the real, legitimate concerns of hundreds of thousands of Albertans who are counting on us as their Official Opposition to stand up for their rights.

Fear and smear: one of the many baseless talking points of the same government that's limited debate in the House and saw many of their members literally plugging their ears. This is a troubling pattern, laced with arrogance and a complete disdain for the very people who elected members into this House. This government is saying: we don't actually need to listen to you.

On this side of the House we stand up for our constituents. We demand answers to valid questions and concerns, and we hold this government to account when they refuse to do their job. We won't stop fighting for issues that matter to Albertans, high-quality public health care, a strong education system with safe schools for all. We

will leave the arrogance at the door because Albertans deserve better.

Thank you.

Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day

Mr. Yao: Mr. Speaker, June 27 is Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day. Also simply known as PTSD, it's been identified as a mental illness. Many people who suffer from PTSD often have vivid nightmares, flashbacks, or thoughts of the event that seem to come from nowhere. The trauma it causes is often unexpected, and many people say they felt powerless to stop or change the event. For millions of people around the world the most traumatic events of their lives have never ended.

One of the most at-risk groups for PTSD are our veterans and first responders. They're exposed to sights that most people rarely experience. They see people in great pain and suffering and even death and are themselves exposed to such a potential fate. I'd like to express my sincere gratitude to the paramedics, the firefighters, the military personnel, and police officers for everything they do day in and day out. While most would head in the opposite direction, these men and women are the ones who run towards the danger. These efforts can sometimes mean that they're left to deal with the haunting images, the sounds, the smells, that can stay with these responders for a lifetime.

A welding truck and a car suffer a head-on collision. That left unusual odours and bodies that, interestingly enough, weren't burned, but it had melted the skin over their faces. A SIDS call where a baby already had rigor mortis set in. A newlywed couple and their baby dead and freezing in a car on the highway in minus 40 temperatures. A woman beaten by her boyfriend, broken, bruised, and bloodied while her two young children clutched at her dress. These can be some of the experiences that stay with a responder for a lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to celebrate this day is to take the time to understand the experiences and the day-to-day realities of those around you who may be suffering from PTSD. With support people can recover from PTSD and the effects of trauma. Let's remind those with PTSD that they are never alone and that we are here to help them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Sherwood Park.

1:40 Somali Independence Day

Mr. Walker: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On July 1 we celebrate Somalia's Independence Day. Fifty-nine years ago the present-day north and south Somalia, which were under British and Italian control respectively, merged to form one nation, the Republic of Somalia, thus ushering in a new chapter in the history of the country. Since then, this day has been observed as the Independence Day of Somalia. Somali Independence Day commemorates the Somali people's struggle for freedom and their victory. It celebrates the beginning of a new nation by merging to form one nation.

Somalia is a beautiful country located in the horn of east Africa. It consists mainly of plateaus, plains, highlands, and has Africa's longest coastline. Its official languages are Somali and Arabic. Somalia is roughly the same size as Alberta but has over 10 million more people than we do. Somalia's ties to the Arab world allowed it to be accepted into the Arab League in 1974. Somalia also belongs to the African Union, the organization of Islamic conference, and the United Nations. It supported anti-apartheid groups and countries in Africa wanting to gain independence. The country has maintained a free-market economy despite its instability.

Somalis have a long history in Canada. While many came as refugees following the country's civil war in the early 1990s, a number of Somalis came to Canada in the 1960s and '70s as students. Here in Alberta we have Canada's third-largest Somali population, with over 20,000 Somali people living in Edmonton alone. We are happy to have a shared day to celebrate both our countries and encourage that all Albertans join in celebrating Somali Independence Day.

Mahadsanid.

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

Religious Freedom and Human Rights

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Religious freedom is a fundamental right. That is why Albertans have been shocked and disturbed by Quebec's recent law that bans turbans, hijabs, and other religious symbols in public spaces. It is particularly concerning for many in my riding as it's home to people of many different cultures and faiths, many of whom actually have witnessed or experienced discrimination and violence. History has shown time and again that discrimination can lead to unrest and often violence.

There are many Sikh families who fell victim to the 1984 genocide and are still looking for justice and closure. We also remember the 2002 riots in Gujarat, where Muslims were murdered only because they were Muslims. More recently we have seen a rise in attacks on religious places such as on a church in Sri Lanka on Easter Monday and on a mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand, and ongoing violations of human rights in Kashmir, which is threatening peace in the entire Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, we know we are not immune to human rights violations of religious and ethnic communities even right here in Canada. In fact, this government has had candidates with connections to white supremacists, anti-immigrant, and anti-Muslim groups. We have a Premier who has advocated for the niqab ban, the barbaric cultural practices hotline, cut refugee health care, and brags about his two-decade long friendship with the Prime Minister of India. In fact, many in my riding would want this Premier to raise the 1984 Sikh genocide, the 2002 killings in Gujarat, and human rights violations in Kashmir with his friend the Prime Minister of India. There is no question that on this side of the House we fully condemn violence, and I urge this government to do the same.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Tom Wanyandie

Mr. Rehn: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 2001 I purchased a sawmill and timber quota near Grande Cache. I hired some young indigenous men: Lance, Lane, Doug, and Clint Wanyandie. We needed a couple more workers, and they suggested Emily, their mother, and Tom Wanyandie, their grandpa. I asked how old Tom was, and they said that he was in his 70s. I didn't know if Tom could handle the hard physical work, but he truly amazed me.

Ten years ago this month Tom and his son James were walking in the bush when suddenly a grizzly bear came out of nowhere. James tried to take a shot, but he missed, and the grizzly grabbed onto James' arm, shaking him like a rag doll, and threw him to the ground and pounced on him. Tom bravely charged the bear, yelling curse words in Cree and hitting the bear repeatedly with a walking stick. The bear reared up on its hind legs and turned towards Tom, mouth open, ready to attack. Tom could count every tooth in that crazed animal's mouth. He plunged his walking stick into the bear's mouth. The bear quickly flipped his head sideways, dislodging the stick. Then biting Tom's arm, he broke it and jumped on top of Tom

and took him to the ground. James, with a broken arm, still on the ground, poked at the bear with the barrel of his rifle. The grizzly jumped off Tom and gave James a vicious swat, knocking him about 10 feet, and pounced back on top of James. Tom got up, yelling and cursing with his fists in the air, heading straight for the grizzly bear. The grizzly looked at Tom and decided it was time to go. As Tom chased after the grizzly bear, yelling with his fists in the air, James had to say: Dad, please come back.

News headlines described Tom Wanyandie as Badass of the Week and a feisty senior who stuck it to a grizzly. Tom Wanyandie has always worked hard, stayed humble, and earned every dollar he ever made. Grandpa is 88 years old and truly an amazing inspiration to all of us.

Thank you. [Standing ovation]

The Speaker: Sounds like Tom would be a perfect fit for this job.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

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

Mr. Ellis: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As chair of the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills I'm pleased to table the committee's final report on Bill 203, An Act to Protect Public Health Care, sponsored by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Rutherford. This bill was referred to the committee on June 13, 2019. The committee's final report recommends that the bill, Bill 203, An Act to Protect Public Health Care, not proceed. I request concurrence of the Assembly in the final report on Bill 203.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the motion for concurrence in the report is debatable pursuant to Standing Order 18(1)(b). Are there any members who wish to speak to the motion for concurrence? Seeing the hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. Given that members wish to speak to the motion for concurrence in the report, that consideration will take place on the next available Monday under the item of business motions for concurrence in committee reports on public bills other than government bills.

Prior to us getting to tablings today, I beg the indulgence of the House. Not to draw attention to their tardiness, but I did see the MPs Arnold Viersen and Garnett Genuis sneak into the Speaker's gallery just a few moments ago. I hope that you'll welcome them and encourage them to arrive on time next time.

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood has a tabling.

Member Irwin: Yes, I do. Thank you. I rise today to table the requisite number of copies of an ad in an organization affiliated with the Finance minister related to conversion therapy.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Ms Ganley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite number of copies of a document entitled Alberta Crown Prosecution Service Statement, wherein they indicate that an extraprovincial prosecutor will be responsible for advice to the police on the kamikaze scandal.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-Glenora has a tabling.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the requisite number of copies of correspondence I received from a constituent who is deeply troubled and concerned about the behaviour of the government on June 19 at 2325 hours, approximately the time that the orange earplugs were distributed in this House, and says that it doesn't reflect the values that she expects of a government.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-South has risen.

Mr. Dang: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the requisite number of copies of a letter that I received indicating that the opposition and I "did solid work" regarding the earplug incident and shaming the government for their actions.

Thank you.

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

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two tablings. The first one is copies of the what-we-heard document from the PDD review panel, who stopped in St. Paul, Fort McMurray, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Grande Prairie, Red Deer, Edmonton, and Calgary.

The second is a local article reminding us that when the candidates laid it all on the table at the UCP forum, the Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul member told Albertans: it's going to hurt.

1:50

Oral Question Period

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

2017 UCP Leadership Contest Investigation

Ms Hoffman: Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our justice system is paramount. Yesterday our leader asked why it's been a month and this government still hasn't followed through on its promise to appoint a special prosecutor to oversee the UCP leadership voting scandal. But the Attorney General said his department had, quote, reached out to folks in Ontario to handle legal advice. Well, now our understanding is that a special prosecutor has been appointed. To the minister: would you just be upfront for once on this disturbing matter and just tell us who this special prosecutor is?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the minister has been very clear inside this Chamber that the process is independent from the government, that this government respects this, as does the minister. He referred the hon. members to the press release and to the appropriate officials within the department if they wanted to seek more information as well as to the RCMP. The question, then, becomes: why won't the members in the opposition take the time to actually do that process? To continue to come here day after day and question the Minister of Justice's integrity is ridiculous and fits in with the NDP's fear and smear tactics.

Ms Hoffman: I ask for the name of the prosecutor; the Government House Leader says "fear and smear". It's actually facts that we're asking for, facts that are very reasonable to be shared with the public.

Yesterday the Premier stood in this House and started to describe the RCMP's recent interview with the Minister of Infrastructure about the UCP voting fraud scandal. It is very concerning given that we know there were fraudulent votes cast for the Premier, who ultimately won the leadership contest in question. To the Minister of Infrastructure: what exactly did you tell the Premier about the RCMP interview, and do you think it was appropriate given that the voting fraud scandal ultimately may have led to the Premier becoming that himself?

Mr. Panda: Mr. Speaker, at the request of the RCMP I met with them briefly on June 23, and they assured me that I'm not the subject of any investigation.

Ms Hoffman: My question was about what the minister said to the Premier in the Premier's office about the investigation.

The investigation into the UCP voter fraud has been going on for months, Mr. Speaker. Information continues to trickle out in the media in dribs and drabs, and every time it does, this government looks less credible. It's time to be transparent and public. Will all members of this House who have been interviewed by the RCMP about the UCP voter fraud please stand up?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, to be clear, I have not been interviewed by the RCMP. I think that's probably important given the context of the question from the hon. member.

With that said, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and our government and our party have been clear that we have instructed and want everybody to fully co-operate with the RCMP investigation. We respect the independence of the RCMP. We suggest the members do the same. We let the RCMP do their work, and in the meantime, inside this Chamber, we're focused on defending Albertans on jobs, the economy, and pipelines, and that's what we'll continue to do.

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

Oil Transportation by Rail

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's talk about pipelines. Four times in the past two weeks I have asked the Minister of Energy to tell Albertans how many barrels of oil she has moved using private rail companies. She has dodged the question every time. Today she put out a statement that had very little detail. Certainly, there was no number of barrels being moved, so to the minister, for the last time: can you please state exactly how many barrels you are moving by private rail companies?

Mrs. Savage: Mr. Speaker, we have taken the next step today in shifting the NDP crude-by-rail deal to the private sector by engaging CIBC Capital Markets to help oversee the divestment of this program to the private sector. We have always said that moving crude by rail is something that the private sector is in the best position to do. The private sector is doing it now, and they will continue to do so in the future. In fact, the private sector has increased their capacity and moved 25,000 barrels a day additional on crude by rail.

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

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Starting Tuesday our government would be moving tens of thousands of barrels per day thanks to the rail contract we signed. Ripping up our contracts puts many jobs at risk, but this minister doesn't seem to care, and the Premier's federal Conservative friends in Ottawa botched Northern Gateway and Energy East and all the jobs that would have come with those projects. To the minister: can you tell us how many jobs would be lost by this latest failure to act on the contracts?

Mrs. Savage: Mr. Speaker, that's a great, great question. Their crude by rail would have moved an additional 10,000 barrels of oil a day. I just said and told this House that the private sector has already moved an additional 25,000 barrels on their own. Every single barrel of oil that would have moved through the NDP crude-by-rail program would have done so at a loss of money, and that

would be paid for by the Alberta taxpayer. No responsible government would impose that upon the Alberta taxpayers.

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

Mr. Sabir: Thank you. I was asking about the jobs that would have come with the contracts that we entered into.

I think that the Energy minister claims to be a long-time advocate for the oil industry, and she's supposed to be taking steps to move our products to market, but she has continuously dodged the questions, so I think that zero barrels have been moved so far. To the minister: if you don't want to do your job, can you at least ask somebody else to do it for you?

Mrs. Savage: Look, Mr. Speaker, the NDP's disastrous crude-by-rail program wasn't even going to start losing money for taxpayers until July 1, so, of course, even under their own crude-by-rail program there wouldn't have been any moved. The private sector is already moving 25,000 barrels a day additional on their own. Look, the NDP wouldn't even know how to run a lemonade stand. They would run a lemonade stand and think, using some of the numbers from crude by rail, that they could set up the lemonade stand at \$3.70, sell the lemonade for \$2 . . .

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Whitemud. [interjections]

Ms Pancholi: Is that Edmonton . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order! I'm sure you're all very excited to hear the question from the hon. member.

Gay-straight Alliances in Schools and Bill 8

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm hoping that the MLAs from across the way will also be smiling, or maybe they were smiling, when last night 32 UCP MLAs stood in this House and voted against restoring a clause that would allow for the immediate establishment of GSAs when a student requests it. It was a single word with a massive meaning to our LGBTQ youth. We know that prior to Bill 24 requests to establish GSAs were being stalled and student needs were being pushed aside. The Minister of Education provided no reason for why she voted this down. To the minister. Here's your chance to explain yourself. Why would you object to the immediate establishment of GSAs if you are truly supportive of LGBTQ . . .

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. I categorically disagree with what was just said. We have been perfectly clear that we oppose mandatory notification of any student. Also, once requested by a student, creating a GSA, a QSA, or any other inclusion group will absolutely be allowed, and there is a process in place. Our government will have the most comprehensive statutory protections for LGBTQ students in the country. We've said it over and over again. They don't hear it.

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

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. More tone-deaf key messages. I don't know why the Minister of Education would stand up here and say that she disagrees with facts, which is that she voted against an amendment . . .

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Pancholi: . . . which was a compassionate thing. So here's the thing. Kids are being put at risk by the hateful Bill 8. We know that, they know that, and the minister stands in this House and provides nothing of substance. Perhaps I'll have to ask her colleagues. To the Minister of Children's Services. Your job is to protect kids. How could you possibly vote against immediately establishing GSAs when kids ask for them? I really hope you answer and don't rely on the House leader, a man who fired a woman who complained about being sexually harassed. You are a strong, intelligent woman. Please let us hear your voice on this issue.

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. The NDP need to stop with their scare tactics and stop playing politics with our children. I am a strong woman, and I believe in protecting all children, and I will do that.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Pancholi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe she is a strong woman who has continued to fail to explain why she would be opposed to the amendment to allow immediate establishment of GSAs. We brought forward a simple amendment that would signal to the LGBTQ community that this government actually cares, but they have shown that they don't. The minister of labour had a big Wednesday. He officially cut wages for youth workers. Then he sat in this House last night and voted to cut their rights.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Pancholi: To the minister of labour. Please explain to the young constituents in your Calgary-Varsity riding why you don't feel they're worth as much as others and explain why if they're gay, you don't think they should have the utmost protections they're asking for. I don't need the House leader, by the way; we're coming for you.

2:00

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

Mr. McIver: Point of order. Thank you.

The Speaker: Point of order is noted.

The hon. Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that question. I can't even thank you for that question. That was unheard of. The NDP are continuing with their fear and smear. This is totally even below them. I apologize to any student in that gallery because I feel that we should be the examples, and we are not being good examples. We're being . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Hon. members, we will have order.

Ms Hoffman: The Minister of Education absolutely should apologize for failing to stand up for kids last night, when we brought forward a very reasonable amendment. Who else failed to? The Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Hoffman: He also voted against immediately establishing GSAs last night. It's on the record.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Point of order.

Ms Hoffman: As the minister responsible for preparing our students for their futures – this fixation seems to be on bringing in controversial Chicago principles on postsecondary campuses. To the Minister of Advanced Education. I guess our K to 12 schools won't be safe for LGBTQ youth because of your government. Is it your goal to make sure that we keep bullying and abuse going once they get to university as well?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

Mr. Nicolaides: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question is just so ridiculous. Our government has been so clear on our support of GSAs and of the LGBTQ community. We're going to continue to do that. We're going to continue to stand and support them and not listen to the fear and smear coming from the other side of the aisle.

Ms Hoffman: Last night, after his flock of loyal MLAs made it clear that they really don't want to support GSAs, the Government House Leader stood and said that what we were saying wasn't factual. Well, I guess the House leader is now an expert on what protecting kids is, so let's give him a chance. I really don't think he should be turning to his key messages. I think he should stand in this House and tell people the truth, not blah, blah, blah. To the House leader: stand in this House and explain why you voted against the immediacy clause, please.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, here comes the Official Opposition with their fear and smear and their just ridiculous, absolute practices. It's bizarre to see what the opposition continues to do inside this place. Here are the facts. We'll have the strongest statutory protections for GSAs. We've been clear about that. Our government stands by that. We made that clear again last night inside the House. That's the reality. Unfortunately, the opposition continues to want to fearmonger and tell Albertans things that just are not factual. It's disappointing.

Ms Hoffman: The Government House Leader could give Donald Trump a lesson in spreading misinformation, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader knows full right that hundreds of youth have protested, have written letters, have said: bring the word "immediate" back. The Government House Leader and all of his caucus continue to vote down these kids and make it more difficult for them to form GSAs. Enough of the talking points, enough of blaming us for standing up for kids. Government should be standing up for kids. Why won't you? Why did you vote against the immediate clause, the word "immediate"? Just stand up and tell us: why is it so wrong for it to be "immediate"?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, again we've got Team Angry, particularly that member. Well, actually, I'd go as far as to say her leader probably the most. But I know that member is frustrated that Albertans fired her on April 16. I understand that party is frustrated with the judgment of Albertans, but that does not mean that they should take this approach as the Official Opposition. What you're seeing here right now is an absolute embarrassment to the institution. It may be at this point the worst Official Opposition in this Chamber's history. It's ridiculous. We will not be lectured or bullied by these people. We will continue to stand up for our constituents inside this Assembly.

Ms Sweet: Point of order.

The Speaker: Well, we have a bevy of points of order from the government, that I have now acknowledged, and a point of order from the Member for Edmonton-Manning.

Now we will hear from the Member for Calgary-Glenmore.

Condominium Governance Regulations

Ms Issik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since I became the MLA for Calgary-Glenmore, in April, I've been increasingly alarmed at the growing number of condo stakeholders, including owners, management companies, and boards of directors, in my constituency expressing concern that some of the regulations set to come into force on July 1, this Monday, represent a major increase in red tape and, therefore, costs. As examples, I've heard concerns about everything from hard-copy-only documentation to changes around voting rights. To the minister: what is the status of the regulations, and what is being done to engage condo owners, boards, and other impacted stakeholders?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Service Alberta.

Mr. Glubish: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the member has noted, there were a number of regulations set to come into effect on July 1. Since the election we have heard serious concerns from stakeholders. They don't feel that these concerns were addressed by the previous government. Considering this, we have taken decisive action by pressing pause on those regulations so that we can review them to reduce red tape. Let me quote to you what we've heard from Willis Law, specialists in condominium law, in response to this action. "I applaud the government for listening to these concerns of over-regulation and impracticality on certain regulations and taking action to correct."

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

Ms Issik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for the answer. Given that these changes are quite broad in scope and given that the feedback I've been hearing has come from multiple sources, not solely owners or boards or managers, can the Minister of Service Alberta please tell us who will benefit the most by pausing the governance regulations? Will it be owners, condo boards, condo corporations, or condo managers?

The Speaker: The Minister of Service Alberta.

Mr. Glubish: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can tell the member that removing red tape and administrative burdens benefits everyone. It benefits owners, boards, managers, and corporations. Condo owners benefit because they can avoid higher condo fees, that would have accompanied some of these regulations, and boards, managers, and corporations can do their jobs more efficiently. This is a common-sense action that will benefit everyone who lives in, operates, governs, or manages a condominium. Don Brown of Core Real Estate Group has said: "These regulations... represent additional burdens on boards and management companies, which end up increasing the costs for owners. We are happy to see the government..."

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

Ms Issik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that when the order in council was issued by the previous government last December, there were two coming-into-force provisions and given that the majority of regulations were set to come into force on July 1, this Monday, of this year and given that a number of regulations related to insurance and reserve fund surveys and who's qualified to conduct them were set to come into force on January 1, 2020, to the minister: will the regulations set to come into force on January 1, 2020, be delayed as well?

Mr. Glubish: Thank you to the member for the question. We are pressing pause only on the regulations that were set to come into effect on Monday in order to review them. As a result, all of the pending regulations, including insurance requirements, will come into force on January 1, 2020. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the president of the Canadian Condominium Institute has said that in their education efforts they have "found that many people are still unaware and unprepared for the proposed changes. We are happy to support the government's pause on this." Again, this will enable us to look at the regulations with fresh eyes in preparation for all pending regulations to come into effect January 1, 2020.

Education Funding

Ms Hoffman: Scare tactics: that's what the Minister of Education repeated over and over yesterday when asked about real cuts coming to Alberta classrooms. The Calgary board of education is cutting hundreds of teachers. Edmonton public schools is losing millions of dollars dedicated to students with complex needs. These are real situations being detailed by superintendents and school trustees. Minister, the only thing that I see that is scary is your lack of leadership and the consequences we have for Alberta students. Why won't you show an ounce of leadership and fund education properly?

Mr. Jason Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we talk lots about the fear and smear unfortunately coming from the opposition. We see it in Team Angry, but also what you're seeing right now is that hon. member posturing for her future leadership race, I suspect, that's going on here inside this Chamber. As the NDP go through their internal problems, as they go through maybe their self-reflection or whatever is going on to determine their future, I suggest that they keep that internally and not bring it into this Chamber. We're here to work for the people of Alberta. We're here to return jobs to this province. We're here to get pipelines built and to get our economy going. Clearly, the opposition is just here to play games.

Ms Hoffman: Every single member of our caucus is united in standing up for the people of Alberta, Mr. Speaker. We won't be intimidated to stop asking about the ludicrous work that's being done by the government in terms of funding education.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora will get to the question as there are no preambles after question 4.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you for the reminder, Mr. Speaker.

Ludicrous: given that that's how the minister described our proof that Normandeau school in her own backyard is being forced to crowd-source to keep its school nutrition program going and given that it's ludicrous to tell 33,000 students to go hungry, why won't the minister come clean and tell us...

2:10

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. We absolutely look forward to the program, the nutrition program – we know the value that it has, how it impacts our schools – but we also have a procedure in place for funding. Information comes at certain times. We've communicated this to school boards. In fact, I've been in touch with many school boards, including Calgary public, Calgary Catholic, and I could go on and on and on. They've told me that the level of collaboration that we've been able to have, that my department and I have had, is refreshing and unprecedented.

Ms Hoffman: Given that the minister said, and I quote, that it's standard procedure – and she essentially said the same today – to communicate budget details to schools after they come to the Legislature but given that that will be months into the school year this time, Mr. Speaker, and given that her so-called standard procedure will see Battle River school division cut all of their special education teachers, to the minister. Hundreds of teachers lost, students going hungry, and boards cutting key educational supports for students with severe disabilities: is this what the minister calls standard procedure? I call it cruel.

The Speaker: The minister.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. Our government has committed to funding education and supports for our students. We are committed to funding enrolment growth. We are committed to building schools. We are committed to providing the resources and keeping teachers in front of students. Our schools know this, and I know they're looking forward to a wonderful summer.

Thank you.

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

PDD Program Applications

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. People are waiting for decisions about the status of their PDD funding, and they're hearing from staff that funding for PDD is now frozen and no new funding requests are being approved. Day after day I hear the Minister of Community and Social Services repeat empty talking points. Albertans with disabilities and their families deserve straight answers in plain language. Here's a very simple question: are new PDD applications for funding being frozen? Yes or no? Might as well be honest. We will find out.

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, let me say very clearly in plain language that no operational decisions have been made in regard to the PDD program. What we have in place is very much the program that we inherited from the previous government, and certainly no changes have been made at this time.

Ms Renaud: That's not what I asked.

Given that people with disabilities who do not receive funding approvals within a reasonable time frame face increased risk of homelessness, abuse, and neglect and given that right now service providers and families are being told that there is no new funding for PDD, will this minister assure Albertans with disabilities and their families that eligible applications will be processed and funded without delay? Yes or no?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mrs. Sawhney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will reiterate that we have not made any changes to the PDD program at this time, and I'm working with stakeholders and the disability community quite diligently, actually, to determine what their needs and concerns are so that we can improve the existing program. No changes have been made yet, but the changes that will be made will be effective and efficient.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Renaud: Thank you. That is not what we're asking.

Given that the community-led PDD review launched by our government is currently in limbo under this UCP government and

given that I've asked questions previously and received no answer from this minister, let me try again. To the same minister: will you come clean about the PDD review and provide an exact date of when the panel's report will be shared with the public, or have you fired the PDD panel and not told us yet?

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, it actually pains me that the previous government waited four years to initiate this PDD review panel. They could have done it at any time. To do a proper job, to make sure that it's done efficiently and with compassion takes time, and I will take that time to make sure that this review report is looked at thoroughly and also to demonstrate respect to the panel as well for their great work. That report will be released, and I will let everyone know when it's released.

Alberta Senators Federal Bills C-48 and C-69

Ms Glasgo: Mr. Speaker, my dad is one of the people who builds the pipelines that take our resources to market. I'm so proud of the work that men and women like him do every single day. Unfortunately, that same mindset isn't shared by the Alberta Senators that voted to support bills C-48 and C-69, that aim to shut down Alberta's energy sector. It is clear that independent Liberal appointees like Patti LaBoucane-Benson, Grant Mitchell, and Paula Simons are completely out of touch with everyday Albertans. To the Minister of Justice: what is being done to ensure that Alberta Senators are effective and represent the interests of everyday Albertans?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the work of our elected Senators here in Alberta. Senator Doug Black, Senator Scott Tannas: they led the charge in Ottawa fighting against Bill C-48 and Bill C-69. It's a great honour to, hopefully, you know, with the passage in this Assembly of this act, get Alberta Senate elections back here in Alberta and have the will of the Alberta people heard in Ottawa.

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

Ms Glasgo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the minister. Given that the NDP failed Albertans by not renewing the Senatorial Selection Act in 2017 and given that an election and a strong mandate from the people of Alberta embolden those who are in the Senate with the legitimacy of being elected and given that those who were previously elected as Senators and appointed by Prime Minister Harper – namely, Doug Black and Scott Tannas – have been champions for our energy sector, can the Minister of Justice update this House as to what our government is doing to ensure that further Senate appointments from Alberta have been recommended by the people of Alberta, not Justin Trudeau and his anti-energy views?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, we've held four Senate elections in Alberta. Half of the people that were nominated by this province were appointed to the Senate. These are some of the most effective parliamentarians that we've had here in our history. While the opposition rolled over with their best friend, Justin Trudeau, we're going to make sure we send people to Ottawa that have the best interests of Albertans at heart.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Glasgo: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the hon. minister. Given that bills C-69 and C-48, coupled with the imposition of a federal carbon tax, have stoked tensions across the country, fuelled

by the Prime Minister's failure to recognize these policies for what they are, an assault on this province's oil and gas sector and the humble, hard-working people that work within it, and given that this bill threatens the very national unity of Canada, can the government inform the House as to what is being done to challenge these harmful bills and stand up for Alberta?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, just last week we launched the constitutional reference to challenge the carbon tax. The Premier has been clear: we're going to use every legal tool possible to make sure we fight against Bill C-48 and Bill C-69. Remember, too, about Bill C-48: two votes. If two votes had gone the other way, we could have defeated Bill C-48. I would propose that if elected Senators were there in Ottawa, we would have defeated Bill C-48.

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

Justice Ministry Funding

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This government's refusal to provide budget certainty is creating chaos in education. I'm hoping the same won't happen in the justice system. Interim supply at the end of November represents more than two-thirds of the Justice budget. The figures the ministry is using signal over \$100 million in cuts. Over half a billion of the \$1.4 billion budget last year went to policing and jails. Judges decide who goes to jail, so you can't cut that. Can the minister reassure the public and confirm that there will be no cuts to public security?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, as we have clearly articulated, that was not a budget. We're going to be looking forward to bringing forward a detailed budget this fall.

As we articulated in our campaign platform, we're going to be providing our law enforcement officials with the resources that they need. Just remember here the previous record of the last government: seven out of 10 cities that had the highest increase in crime intensity were here in Alberta. We're going to make sure we reverse this trend.

Ms Ganley: But no commitment to police funding.

Given that of roughly \$600 million remaining after excluding police and jails, \$100 million in cuts would represent a significant portion and given that the Jordan decision puts significant pressure on the courts and prosecutors, pressure that requires additional resources each year just to keep up, to the minister. You claim to be tough on crime. Laying off court clerks would result in matters not going to trial. Can you commit that you will not cut the clerks or prosecutors?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many times I've said in this House our campaign commitment to hire 50 new prosecutors.

Let's talk about the record of the previous government. These galleries were full of Albertans concerned about safety in their community. Not a day goes by that I don't get a phone call or a meeting with somebody that's worried about what's happening in rural Alberta. The previous government let rural Albertans down. We're going to make sure that we deliver on our campaign commitments, to be there for Albertans so that all Albertans – all Albertans – can feel safe in their communities.

2:20

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Ganley: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the minister's colleagues voted repeatedly against funding for the RCMP and for prosecutors to support rural crime-fighting efforts and given that all the minister has committed to do so far is study the issue and that he appears to now be sliding in over a hundred million dollars in cuts and given that we know that the RCMP needs to hire constantly just to maintain staffing levels in rural areas, to the minister: if you can't commit to Albertans to maintain police funding, can you at least promise to commit to the RCMP so that they don't have to quit hiring as a result of your uncertainty?

Mr. Schweitzer: Mr. Speaker, I'll gladly rise all day to talk about the failed justice of the past government. Let's keep doing this. The fact of the matter is that crime continues to go up in rural communities. We're going to be there for these people. We're going to make sure our police officers, our prosecutors have the resources that they need. We're going to be providing \$50 million to ALERT. We're going to be making sure we expand drug treatment courts. We're going to be making sure we have the priorities of Albertans at heart. We're going to deliver on our campaign promises.

The Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-West Henday.

Condominium Governance Regulations

(continued)

Mr. Carson: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our government was proud to bring in new condominium rules to protect Alberta consumers. We put caps on fees, enhanced transparency for condominium boards, and we introduced protections for first-time homebuyers. Today this government has announced that they're putting a pause on the work we did. This is concerning to me and my constituents. To the Minister of Service Alberta: why would you ever pause rules designed to protect condo owners?

Mr. Glubish: Mr. Speaker, glad to have a follow-up on this very important topic. We place a great deal of value on input from condominium stakeholders, and these stakeholders have told us that the new condo regulations, scheduled to come into effect this summer, will cause an unnecessary administrative burden. We take these concerns very seriously. We have said that we want to ensure that Alberta is the best place to live, work, and raise a family. We are serious about that. Part of that means reducing red tape where we can and making sure that we are not adding unnecessary burdens to condominium owners, managers, associations. This is what our government is focused on delivering.

Mr. Carson: Well, it seems we're seeing a pattern of weakened consumer protections under this minister.

Given that 1 in 5 Albertans live in a condo and given that we know that condo owners endured outrageous fees and had no recourse and given that this government has a long track record of putting their wealthy donors first – and I fear they may be doing it here again – to the minister: can you confirm that your only goal here is to actually enhance consumer protections, not like, say, the promises you've made to your used-car dealer donors?

Mr. Glubish: Mr. Speaker, I'm having trouble with this one. The member opposite is really just trying to create problems where we're trying to bring about solutions. All we are doing with this is pressing pause on these regulations so that we can review them with fresh eyes and incorporate the feedback we have received from the stakeholders in this community. Albertans elected us to take action. We are committed to delivering on their best interests. I've already heard from stakeholders that this change is good news and that the

regulations that they were facing were impractical and overregulated and that they were going to increase costs.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Carson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I've heard stories, too. Given that we've heard heartbreaking stories of Albertans losing their condo deposits and stories of special assessments bankrupting families and given that these victims had nowhere to turn prior to the actions taken by our NDP government, to the minister: will you please commit to involving condo owners in whatever study you're conducting, and will you be open and transparent on who else is being consulted?

Mr. Glubish: Well, Mr. Speaker, as a former apartment condo owner and also a former director on my local condo board, I can assure the member opposite that I understand the serious nature of these issues. I can tell you that we have talked to stakeholders, which includes condo owners. We are going to take the time to get this right, and we are going to include the feedback from stakeholders. I can't tell you enough how much these stakeholders have told us already in the last two months that the previous government got this wrong. We will get it right. We are standing up for Albertans' interests, and we will not apologize for that.

Support for Persons with Disabilities

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, approximately 444,000 Albertans are reported to be living with a disability. While not all disabled persons are unable to work, statistics show that individuals with disabilities tend to have lower incomes and higher rates of unemployment than people without disabilities. All Albertans deserve to live with dignity and support themselves in the manner that they see fit. To the Minister of Community and Social Services: what is our government doing to ensure supports for all Albertans with disabilities?

Mrs. Sawhney: Thank you to the member for that question. Mr. Speaker, as a government we are deeply committed to providing quality services to vulnerable Albertans, including those with disabilities. We have strong platform commitments around the PDD program, employment opportunities, and enhancing supports for children with disabilities. Currently we have not made any changes to any of the programs. We are very much in listening mode. I have been working in co-ordination with stakeholders, students, families, and other members of the disability community to better understand their concerns and needs.

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

Mr. Amery: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister. Only 11,000 of these 440,000 disabled Albertans qualify for the persons with developmental disabilities program, and of these 11,000, only 16 per cent are actually employed. Given that often businesses are reluctant to take on the responsibility of employing a disabled person and given that there is often a job shortage for individuals with disabilities looking for work, to the minister: what is our government doing to help these individuals find gainful employment?

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, our government recognizes the underrepresentation of persons with disabilities in the workforce, and we will change that. We want all Albertans to be able to participate in society and the economy. That is why, as part of our job-creation plan, we will provide \$5 million per year to local

partner organizations like Abilities at Work and the Rotary employment partnership program to help create these job opportunities. We're also committed to making the government of Alberta a leader in hiring people with disabilities.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Amery: Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker and to the minister for that response. Given that the early years of a child's life are the most important for a child's development and given that certain disabilities have a direct impact on learning capabilities and given that children in Alberta deserve the best shot at life, can the Minister of Community and Social Services please outline what our government is doing for children with disabilities?

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, all children deserve to be protected, nurtured, and kept safe. Our government believes that prevention should be a guiding policy principle in social services. That is why our government plans to restore the wellness resiliency partnership program to help children with fetal alcohol spectrum disorder succeed in school. We will also be updating the standards of special education to reflect modern technologies and practices. All children deserve a quality, inclusive education regardless of ability.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Minimum Wage for Youth

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In a recent opinion piece to the *Morinville News* the labour minister wrote, "With the stats showing that unemployment for those under 18 for Q1 of 2019 is almost triple the adult unemployment rate, we can see that the previous government's policy has failed." What he fails to mention is that the youth unemployment rate has been triple the adult unemployment rate for several decades. He used a statistic many Albertans may not be familiar with to try and justify his assault on the wages of hard-working Alberta students. To the minister: when will you stop hiding behind partial statistics?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour and Immigration.

Mr. Copping: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the hon. member across the aisle and also to the party: what they failed to realize is the harm that their policies had on job creators and on the youth that they are trying to protect. What they failed to realize is that by increasing by nearly 50 per cent the minimum wage during the course of one of the worst economic downturns in Alberta's history, they actually created greater damage on employment and reduced opportunities for youth.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

Ms Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that the minister is still pretending that the ratio of youth unemployment to general unemployment shifted due to the increased minimum wage, when it didn't, and given that Saskatchewan has almost exactly the same ratio, just as in Alberta, roughly around three times, and didn't have an increase to their minimum wage, to the minister: when can the *Morinville News* expect your correction, and when can Alberta students expect the \$2 an hour you lifted from them?

2:30

Mr. Copping: I struggle with the comments made by the hon. member on the other side mainly because there's a failure to recognize that their drive to \$15 per hour in the face of one of the worst economic downturns had an impact. The Conference Board

of Canada indicated that a 10 per cent – 10 per cent – increase in the minimum wage would result in a 1 to 3 per cent increase in unemployment, and they did nearly a 50 per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, 21 per cent of our youth aren't working. We need to get them back working, and this minimum wage job creation for youth will do that.

Thank you.

Ms Gray: Given that the minister is quoting studies where we can see what happened in Alberta and what happened to Saskatchewan – both saw an increase in youth unemployment not related to the increase in minimum wage – and given that squeezing working students out of a couple of bucks an hour won't alter the state of Alberta's economy but will cause great pain to the youth who rely on that money, will the minister finally admit that the UCP labour policy is not about what's good for Alberta's economy but, rather, only what's good for the UCP's friends and donors?

Mr. Copping: Mr. Speaker, the student job-creation wage is about creating jobs for Alberta's youth. Not only were there studies done while the government was actually increasing its minimum wage urging them not to do so in the context, but after the fact we had studies done by the Calgary Chamber of commerce, also by other business organizations, where businesses in Calgary and across Alberta indicated that because of the changes that they made in terms of the increase in minimum wages and changes to general holiday pay, there were layoffs and a reduction in jobs, and there was also a reduction in hours. This hurt youth the most, and we're going to correct that.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie is rising to ask a question.

School Infrastructure Capital Projects

Member Loyola: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Father Michael Mireau school in my constituency of Edmonton-Ellerslie is desperately in need of new portables in time for the start of classes in September. A letter from Edmonton Catholic schools on June 13 indicates that the modular units are ready to go, but the school board can't proceed with installation without this minister. To the Minister of Education: are you aware of this situation, and can you please confirm here and now that you will approve these modulars?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. With the interim supply just passing, we are in the process of going through with all of the capital projects, including the modular projects that were approved.

Thank you.

Member Loyola: Given that portables have become a long-time reality in Alberta after decades of Tory governments that were unwilling to build schools and given that Edmonton Catholic was due to prepare the site for the modulars at Father Michael Mireau this week and given that time is tight to get the modulars in place, will the minister commit to looking into this matter immediately after question period, and will she ensure the modular installations by the end of the day tomorrow?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Education.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the question. I will absolutely – my door has been open. I've been receiving

numerous calls to meet on various capital issues. I continue to meet, and I welcome the information to be sent to me.

Thank you.

Member Loyola: Given that our government built or renovated 240 schools in just a four-year term and given that this minister has committed to building more schools in the future and given that the Minister of Infrastructure has said that he's going to use the capital plan created by our government, to the Minister of Infrastructure: will you commit here and now that every single school project across this province that was approved by our government will go forward and do so on the same timelines that we had planned?

Mr. Panda: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite knows full well that we're going through a budget process. As I've said before, we are looking at every project. We told them that we will honour their capital plan, but we'll still prioritize the projects. They also have left us in a ditch with a projected \$100 billion debt, so we have to handle that, too. We're trying to balance and trying to deliver the key infrastructure projects for all Albertans.

The Speaker: The Member for Spruce Grove-Stony Plain has a question.

Infrastructure Project Prioritization

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Municipalities need transparency from the provincial government. Without transparency from the government it becomes impossible for municipalities to properly plan limited infrastructure resources for the many needs each and every municipality faces. To the Minister of Infrastructure: when will the government uphold its campaign promises to provide transparency on prioritization criteria, establish predictable funding levels, and ensure adequate maintenance of existing infrastructure assets?

The Speaker: The Minister of Infrastructure.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was in our government's election campaign commitment platform to provide transparency on prioritization criteria for infrastructure projects and to establish predictable funding levels and to ensure adequate maintenance of existing assets, and this will be contained in the proposed Alberta infrastructure act. My staff in my department have started the work to ensure the bill is drafted, and I hope to table the bill in the spring of 2020.

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

Mr. Turton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given the previous government's utter contempt for transparency of the infrastructure priorities list and given that this absolute lack of transparency drives away potential P3 partnerships which could increase the quality of Alberta infrastructure and decrease the cost and given that without predictability and funding it is difficult, bordering on impossible, for municipalities to plan for growth and other challenges, how does the government intend to uphold its promises of transparency?

The Speaker: The Minister of Infrastructure.

Mr. Panda: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question and for his advocacy. It is true that the previous government derided P3s. For example, the Calgary cancer centre was supposed to be a P3, but the NDP chose the most expensive design and did not source out the building operations and maintenance. I know we could have saved millions of dollars on that

project. The Alberta infrastructure act will bring more transparency on how these kinds of decisions will be made in the future.

Mr. Turton: Mr. Speaker, given the previous government's obscuring of the infrastructure priorities and the criteria for choosing them and given that previous administrations have interfered in infrastructure priorities in an attempt to buy the votes of Albertans with their own tax dollars, how will this minister ensure accountability and transparency on the prioritization criteria to Albertans?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Panda: Thanks again, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the member. As you know, the NDP government attempted to buy votes, like the Member for Lethbridge-West trying to build backcountry huts in the Castle provincial park while the schools needed to be built and the roads needed to be paved. I want Albertans to know two things. One, I'll be publishing an annual infrastructure report to provide detailed information on the progress being made to meet the commitments of this government. There will also be a 20-year strategic capital plan that looks forward to see . . .

Seniors' Housing

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, seniors are the most valued members of any community. They have served their families, friends, and co-workers admirably and have built Alberta into what it is today. Over the past four years, though, the NDP failed Alberta's seniors. Wait times for care centres increased while their plans to build new care facilities were 10 to 15 times more expensive than previous government estimates. Minister, seniors in my riding want to know: what is this government doing to reduce wait times for more seniors' housing?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Seniors and Housing.

Ms Pon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for the question from the hon. member. We fully support seniors aging in their own communities through funding to build, operate, and maintain housing for low- to moderate-income seniors. Allowing for more creative community options such as personal care homes for seniors who need more care that can't be provided at home but less than a supportive living facility is an innovative solution for many of our seniors as the demand for seniors' housing continues to grow.

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

Mr. Milliken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that many seniors' homes in my constituency of Calgary-Currie are out-of-date facilities that can't keep up with the needs of the residents and given that a United Conservative Party campaign promise was to build more affordable housing for seniors who need it, Minister: can you please let my constituents know what the government is doing to provide quality housing for seniors in Calgary-Currie and across Alberta?

2:40

The Speaker: The Minister of Seniors and Housing.

Ms Pon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Seniors have established Alberta's values of hard work, responsibility, and community, and they deserve our support. We are currently working with our housing partners to evaluate current housing facilities and prioritize future projects to best serve our seniors.

Mr. Milliken: Given that while Alberta was under the NDP's watch the cost to the government for seniors' housing skyrocketed without having any measurable improvement on the quality of the few residences they provided and given that as Alberta's population ages more and more seniors will need more housing, to the minister: how will this UCP government reduce the cost per bed while providing the highest quality care for our seniors?

The Speaker: The minister.

Ms Pon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The NDP had four years to address this issue, yet there are more than 4,800 seniors' households on the waiting list. The cost of a bed under the previous government was 10 to 15 times more than it should have been. While the NDP has failed Albertans and seniors, our government will work with private and civic society partners to provide more affordable housing units in a fiscally responsible way.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I'll ask you to exit quickly in just a brief moment. I invite you to travel home safely, those of you who have other commitments, and please enjoy a very, very happy Canada Day. I invite all members to join us here at the Assembly. There are programs for the public between the hours of 12 p.m. and 9 p.m.

Hon. members, we are at points of order. The first point of order was raised by the hon. Minister of Transportation and Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. McIver: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe you received a note expressing my intention to change my point of order to a question of privilege. I reluctantly do this in regard to the threatening comments made by the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud during question period. I would appreciate it if you would allow me until the next sitting day to prepare my arguments.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the Minister of Transportation has provided oral notice for a Standing Order 15, which will be debated on Tuesday.

We are still at points of order. The Government House Leader also rose on a number of points of order throughout the afternoon. For any points of order of similar topics, if you can address them in one, I think it would be reasonable.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Of course, Mr. Speaker. I completely agree. I have two different topics. The bulk of the points of order are on one issue and then one separate if that works for you. I suspect it works for the Opposition House Leader as well.

Point of Order

Reflections on a Decision of the Assembly

Mr. Jason Nixon: I am rising first under Standing Order 23 which says:

- A Member will be called to order by the Speaker if, in the Speaker's opinion, that Member . . .
- (c) persists in needless repetition or raises matters that have been decided during the current session.

I would also point out a couple of other subsections of Standing Order 23:

- (d) refers at length to debates of the current session . . .

and then, lastly,

- (f) debates any previous vote of the Assembly unless it is that Member's intention to move that it be rescinded.

Throughout question period today, Mr. Speaker, the opposition referred repeatedly to a vote that took place in the Assembly last

night on an amendment, at some length. I think you could see throughout today, during question period, that there's no doubt that that was referenced repeatedly. Sadly, it was also done in such a way that certainly could be perceived as threatening to the hon. members of the government. With that said, I think that'll be addressed on Tuesday.

The reality is – we'll see how you feel about it – I think, that it's inappropriate for that to continue inside this place and that members should withdraw those comments, apologize for those comments, and return to proper decorum inside question period.

The Speaker: The hon. Official Opposition deputy House leader.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just clarifying the point that the Government House Leader, I believe, is referring to the votes that occurred last night in his point of order. Just for point of clarity, it is public record. I mean, all of our votes are recorded. It was a matter that did occur last night.

I think that, just to remind the government side and the ministers, they are responsible as, you know, members of Executive Council to be part of this legislation and to engage in the debate around the legislation. A vote occurred last night, and it is obviously one of the ones that we've been significantly debating over the last few weeks – significantly – and the member, of course, wanted to ensure that and provide an opportunity for Executive Council to explain why they chose to vote the way that they did. Again, it's public record, so that would not, in my opinion, be a matter that is really a point of order or a matter of dispute given that it's on the record.

The Speaker: Well, thank you for the interventions.

I would highlight, just for those of you following along at home, that the Government House Leader's point of order, I believe, is specifically referring to Standing Order 23(f). "Debates any previous vote of the Assembly unless it is that Member's intention to move that it be rescinded" is how the standing order is worded in our Standing Orders.

The Government House Leader also made some reference to prior debates that have taken place inside the Assembly in the same session. While I am not nearly as sympathetic to his position on the discussion of prior debate in a previous session, I think that there may be some validity to that.

Having said that, with respect to specifically 23(f), as Speaker Wanner also ruled with reference to the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, page 617, when it reflects on specifically commenting on how individuals have voted in the Assembly and therefore reflecting on a previous vote of the Assembly, in Speaker Wanner's words: "'Members may not speak against or reflect upon any decision of the House.' In other words, an allegation or question concerning how a member has voted is [in fact] offside." That is May 9, 2017, on page 924.

As such, I agree with the ruling that Speaker Wanner made on that day, and while I won't ask for an apology or a withdrawal today, I will strongly encourage members of the Official Opposition, when asking their questions, to not refer specifically to the voting record of any member of the Assembly as that would very clearly be in violation of Standing Order 23(f).

We are continuing with points of order. The hon. Government House Leader.

Point of Order Supplementary Questions

Mr. Jason Nixon: My last one, Mr. Speaker. It's in regard to the question that the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud had today. In

the interest of time I'll just refer to two previous Speaker rulings. Speaker Kowalski ruled on May 12, 2004:

Now, there's also a tradition we follow here that if an hon. member is recognized, they raise a first question and then they're allowed two supplementals. It has always been understood that supplementals must have something to do with the first question.

In addition, a second ruling I would refer you to, Mr. Speaker. On March 30, 1998, Speaker Kowalski as well ruled: "There is a consistent rule that there should be some flow with the questions and they should be in a similar type of subject." I find those, actually, in a ruling that was also made by Speaker Wanner on the same type of topic on December 6, 2016.

2:50

I don't have the benefit of the Blues, but if you listen to the hon. member's questions, she began talking about children's services and education issues on her original question and her first supplemental and then made a drastic switch well over to minimum wage, going to another minister. While I have no concern with asking multiple questions of different ministers in the Chamber, I would submit to you that it was a drastic change in topic and fits within that ruling.

The Speaker: I appreciate the hon. Government House Leader's remarks. I don't know if the Official Opposition House Leader would like to speak, but I am also prepared to rule.

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just really quickly, I am sure that you have the benefit of the Blues now. I do believe that all three questions were related to the bill last night and to the previous ruling that you just made, so I won't go into that piece, but all three questions were related to Bill 8 as of last night. Although directed to different ministers, it was related to that part.

The Speaker: Thank you to both House leaders for your comments.

I unfortunately don't have the benefit of the Blues for this particular question, and my memory on a Thursday afternoon perhaps isn't as sharp as it might be. I think it's possible that a case could be made that the questions that were being asked were about the overall health and well-being of young people. As such, it's possible that they were in order. Without the benefit of the Blues I am unable to rule, but I think that we need to offer all members of the Assembly certain levels of latitude when asking questions. It is the opposition's opportunity to hold the government to account, and I would say that I'll likely be hesitant to make further comment on this particular situation after reviewing the Blues, but if I feel there's a need, I'll do so on Tuesday.

The hon. Official Opposition House Leader.

Point of Order Imputing Motives

Ms Sweet: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise under 23(h), (i), and (j), making allegations against another member, imputing false or unavowed motives to another member, using insulting language of a nature likely to cause disorder. I'm specifically speaking to the word "bullying" as the example that the Government House Leader used in one of his responses to the Official Opposition. However, I would like to speak to a broader context around the tone that I feel the government is using when responding to the opposition with their "fear and smear" language, and then specifically the bullying component.

I think if you would refer to *Beauchesne's* section 3, page 4 – I'll just read it back to you really quickly.

The whole concept of the parliamentary Question Period depends on the tradition that the Cabinet is willing to submit its conduct of public affairs to the scrutiny of the Opposition on a regular basis. More tentative are such traditional features as respect for the rights of the minority, which precludes a Government from using to excess the [excessive] powers that it has to limit debate or to proceed in what the public and the Opposition might interpret as unorthodox ways.

I appreciate that this new government is not a big fan of question period or being held to account for, you know, some of the decisions that this Executive Council has decided to make around legislation and how that may be impacting Albertans and specifically a minority group within Alberta, but our position and our responsibility as the Official Opposition in this House is to hold this government to account. The language around we're "bullying" them, the language around using "fear and smear" in this House I deem to be trying, deliberately, to impute false motives of the Official Opposition. I also believe that it is used deliberately to create disorder in this House on a regular basis by the Executive Council. I also believe that it has allegations to members of this Official Opposition about what our motives are.

I would just like to ask the government and this Executive Council to maybe just be respectful of the parliamentary process and the role of the Official Opposition, reference *Beauchesne's* if you would like, and maybe take a step back and . . . [interjection] I appreciate that one of the members of the Executive Council is actually heckling me right now about this while I am trying to speak to decorum in the House, something that I believe their leader has been very clear is important to them.

So again I would ask that there be some level of respect and that we may bring down the allegations of us bullying this Executive Council and maybe just answering the questions as a government should.

The Speaker: The Government House Leader.

Mr. Jason Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, for this opposition to try to attempt to lecture anybody in decorum is an absolute joke. Anybody who's seen what's taken place in this Assembly knows that.

With that said, I don't have the benefit of the Blues specifically for the comment the hon. member refers to. But, again, the context that I recall is making it clear that this government will not be bullied by the opposition. It is disappointing to have seen what has taken place over the last few weeks inside this Chamber as over and over the opposition has bullied particularly our female members. Completely inappropriate. Now, they might disagree that they're doing that. I would submit to you, then, I guess, that that's a matter of debate and a disagreement on the facts. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that that's certainly how this government feels. I think anybody watching how that opposition has operated inside this House agrees. In fact, I know they do because I've heard from constituents often on how appalled they are about their behaviour on that issue. I'll be happy to start tabling those comments if that would help with the situation.

In addition to fear and smear, while I understand that the opposition doesn't like to have that pointed out, that is certainly how we feel their tactics are, not only in the House but as a party. Again, a disagreement as to the facts and a matter of debate. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, as far as this Chamber is concerned, it's something that this government thinks is taking place. We will point out the opposition's behaviour to the people of Alberta despite the fact that today they went quite out of their way to try to be able to stop the government from pointing out how they're behaving. That is our

right to answer that question and to point out the concerns that we have with what is being presented by the opposition.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. I do in fact have the benefit of the Blues, and I am pleased to rise to speak to this important point of order. The statement made by the Government House Leader is: "It's ridiculous. We will not be lectured or bullied by these people. We will continue to stand up for our constituents inside this Assembly."

I have some significant concern around the use of the word "bullying." In fact, I was having this conversation with members of my team earlier today. Inside this Chamber I have heard members of the government use the term, that the opposition is bullying certain members, and I, in fact, on numerous occasions have heard in questioning from the Official Opposition that this government is bullying other individuals.

As hon. members of this Assembly I understand that we are here battling for ideas, but when we start to make accusations about one member bullying another, I believe that it actually does a significant disservice to the major impact that bullying has on our young people. We need to be very cautious with both how we engage in decorum in this Assembly as well as what we communicate to others. When we make accusations about each other, bullying inside this Chamber, I believe that it minimizes the significant bullying that in fact takes place online and in schools and of our young people.

So I call upon all members to raise the level of decorum. Let's think very cautiously, both members of the opposition, to be clear, and members of the government, when we use the term "bullying," that we're not minimizing the impact that it's having on youth, children, teens in what I would say is the real world and not just here in this Chamber. I encourage all members to govern themselves accordingly as we move forward together to work to raise the level of decorum inside this Chamber.

We are at Ordres du jour.

3:00

Mrs. Savage: Mr. Speaker, under 13(2) I rise to . . .

The Speaker: We are at Orders of the Day, ordres du jour.

The Government House Leader would like to speak under 13(2)?

Mr. Jason Nixon: No. The Deputy Government House Leader would like to speak under 13(2).

Mrs. Savage: I would like to speak under 13(2).

The Speaker: Sure.

Point of Clarification

Mrs. Savage: Mr. Speaker, respectfully, I feel your remarks don't understand the effect that some on our side of the House have felt in feeling bullied during question period, and I want it on the record that I think it's real. I think the effects are real, and I believe and feel that perhaps your comments have minimized that impact to the women on this side of the House.

The Speaker: I appreciate your comments. Here's what I would say. I think that you've proven my point. We use this accusation: members of the opposition are doing certain things, and the government is bullying. The government responds with: the opposition is bullying us. We all need to raise our level of decorum. [interjection] The Government House Leader may disagree, but making accusations about bullying people, on both sides of the Chamber – I'm speaking to the opposition, and I'm speaking to the government, responding to the fact that they have, then, felt bullied.

We're talking about a very, very significant issue that widely impacts predominantly young people in our province, and as adults we need to reflect much better on those young people and on each other and govern ourselves accordingly. The opposition should not be accusing the government of bullying Albertans or bullying others, and the government shouldn't be making accusations of the opposition bullying them. We are here for a battle of ideas, not to be focused on bullying each other inside this Chamber.

Orders of the Day
Government Bills and Orders
Second Reading

Bill 13
Alberta Senate Election Act

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

Mr. Schweitzer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 13, the Alberta Senate Election Act.

This bill is based on historic Senate election law here in Alberta that expired in 2016. The law was not renewed by the NDP in 2016, and pursuant to its sunset clause it expired. We've held four Senate elections here in this province, starting in 1989. The last one was in 2012.

[Mr. Milliken in the chair]

Through that process Alberta has nominated 10 nominees for recommendation for appointment to the Senate, five of whom were appointed to represent us in the Senate in Ottawa. Those include Stan Waters, Bert Brown, Betty Unger, Doug Black, and Scott Tannas.

I have personal knowledge, Mr. Speaker, of the Senate election campaign from 2012. I happened to run the campaign for Senator Doug Black in that process, and it was one of the most enriching political campaigns that I've ever been involved in. Now, Senator Black toured across this great province, meeting with hundreds and hundreds of Albertans in communities ranging from Grande Prairie to Sundre down to Lethbridge. It was an amazing experience for a Senator who wants to represent all Albertans to go through, the process of earning the trust of Alberta voters. In that election over a million people in Alberta cast ballots for Senators here in this great province. Senator Black received 428,000 votes. That is a democratic mandate. That is important.

This bill reflects the belief that Senators that have that mandate, Senators that go through that process, that earn the trust of voters, have the democratic authority then to go to Ottawa and represent them in our Parliament.

We currently have six Senators in Alberta pursuant to our Constitution, Mr. Speaker. Last week, with the passage of Bill C-48, a prejudicial attack on Alberta, and Bill C-69, the no-more-pipelines act, we saw it play out in our Parliament why it is so important to have elected Senators from here in Alberta. The two Senators that were leading the charge against this attack on Alberta's prosperity were elected Senator Doug Black and elected Senator Scott Tannas. From the government side we just thank them so much for fighting so hard for the future of this province.

Conversely, unelected, unaccountable Senators that were appointed to the Senate from Alberta did not all vote in Alberta's best interest, Mr. Speaker. They did not vote in Alberta's best interest. All we needed to stop Bill C-48 was to turn two votes. Now, if people had gone through an election and if the six Senators representing Alberta were elected Senators, I would contend that the voting results on Bill C-48 would have been very different. We

probably would have seen that bill defeated. That would have been in Alberta's best interest.

That's why it is so important that we set the example for this country on the democratization of our Senate. When Albertans have had a say as to who represents them best, they've always chosen individuals of the highest calibre. The five Senators elected by Albertans that were appointed to the Senate have shown that they've effectively stood up for Alberta's economy, jobs, and families. When the federal government ignores our concerns, elected Senators have been our voice of reason there, fighting for Albertans. Alberta has always taken a leadership role in Confederation. We have led the discussion around Senate reform and provincial rights. Our elected Senators have set an example for other provinces of the benefits of having elected Senators.

It also sends a message to Ottawa and Justin Trudeau, who refused to appoint Senator-in-waiting Mike Shaikh, who received a democratic mandate from Albertans. I was so proud of the fact that our Premier yesterday said that if this bill passes, Mr. Speaker, he would appoint Mike Shaikh, who has the democratic mandate of Albertans, as a Senate nominee for our great province. We would highly encourage the Prime Minister to listen to the democratic mandate of Albertans and appoint Mike Shaikh when an opportunity is there for an appointment to Alberta on the Senate piece.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in 2012 over 1.3 million Albertans voted for who they believe should represent them in the Senate. We need to make sure that the Senate is accountable to the people. This is an important bill to get that done. This is the best way to make sure that our voice is heard in Ottawa to fight against other bills like C-48 and C-69, that are so damaging to our province.

Again, it is my honour and privilege to introduce this bill. We are showing Albertans once again that they have their say. This was a key election promise of ours to Albertans, Mr. Speaker. Promise made, promise kept.

I now move to adjourn debate.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Government Bills and Orders
Committee of the Whole

[Mr. Milliken in the chair]

The Deputy Chair: I would like to call the committee to order.

Bill 12
Royalty Guarantee Act

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. It's an honour to rise today to speak to Bill 12. I thought we were speaking to a different bill.

The Deputy Chair: We are currently debating in committee Bill 12, Royalty Guarantee Act.

Member Irwin: Okay. So we are on Bill 12?

The Deputy Chair: Yes.

Member Irwin: Okay. Thank you. We know that Alberta's energy resources are owned by the people of Alberta, and our job is to steward those resources to provide the right return for Albertans and to not squander them for tomorrow. This is exactly why our

government appointed an expert panel in 2015 to review royalties and ensure that we're competitive with other jurisdictions. That work is something that we should all be quite proud of. Based on that panel's recommendations, we were able to create a modernized royalty framework that is much stronger, that was much more efficient and more competitive.

3:10

But, as we're seeing, the UCP is taking a different approach. Instead of taking real action, we see that this Premier is misleading Albertans with yet another empty promise. My concern and the concern of my colleagues is that this bill does not create the certainty that our industry needs. In fact, it's full of loopholes that allow the government to change royalty rates whenever they want. We call upon this government and this Premier to stop with these empty promises, these gimmicks, and take real action.

We know that it's important that we get our oil moving. By cancelling our oil-by-rail deal, our Premier is risking jobs. You know, I've talked about this in the House before. My own father actually worked in oil and gas for decades, for nearly 40 years. I saw how hard he worked and how much he had to sacrifice to support our family, so I worry about folks like him who are employed in the oil and gas industry who are working so hard to support our province's economy.

Now, I want to talk a little bit more about the modernized framework that we introduced. I was not, obviously, a member of this government when the framework was put forward, but I saw how hard our government, the cabinet, and our former Premier worked on this issue. In August 2015 – that was pretty early into their mandate as well, I should point out – our government appointed the panel, including Calgary-based energy economist Peter Tertzakian; the mayor of Beaverlodge, Leona Hanson; the president and vice-chancellor of the University of Winnipeg, Annette Trimbee; and, of course, the chair, who was Dave Mowat.

The panel took a lot of time and put in a lot of effort to ensure that they were hearing from everybody, not just from industry experts but from labour groups, from environmental groups, from a whole number of academics working in a range of fields, from business leaders, community leaders, thousands of other Albertans who participated in person or online, and from workers as well, which is crucial. Their consultations with Albertans included more than 7,000 online responses.

What did that panel find? Well, I talked a little bit about it, but I want to share a little bit more detail. Overall, royalty rates are comparable to other jurisdictions. They recognized that there are issues with crude oil, liquids, natural gas. They recommended that all changes to that new framework should apply to new wells in 2017, that existing royalties should remain in effect for 10 years on any wells drilled before 2017, and that more transparency and more disclosure is needed about calculations and royalties per project.

What did our government do? Well, we took the advice of this expert panel and accepted that royalty review panel's recommendation. As a result, we released a modernized royalty framework in January 2017 to try to, as the panel urged, encourage industry to innovate and to reduce costs, to make those same companies competitive, and, of course, most importantly, encourage more investment in Alberta.

I'm not going to go on a lot about this one, but I wanted to get on the record here, because I haven't yet spoken to Bill 12, that we're concerned about the lack of certainty in this bill. We're concerned about the loopholes that, as I said, will allow government to change royalty rates.

What I'm going to do is that I'm going to move that we adjourn debate on this bill and move forward. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Bill 2

An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill? I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood has jumped up to speak to this bill.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. While I was quite happy to speak to Bill 12, I'd also love to speak to Bill 2. All right. Look, 13 bucks an hour, that's a heck of a lot more than zero bucks an hour, and that's the option here: that was our Premier speaking after Bill 2, the open for business act, was tabled in the Legislature. I want to rise today and speak to this bill and speak to the amendment as well to propose changing the name of this Bill 2, An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business, to make it be called the employment standards and labour relations statutes amendment act, 2019.

I want to just talk a little bit more about the words of our Premier and why I'm quite concerned about his approach to this bill. He says that we've got 30,000 young Albertans here out of work, that we want to get them their first job experience, that we're talking about part-time, teenagers, who are typically in high school. He goes on to say that this will reduce costs for businesses and allow job creators to hire more young people who are just starting out in the workforce, that they're working typically 20 hours a week or less.

Now, these statements fail to recognize that there are many young people in Alberta who are actually working more than that. I can pull in some stats from a number of places, but I've got the Alberta Federation of Labour here, who estimates that there are approximately 35,609 workers in Alberta age 15 to 17 that will be negatively impacted by lowering their wages. They point out that this minimum wage cut will make life harder for young workers who are saving for school or contributing to their household's income.

We know that this government is saying that they're trying to address these higher unemployment rates, which, our Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods pointed out earlier, is simply not true. This is a discriminatory policy that tells young Albertans that the work they do is worth less than other Albertans'. We know that there are young people who work more than one job, that there are young people who work day in and day out to support their families. It's not about working to buy fun extras but actually to put food on their family's table, to help pay the bills. Certainly, we know there are some young people out there who are fortunate enough to just be able to work because they want to, to have extra pocket money, but that's not the reality for all young people.

That's not the reality of many of my constituents who shared with me that they're concerned about what this minimum wage cut will mean for them and for their families. For these young people a \$2-an-hour difference is huge. It's a big deal. It's a significant amount. We need to consider these young people as we move forward. I want to echo the words of 16-year-old Karissa Goulding, who works at a Fort Saskatchewan restaurant. She said, quite simply, that these changes don't seem ethical. She said: I think it's crazy for me to be paid less when I work just as hard as my adult colleagues.

The concept that the Premier put forward, that young people don't have to pay bills, is dead wrong. Karissa, like many young Albertans, is supporting her family. We see this a lot. There are statistics that show that, particularly in newcomer families, young people are trying to help support their families, their parents, or perhaps just one parent.

She says: the youth wage cut represents the government telling me that they know more about my situation than I do, that my work is not valued as much as my adult colleagues. Pretty strong, pretty insightful words from a 16-year-old. She said that her boss told her that her wages will be cut when the change comes into effect, which is as of yesterday.

What I found most troubling as a former teacher is that she said that as a result, she's going to have to work more hours, which will eat into her study time. So there you go, an example of a student who's quite worried about this change. It's not only cutting into the money that she worked so hard to earn; it's potentially damaging to her academic career. She needs to work more hours to make up for those lost wages, and in turn her studies are potentially compromised. Of course, the Premier says that this will, quote, get young people back to work. You're right. It'll get some people back to work, young people like Karissa, who now need to work even more hours just to make ends meet.

3:20

As I said, I was a teacher. I was a high school teacher. I worked a lot with young people in that age range, 16 years old, just like Karissa. In my role as a teacher I often had to sit with students to urge them to stay in school. I was an academic counsellor, and I was a vice-principal, so I took it seriously to really keep kids in school. I mean, a lot of those kids out in rural Alberta, where I taught, were quite drawn to some pretty high-paying jobs or at least jobs that would lead to high-paying jobs in the future, particularly, at that time, in oil and gas, other industries. As I said, I had to sit with those students to really urge them to stay in school. You've got your whole life to earn money in a full-time sort of role. Many of them wanted to get out there, and it was tempting to drop out. I worry that with this move to cut wages, kids like those ones that I used to teach will be further pushed to drop out of school.

I'm concerned about young people. I'm concerned about the students, like the ones I used to teach and the ones that are out there right now, who are now, now that this wage cut has come into effect, being impacted. Their families are being impacted in many cases.

It's not just about the students. As I said, I wanted to hammer that point home because it's an issue that's – you know, the livelihood of students is something that I take quite seriously. But it's also about workers generally. We've seen from this government a continued attack on workers.

Joel French, executive director of Public Interest Alberta, noted:

These changes will create a perverse incentive for employers to maximize profits by hiring youth instead of other workers because they can be paid less for doing the same work . . . [and it's] clear discrimination against a [group] of workers who are not even able to express their opinion at the ballot box.

As I've said before, I mean, I was a social studies teacher, so in that role – central to the Alberta social studies curriculum program of studies, kindergarten to grade 12, is the importance of active, engaged citizenship. My role as a teacher was to encourage my students to voice their concerns when they felt that they were being discriminated against. If I were a teacher in a school right now and I was hearing from my students their concerns about this, I'd sure be encouraging them to write letters, to send off e-mails. I know, at least on our side of the House, we've certainly been CCed on some of those e-mails.

Now, Joel French goes on to say that – you know what? – this is about more than just the impact on youth workers. It's about the impact on adult workers as well. He pulls in data, which I think is an important approach to take, an evidence-based approach, and says:

We can easily predict that this will cause a drop in employment for vulnerable groups of adult low wage earners, who tend to be young adults, women, and people of colour . . .

groups that we know, here in Alberta,

. . . are already struggling in our economy, and the last thing they need is an attack on their employment.

This is a deep concern.

We know that there are stats that raise concern from a global context, too. Our party, the NDP: we take this seriously. We will stand in this House and tell you that the youth minimum wage is discriminatory. Don't just take our word for it; take the words of young people who have gone on the record to say the very same thing. As information from the Alberta Federation of Labour outlines, a youth minimum wage “violates international standards on fair pay.” Youth workers cannot be universally judged to have lower productivity than older workers, especially given the types of jobs that we typically find youth workers in. The International Labour Organization, the ILO, and the international community have embraced the principle, a principle that we should all embrace, of equal remuneration for work of equal value, equal pay for equal work.

Mr. Schmidt: Sounds like socialism.

Member Irwin: Right?

We'd like to take a jurisdictional approach. It's important that we look at what's been done Canada-wide and internationally as well. All Canadian provinces embraced this standard in the 1980s and the 1990s. Countries such as New Zealand have moved to a single minimum wage because they saw that it was discriminatory. They saw that, in fact, the very people it was intending to help were being hurt by the policy. By implementing a tiered minimum wage, as our province has sadly done, Alberta is arguably in contravention of international labour standards and is pushing even lower wages on some of the people who are already the lowest wage workers in our society.

I'd like to just close by reiterating my concern about this bill, my concern about the unintended consequences of some of the policies inherent in it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Are there any other hon. members?

I will also just say – I didn't say this at the outset of the comments from the hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood – that we are still on amendment A2. I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore rising to speak, please.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate you recognizing me so I get the opportunity to speak, as you mentioned, specifically to the amendment to Bill 2 to change the name of the bill. Quite frankly, when I look at this bill, it's highly incorrect. We are trying to say that we are going to make Alberta open for business. We're just going to force it. It's just going to happen. That would mean to suggest that Alberta was closed for business to begin with. So I'd like to point out just a couple of little details that maybe members opposite might have missed.

Over the last few years we've seen a company called Seven Generations Energy building a natural gas processing facility to the tune of \$1.2 billion, Mr. Chair. We've seen a company, which, of course, I'm very aware of in my free time, with a little bit of the gaming that I get to do – but I was very impressed when the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview as the former minister of economic development and trade brought in the digital media tax credit, which is credited for bringing the company Improbable to move their head office to Edmonton. We've seen Amazon set up a

warehouse here in Alberta. That warehouse is a \$120 million investment into Alberta.

CN Rail had decided to make a significant investment in its network to expand and strengthen all of its infrastructure. That's about a \$370 million commitment by that company. Something tells me that someone like CN wouldn't make that kind of investment in our province if they didn't think it was open for business already. Pembina Pipeline Corporation is building a petrochemical plant. That is a \$4.5 billion investment here in Alberta. Another quick one I could mention is Inter Pipeline building another petrochemical facility to the tune of \$2.1 billion.

Just quickly, that is roughly over \$8.2 billion of investment here in Alberta over the last three years. If Alberta wasn't open for business already, I doubt that any of these companies would have made these types of investments here in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Schmidt: They're making it opener for business.

Mr. Nielsen: I don't know if it's possible to make it opener. Is that even a word?

I think that to aptly rename this the employment standards and labour relations statutes amendment act, 2019, is more appropriate. When we look at some of the things that are being done throughout Bill 2, we've seen some regulations that, of course, the Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood had mentioned earlier, around lowering the youth minimum wage.

It's amazing. I came from a graduation earlier this morning. Getting the opportunity to hang out with our young emerging leaders here in the province, it's incredible how much they are paying attention and how much they know what's going on. I think I recall this story from the Member for Edmonton-Glenora, speaking to some students that she happened to recognize in a mall that she was at at that time, and they said: you know, we're very confused about this youth minimum wage. They were working. If there were five people on shift at that time and two of them were 17 years old and in school, they would get \$2 an hour less. The thing that they were able to very quickly realize, apparently, was that if it only requires five people on staff during that shift, it magically, because two of them are making \$2 an hour less, does not mean that a sixth person is required to do the work.

Of course, I have heard the same thing from some of my business owners throughout Edmonton-Decore. It's, like: look, you know, maybe I kind of, sort of, possibly appreciate the government's attempt to save me some money, but because they're going to make \$2 an hour less is not going to change my hiring practices.

3:30

Again, when I'm looking at Bill 2, calling it An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business, how does taking away hard-working Albertans' overtime make Alberta open for business? I think that is highly, highly incorrect – highly incorrect – because when people have money in their pocket, they spend it in the local economy. Now, I mean, maybe some of my colleagues on this side of the House might be able to help me out. I know that in Edmonton-Decore a lot of my residents aren't taking this money and squirrelling it away in a Cayman Islands account for some rainy-day investment or something like that. They're spending it right in Edmonton-Decore, not only on the things that they need but also on the things that they want. When they have that money, businesses will flourish.

I can tell you, Mr. Chair, that things in Edmonton-Decore are hopping. I was joking both back in the 2015 election and even in the 2019 election that I found it very, very hard to try to find a campaign office because the great news was that business was

booming in Edmonton-Decore. There was no room. Of course, I guess, you know, it was a bit of a struggle because there was no room. But you know what? That is a fantastic problem, I think, to have.

When we consider this amendment to change the name, it's because of language like that in this bill, Bill 2. Trying to call it An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business is highly, highly incorrect. Taking away, potentially, people's ability to get holiday pay: you know, you start adding all kinds of criteria in order for them to qualify for that.

See, Mr. Chair, the unfortunate part is that, in my experience from the labour movement, we have unfortunately seen some bad actors out there that will very, very quickly take advantage of people on this. You know, I know that the other side has talked about how: well, for the people that are under union contracts, this doesn't affect them. That is slightly correct because, unlike the government not honouring bargaining contracts, thankfully there are companies out there that are honouring these things. But once that expires, potentially all bets are off, and that is what's called a concession, and that's going to essentially be imposed on hard-working Albertans, all under the name of "I can't compete," because we've created the conditions to allow our bad actors to exploit people, and our good employers, who are really trying so hard to be good employers – to create a safe working environment, to value their employees – get put at a disadvantage because of that. I don't see at all how that makes Alberta open for business.

Like I said, even just in that one word – people have probably heard me speak a little bit ad nauseam around this, around language. Language means everything. You change one little word, and it completely alters a sentence. So to say that you're going to make Alberta open for business, that means you're going to try to force things to happen. A lot of times what we see happen when things get forced is unintended consequences. Now, this bill is already filled with all kinds of consequences that are intended, which is a problem in itself, so I think that by accepting this amendment, calling it what it is, that we are changing the employment standards and labour relations statutes, it more accurately reflects what is going on in Bill 2 right now.

This title, An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business, does not reflect that. I think that when Albertans see that kind of a title, they're easily confused. "Oh, well, they're going to make it open for business; that must sound pretty good." And then they start to read the details. Their overtime is getting taken away, and they're being put at a disadvantage in terms of their stat holiday pay. Again, like I said – here's my union background kicking in again – I have seen employers that will do this. Why are we creating conditions to allow the bad actors to circumvent these types of things?

I guess I could probably even tie that back to red tape, you know. Some of this red tape was put in to prevent those bad actors from taking advantage of hard-working Albertans. If you are going to take your time away from your family, your friends, or just your plain old free time, you deserve a reward for doing that, and that reward was time and a half. Overtime is overtime. It doesn't matter whether you're getting paid out for it or whether you're banking it. It is still overtime.

I find this title very, very confusing for people. I have had a few people ask me why that's happening. As I've mentioned, I've even had a couple of friends that have called me up that don't share my political views. Of course, I can't share, really, the contents of that conversation, Mr. Chair, because it would be highly, highly unparliamentary, but they were very, very disappointed with this bill, and I'm going to tell the members opposite: they voted for you. They voted for you. They are not happy. They even mentioned, you know: "How is taking away my overtime making Alberta open for

business? It sounds like it's making conditions to pick my pocket." That is probably why we ended up calling it the pick-your-pockets bill.

I think that if we are to take the time to rename this, this will bring at least a little bit more clarity to what is, really, a bad bill and allow Albertans to see it for what it really is. It's not making Alberta open for business. Alberta was already open for business. I've only mentioned a very short list, like I said, to the tune of \$8.2 billion worth of investment. I'm sure that there are a whole lot more that I could go on with, but, you know, I certainly don't want to take up too much time, because I know that there are other speakers that want to get up and speak to this amendment.

I would really recommend that all members of this House accept this amendment. This is a correct amendment. It more clearly reflects the language that is going on in this bill. As I said, language is everything. We need to be clear with Albertans about what's going on. We shouldn't be fooling them with fancy titles. I certainly know that there are members opposite that were part of the 29th Legislature that used to get quite up in arms about fancy titles, yet here we are – I think I've said this before, Mr. Chair – second verse, same as the first. It seems a little bit rich that a government complains about what was going on, how it should have been done properly, that we should have gone down this path, that this is how we should have handled it, and then when they get the opportunity to show Albertans how the right way to do it is, they end up just kind of repeating sort of the same things that they were apparently up in arms about. I find that just a little bit confusing, just like the title of this bill.

I'd like to see that changed, and I would highly recommend that members in this House accept this amendment so that we can more accurately reflect to Albertans what this bill is really doing.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, those looking to speak to amendment A2? I see the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar rising.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. It's a pleasure to rise and speak to this amendment to Bill 2. First of all, I want to give credit where credit is due. I've been keenly watching the debate around Bill 11, and I want to thank the Member for Calgary-Varsity for his thoughtful engagement in that debate. In my opinion, I think he has distinguished himself from his peers on the front bench as someone who has constructively engaged in debate and has been at least willing to hear some of the things that we on this side of the House have been able to say. I appreciate that. Having sat on both sides of the House, it's not easy to take the things that the members opposite say seriously and engage constructively, and I really appreciate the sincere efforts that he made on Bill 11 with respect to that effort.

3:40

Knowing that he's capable of doing that, I would really appreciate some constructive engagement on this bill as well. It's been a stark contrast between the points that he's made with respect to Bill 11 and the points that he's made with respect to Bill 2. With Bill 11, he's talked at length, very thoughtfully, about what the intent of the bill was. He's admitted its shortcomings and has at least given us a plan for moving forward and given all of us in this House, I think, some confidence that he is taking the issue of fair registration seriously and that he's intending to do more. I've been disappointed, Mr. Chair, though, that when it comes to the content of Bill 2, he hasn't been as engaged. He has relied on the talking points that I suspect have probably come from the Premier's office and were not generated out of his own office. He's been less willing to engage, and I'm a little bit disappointed to see that. I would hope

that he would take the opportunity today in Committee of the Whole or at some point during the Committee of the Whole to thoughtfully engage because I do have some questions.

When you look at the bill, the bill is all about reducing wages for workers. It reduces wages for minimum wage workers. It reduces wages for people who are on banked overtime agreements that are forced upon them by their employers. It reduces wages by making it harder to form a union in your workplace, and it also reduces wages by removing eligibility for some general holiday pay. There are four different ways that this bill reduces wages for workers, Mr. Chair. Under the title of the bill we're told that that's going to make Alberta open for business, that all of a sudden because we're taking these four measures to lower workers' wages, Alberta will have a sudden influx of business investment.

Now, Mr. Chair, that flies in the face of all of the facts that we see on the ground. For a long time Alberta has had, on average, the highest wages in the country. That is one of the benefits of living in Alberta, that we have, on average, the highest wages in the country. We as New Democrats, we as social democrats believe that a successful economy is an economy where everyone has the opportunity to go to school, get a job, be able to work and provide for your family, and retire in dignity. People are more likely to be able to do that in Alberta than in any other part of the country because we've had the highest wages. We've also had the highest business investment of any province in the country. Just on the face of it, just on those two elements alone, we've had the highest wages and the highest business investment. Now, I'm not saying that one causes the other. I'm certainly not saying that high wages create an attractive business environment although there are certainly some economists who do believe that higher wages inject more money into the local economy. Certainly, nobody can argue that higher wages dissuade investment in Alberta because it hasn't been the case.

In fact, if you look at the unemployment situation right now in every other jurisdiction in the country except for our brothers and sisters in the Maritimes, who continue to struggle with high unemployment rates, we see that every other jurisdiction in the country has lower unemployment than Alberta right now even though they don't pay their students a lower minimum wage, with the exception of Ontario, which, the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods has repeatedly pointed out, has similar youth unemployment rates to our own.

In every other jurisdiction where somebody is eligible to bank overtime hours, they're eligible to bank them at the overtime rate, except for Alberta. That hasn't had a negative impact on employment or business investment. In every other jurisdiction, in the province people get the same general holiday pay structure that this bill is taking away, and it's easier to form a union.

I'm hoping that the Member for Calgary-Varsity can summon his powers of reasoning and skilful argument, which he's clearly demonstrated over this past week and over the six weeks we've sat here in the Legislature, and tell me what the case is. Where is the evidence that lowering workers' wages in these ways will actually spur investment and create jobs? I don't see any evidence. Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, this bill, at least when it comes to UCP talking points, has been a fact-free zone. I would encourage the Member for Calgary-Varsity to bring some more evidence to bear in supporting his arguments because we know that he's capable of doing that.

You know, I talked about some of the cases that people have made for higher wages actually improving the economic conditions in the province. I want to refer to an opinion article that was written in the *Edmonton Journal* on March 30, 2019, by Katy Ingraham, who is a business owner in the great constituency of Edmonton-

Gold Bar. She runs a local restaurant called Cartago, and she is a member of a collection of businesses that have banded together, formed alberta15.ca. People of Alberta can go to alberta15.ca and find a list of people who are minimum wage employers who have promised to not adopt the student minimum wage.

She quite effectively lays out the economic case for keeping minimum wages higher in this article, and I want to quote some of it.

Better income is linked to a variety of benefits, including decreased employee turnover, fewer absences due to illness, and increased loyalty and productivity from employees. Paying a fair wage demonstrates that work and skill is valued. And workers with more money have more money to spend.

That's not to downplay the fact that businesses have had to adapt . . .

She acknowledges in this article that it's been a challenging time in Alberta over the last few years. She said:

Despite having the hottest economy in the country for years, in the decade prior,

Alberta also had Canada's lowest wages.

For most businesses, minimum wage won't make the difference between opening and closing . . . But it will make those workers more vulnerable to coercion and harassment.

Paying youth . . . won't suddenly create a ton of new jobs. But it will create an incentive to ditch an 18-year-old for a newer model . . .

Despite low oil prices these past five years, Alberta [had been] inching closer to fairness . . . Our child poverty rate is decreasing. [She] can't help but feel that higher wages . . . had a positive impact.

I've had a chance to discuss that article with Katy in person. I know that it took a significant amount of bravery on her part to write that article because she was under a significant amount of pressure from many of her colleagues in the restaurant industry to not voice her opinion against lowering the student minimum wage.

In the article she also references an advertising campaign that was launched by Restaurants Canada that, she said, was nothing but "fear and intimidation." I know that we get accused of running fear and intimidation. I suspect that might be members opposite projecting their own campaign techniques onto us, but that's a matter for another day.

3:50

I would like to give the Member for Calgary-Varsity an opportunity during Committee of the Whole, during this debate, to actually provide some evidence. What evidence has he seen? I'm genuinely asking the question, Mr. Chair. I'm not trying to trap the member. I'm not trying to box the government into a corner that they can't get out of to score political points. I am genuinely interested to see what evidence he's seen that lowering wages will actually increase investment beyond what we currently expect Alberta to see and to bring some facts to bear in this case, because, like I said in my earlier comments, we know that he's fully capable of doing so, and I think this debate desperately needs it. The people of Alberta desperately want to know the reasoning behind this bill because, to them, it looks like an attack on their wages and nothing more.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, I see the hon. Member for Red Deer-South has risen to speak.

Mr. Stephan: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to take a few minutes just to stand and speak against the suggested amendment to change the name of Bill 2, which is currently named An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business. It was interesting because the member

opposite just recently, just prior to the one who just spoke, said that the implication of the title suggested that prior to the change in government, Alberta was not open for business. I would suggest that the member opposite is leading with their chin a little bit.

I want to talk about some facts because we've been asked to, you know, be fact focused. Let's think about: what are the key success indicators of whether a province is open for business? Well, Mr. Chair, I think all of us in this House would agree that a key success indicator of whether a province is open for business is its private-sector employment. What happened under the NDP? Well, here are the facts. There were tens of thousands more private-sector jobs when the NDP came into government than when they got fired a few months ago. That is a profound failure. These are real individuals and families, and I met some of them. It was devastating for them.

That, to me, is a key success indicator, private-sector employment. Well, what happened under the prior government? It fell. Every year, that should actually grow. Every year, the number of people employed in the private sector should actually grow. In the four-year period that you were in government, you shrank it by tens of thousands of individuals. That is a profound failure, which suggests that maybe Alberta wasn't as open for business.

But let's go on to another key success indicator as to whether or not a province is open for business. I would suggest that corporate tax revenue would be a pretty good indicator, if a province is open for business. Every year the government of Alberta issues an annual report based on fact. The annual report contains a schedule that allows the public to compare current results with historical results, so let's consider the numbers. When the NDP came into power, corporate tax revenue, as reported in the annual report, was \$5.7 billion. Then the NDP increased the corporate tax rate by 20 per cent. Did corporate tax revenue increase by 20 per cent? No. It decreased by over \$1.5 billion. And here's this: the corporate tax revenue for the remaining years that they were in government never reached the 2015 levels just prior to them coming into government, despite their 20 per cent increase. Mr. Chair, does this speak to a province that was open for business? Well, if businesses are no longer succeeding and paying taxes, I would submit, it is not.

Let's talk about another key success indicator as to whether or not a province is open for business, and that is: can government walk the talk? You know, can it live within its means in a responsible, businesslike manner? Is it competent to instill confidence in the sustainability and the stability of government? March 31, 2015, was the last time that Alberta posted a surplus. It was about \$1.1 billion. Then the NDP came into power. Well, what happened the next year? A \$6.4 billion deficit in 2016-17, then the following year a \$10.7 billion deficit, and for this upcoming year a projected deficit, based on third-quarter results, of over \$6 billion.

These deficits added more than \$30 billion of debt. By analogy, that would buy all the houses in Red Deer and Lethbridge. They would do that with their deficits alone, and they did that in only four years. Of course, while they were in government, their spending exceeded population and inflation growth by billions of dollars. Mr. Chair, here's a really important thing that I think the members opposite are confused about. The definition of successful government is not spending money you don't have. The definition of a successful government is not spending money you do not have, right? Living off your credit cards does not make one a responsible individual. That is why you were fired.

Now, we've kind of talked a little bit about – we've kind of listened to the NDP, and it's important that we understand their world view, okay? The world view of the NDP is not shared by the majority of Albertans. Here is the world view of the members opposite. Let's refer to their constitution. Their constitution states

that its purpose is to establish and maintain a democratic socialist government in Alberta. Socialism is their world view. That world view and their record, if it was distilled into an act, would be An Act to Make Alberta Closed for Business.

4:00

This bill, Bill 2, is completely appropriate and why I will be voting against the amendment. Bill 2 repudiates NDP governments that, at their core, have an undercurrent of hostility towards businesses that made Alberta closed for business, and their record speaks for itself.

I do want to talk specifically, though. Bill 2 reinstates the concept of a secret ballot for joining a union. You're upset about that. The NDP does not like secret ballots and changed the law to take them away. They wanted to deny employees the choice to make the private decision as to whether they want to join a union. You know, that ability, that choice, that private decision is common throughout the other jurisdictions in Canada, but the NDP took it away. What are the members opposite afraid of? A secret ballot is a form of accountability, protecting against compulsion and undue pressure. They do not trust employees to make the decision they wanted. You know, socialism is not comfortable with freedom. That is the culture of the NDP, and it does not work in the real world.

In closing, Mr. Chair, I'm very happy to speak in favour of not changing the title of Bill 2, An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business. Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar has risen to speak.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm incredibly disappointed. I made my comments asking for some thoughtful interventions, particularly from the Member for Calgary-Varsity, and I had hoped that maybe the Member for Calgary-Varsity would rise and respond to some of the questions that I had asked in my phrase. Instead, we got the Member for Red Deer-South, who issued us some talking points that they teach in UCP kindergarten. You know, it's like: oh, unemployment is up and corporate tax revenues are down; the NDP must have chased away investment because they're socialists.

Now, first of all, on the issue of socialism, the Member for Red Deer-South, the only thing that he got right in his speech was the fact that we are a democratic socialist party, and we're proud to be so. I just want to share for the Member for Red Deer-South, who is obviously ripe for education . . .

The Deputy Chair: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member. I do believe that I heard desk thumping during that.

Mr. Schmidt: On behalf of whichever member did that, I apologize.

The Deputy Chair: Please continue.

Mr. Schmidt: We will refrain from thumping our desks.

I want to share with the House a quote made by President Harry Truman in 1952 when he was campaigning for Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic presidential candidate in that year's election. He said:

Socialism is a scareword they have hurled at every advance the people have made in the last 20 years. Socialism is what they called public power. Socialism is what they called social security. Socialism is what they called farm price supports. Socialism is what they called bank deposit insurance. Socialism is what they called the growth of free and independent labour organizations. Socialism is their name for almost anything that helps all the people.

You know, we've been in this game here in the NDP for 86 years. We were founded in 1933, Mr. Chair. We were founded in Calgary, actually, Calgary, Alberta. When the member opposite says that, you know, a majority of Albertans don't share our world view, he couldn't be further from the truth. People in Alberta along with other Canadians love public health care, they love public education, they love old-age pensions, and they love free roads and infrastructure, all of those things that the member opposite would call socialism unless they were being built in his riding, in which case that's just prudent governance, right? But when we provide those things for everybody in Alberta, then it's socialism.

Of course, we've seen that here in question period over the last six weeks. Everybody on the UCP side is in favour of big cuts except in their own ridings. We know that the Member for Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock doesn't want public-sector jobs to be taken out of his riding. We know that, I don't know, Mr. Chair, all of these guys here to my right look alike. They all stand up and ask for roads and interchanges and bridges and schools to be built in their own ridings, but they don't want it to be built at any cost to taxpayers, and they certainly want it to be taken away from other people because providing those things fairly to everybody would of course be socialism.

But I want to address some of the – I don't know how to phrase it. Unemployment was up, corporate tax revenues were down, and deficits were up during our term in government. Those things are true, Mr. Chair. I will grant you that those things were true. None of those things can be linked to anything other than the lack of market access for our oil and gas and the fact that the price of oil dropped from \$100 a barrel to almost giving it away at Christmas of last year. We, of course, had the choice of cutting spending to not have a deficit. That would have meant a \$10 billion reduction in the spending of the province of Alberta on a \$50-billion-a-year budget. Give or take, that is a 20 per cent cut. You know, applied evenly, that means 1 out of every 5 patients wouldn't get treated. You could only get to grade 10. You wouldn't be able to get grade 12. We'd have to shut down 20 per cent of the universities and colleges in this province.

We chose not to do that, Mr. Chair. We chose not to burden the people of Alberta with the fallout of low oil prices and a lack of market access. In fact, we chose, I think quite wisely, to run deficits in the short term while we were working diligently on enhancing market access for our oil and gas products, trying to add value so that we retain more of the value of the oil and gas products that were extracted here in the province of Alberta in the hopes that the economy would turn around and that economic activity would increase and we would no longer have to employ those deficits.

I am really looking forward to the budget this year to see what kinds of decisions the Member for Grande Prairie-Wapiti will make when it comes to tackling the deficit. It is either going to create a significant amount of pain for average Albertans, or they're going to admit that cutting the deficit is a lot harder than they thought it was when they were in opposition, and they're going to say that their plan isn't really that different from the one that we had put forward when we were in government.

4:10

Now, Mr. Chair, it's also important to remind the Member for Red Deer-South that when we raised corporate taxes, we raised corporate taxes from 10 per cent to 12 per cent, which brought them in line with corporate taxes all across the country. Every other province in the country has a corporate tax rate of approximately 11 or 12 per cent. We weren't leading the country by any means. We were certainly not taxing corporations beyond their means. It was simply the fact that they were getting 10 per cent less of the value

of the resources that they were selling than they were in 2015, and they couldn't move their products as well as they could in the run-up to 2015.

Mr. Chair, again, being an optimist, I hope that we can get back to the amendment, which is simply that this is an act to amend employment standards and labour relations. It has nothing to do with creating investment, generating investment in the province of Alberta. Unless somebody shows me otherwise, there is not a positive correlation. There is no reason to think that lowering wages, picking workers' pockets, will make it more likely for businesses to invest in Alberta. It hasn't happened in any other jurisdiction, and nobody from the other side has presented a coherent case as to why that's the case. You know, I live in hope that we will abandon the stale talking points, the kindergarten Conservative communication style that we saw from the Member for Red Deer-South, and actually get to a thoughtful debate and convince us with some evidence and facts.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: I see the hon. Minister of Labour and Immigration standing to speak.

Mr. Copping: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to thank the hon. Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar for asking me to speak again on this amendment. As you may recall, I spoke at length on this. I'll do a quick summary of that, but I don't want to spend a lot of time on that detail and getting into this, so my comments will be brief.

I would like to respond as well to a couple of comments that the member had made. You know, it's interesting that the hon. member had admitted that under their government, despite them actually increasing the corporate tax rate, corporate taxes went down, unemployment, particularly on the private-sector side, went up, and that debt continued to increase and was on track for a \$100 billion debt, and the deficit was continuing to rise.

One thing that I found striking about the comments, and I reiterated this in my comments yesterday, is that he made the comment that none of this can be linked to the policy; it was all the economy. Mr. Chair, that cannot be further from the truth. Speaking in particular, let's talk about the increase in minimum wage that occurred under the previous government, an increase by nearly 50 per cent in a few short years during an economic recession. The Conference Board of Canada did a study while they were midway through this increase, and that study suggested that an increase by 10 per cent, an increase of 10 per cent in the minimum wage, could result in a 1 to 3 per cent increase in unemployment.

But despite that being done, that advice from the Conference Board, that caution from the Conference Board – let me also add one more thing. Part of that caution was also that context matters and that in doing that in the face of an economic recession, it could potentially be worse. Right? I recognize there are different views from different economists, but context matters, and the Conference Board came out and made this statement. But what did the previous government do? They continued to increase the minimum wage, and not by 10 per cent, not by 20 per cent, but, Mr. Chair, by 50 per cent.

So I can understand the argument, you know, from the members opposite saying: "No, no. Well, this is just an economist doing a study. That's their assessment." But, then, let's talk to the job creators, Albertan companies, Calgary companies. Studies were done, and these companies responded and said: we have laid off employees and reduced the hours because of these changes.

The chamber of commerce put out the layering effect. It was not only the changes in the minimum wage, general holiday changes, you know, the increase in taxes but all of that layered together. They

said: "We are reducing employment. We are reducing opportunities. We are not hiring." Particularly, those hardest hit were the youth in our society.

So when the member opposite says, "You know, show me," there is a lack of understanding of the implications that their policies had. I go to the hon. member for Red Deer's previous comments. This is what I actually meant in my comments the other day. There is a divide. We have a different world view, right? When the members opposite can't even recognize what impact their policy changes have had, well, then, there's no way that they can recognize that decreasing the minimum wage will have any impact. They didn't even recognize that by increasing the minimum wage, it had any impact to start off with.

Mr. Chair, these changes we're making in this bill will create jobs and signal that we are open for business. As I indicated in my comments – and I'm not going to reiterate all of them that I made yesterday – you know, that is why I cannot agree to this amendment.

I'll make one further comment. You know, I'd like to thank again the member across for having great debate on Bill 11 and for the support from both sides of the House in that regard. I am happy to engage in debate, but on this particular point, Mr. Chair, we are coming from very different sides. Their philosophy appears to be that their policies made no difference on the job creators and didn't result in increased unemployment even though there's a recognition that it was all the economy. Quite frankly, the evidence shows the opposite.

We were elected – we were elected – on a platform to get Albertans working again, and very specifically we were elected on a platform in which Bill 2, that was outlined, said that we would create a youth minimum wage, that we would make changes to general holidays, that we would make changes to banked overtime, and that we would make changes to the Labour Relations Code to reinstate the private vote and put the power back in the hands of workers in that regard. That's exactly what Bill 2 does. It signals a desperate signal that we need to give to the investment community, in addition to bills 1, 3, and 4 and our whole, entire platform, that we are open for business. We want businesses to invest back into this economy and get Albertans working.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-North West.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, that makes, you know, quite a modest suggestion that we change the name of Bill 2 to a statutes amendment act moniker. I think that this is eminently reasonable.

Language is a funny thing, Mr. Chair. You know, it is powerful, and it, of course, conveys the meaning of the words that are on the page, but it also conveys a certain tone – right? – which is kind of the theme that I've been talking about for the last couple of days here. For this one, "Alberta Open for Business," it's pretty strong, and it sort of implies a lot. But when you start to unpack that as language around something like reducing the minimum wage for younger workers, it sort of says "open for business" as in: we're exposing our youth to an unequal and unjust differential in wages just to be open for business. Right?

You start to explore that, and you realize that it's almost like you're presenting our youth here in the province as being willing to sacrifice by 13.3 per cent their wages for the sake of the title of this bill. You know, the same with "open for business" and looking at holiday pay eligibility. We're willing to, you know, allow businesses to have a choice as to whether they pay overtime or a

differential for Christmas, let's say, for example. We're willing to sacrifice those businesses that choose to not pay holiday pay for Christmas for the sake of being open for business. You could go on and on with this, Mr. Chair. It sort of exposes this notion that by compromising labour standards or money in the pockets of workers in the case of overtime, somehow that sacrifice, that compromise will suddenly open the doors of business here in the province.

4:20

We all want to see a healthy economy, we all want to see it expanding, and we all want to see prosperity for all. You know, it's been a challenging time over the last number of years. The economic downturn affected our province quite a lot. The price of energy and market access really did have a marked effect on our economy. But when you're in a tight spot like that, that's when you really have to make the tough decisions around how and who you're going to serve to ensure a level of economic stability for a household budget, economic stability for young individuals, and to ensure that services that you need for yourself and your family are there when you need them, including health care and education. That's when really difficult decisions need to be made – and the choices need to be made there, too – on: who do you serve?

I think that it's an easy job to be a whip with the Alberta New Democrats because we have guiding principles that ensure that we know what the correct decision is every step of the way to make sure you look after everyone even during an economic downturn. You don't cut the minimum wage; you look for ways to make it a living wage. You don't cut overtime pay; you look for ways by which you can have fair compensation that ensures the viability of a business, and you move forward with that. You don't negotiate through the Legislature, through the tip of a legislative pen – right? – which weaponizes the very notion of negotiating, but you sit down and you bargain in good faith even during an economic downturn.

You will find that you will end up with outcomes that will come as creative solutions from both the management side and the worker side, things like, for example, with the teachers, the classroom improvement fund, this organic, creative thing that came off the negotiating table, a negotiating table that was infused with the notion of good faith. We looked for ways by which we said: "Hey, we only have, you know, very limited funds, but we have to educate our kids. What's the best way to spend those very, very difficult funds during an economic downturn to ensure the maximum return for kids?" And – boom – in negotiating in good faith for that, you ended up with something as very effective as the classroom improvement fund, which this current government is cutting.

I bring up that point just to say, you know, Mr. Chair, that semantics and language are powerful and meaningful. An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business is really just a statutes amendment act that is fraught with peril. But we're always so helpful over here on the opposition side. We want to make life better for Albertans, and we want to make language clearer for Albertans, too, so we're offering this amendment as a way by which to make this modest change. You know what? I mean, I can't speak for everybody here

today, because we haven't talked about it yet, but I'm willing to say that if you change this name to a statutes amendment act, I personally will consider not calling Bill 2 the pick-your-pockets bill. You know what I mean?

Ms Pancholi: Yeah.

Mr. Eggen: I've got one there.

Member Irwin: Yeah.

Mr. Eggen: And I've got another one there. There you go. I mean, this is the way we work. Let's make a deal. We will use language. We will, you know, have a language détente, so to speak, at 4:25 on a Thursday afternoon. If you guys change this to a statutes amendment act, I will stand down on the pick-your-pockets bill.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: I see the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora rising.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. That was how I was planning on proposing my opening remarks, hon. Member for Edmonton-North West. But I'm happy to say that that was exactly when the member for Lethbridge . . .

The Deputy Chair: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but under Standing Order 4(3), seeing the time, the committee shall now rise and report progress without question put. For clarity, we will be rising and reporting progress on Bill 12, Royalty Guarantee Act, and we will rise and report progress on Bill 2, An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business. The committee shall now rise and report progress.

[Mr. Milliken in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports progress on the following bills: Bill 12 and Bill 2. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by the 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, say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Acting Speaker: All those opposed, say no. Carried. So ordered.

I see the hon. Minister of Energy.

Mrs. Savage: I move to adjourn until Tuesday, July 2, at 1:30.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 4:27 p.m.]

Bill Status Report for the 30th Legislature - 1st Session (2019)

Activity to Thursday, June 27, 2019

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

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

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

Bill 1 — An Act to Repeal the Carbon Tax (\$) (Kenney)

First Reading — 8 (*May 22, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 44 (*May 23, 2019 aft.*), 79-92 (*May 27, 2019 eve.*), 95-107 (*May 28, 2019 morn.*), 121-43 (*May 28, 2019 aft.*), 166-70 (*May 28, 2019 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 215-24 (*May 29, 2019 aft.*), 239-41 (*May 29, 2019 eve.*), (*May 30, 2019 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — 246-51 (*May 30, 2019 morn.*), 327-339 (*Jun. 3, 2019 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Jun. 4, 2019 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2019 c1]

Bill 2 — An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business (Copping)

First Reading — 58 (*May 27, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 145-52 (*May 28, 2019 eve.*), 189-90 (*May 29, 2019 morn.*), 236-39 (*May 29, 2019 eve.*), 375-79 (*Jun. 4, 2019 aft.*), 416-17 (*Jun. 4, 2019 eve.*), 448 (*Jun. 5, 2019 aft.*), (*Jun. 5, 2019 eve.*), (*Jun. 5, 2019 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 986-1002 (*Jun. 19, 2019 aft.*), 1090-99 (*Jun. 20, 2019 aft.*), 1218-22 (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve.*), 1235-44 (*Jun. 26, 2019 aft.*), 1293-1300 (*Jun. 27, 2019 aft., adjourned, amendment introduced*)

Bill 3 — Job Creation Tax Cut (Alberta Corporate Tax Amendment) Act (Toews)

First Reading — 111 (*May 28, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 236 (*May 29, 2019 eve.*), 341-53 (*Jun. 4, 2019 morn.*), 408-16 (*Jun. 4, 2019 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — (*Jun. 5, 2019 eve.*), (*Jun. 11, 2019 morn.*), 685-700 (*Jun. 11, 2019 aft.*), 738-45 (*Jun. 12, 2019 morn., passed*)

Third Reading — (*Jun. 12, 2019 aft., passed*)

Bill 4 — Red Tape Reduction Act (Hunter)

First Reading — 202 (*May 29, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 277-78 (*May 30, 2019 aft.*), 365-75 (*Jun. 4, 2019 aft.*), 432-48 (*Jun. 5, 2019 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 633-44 (*Jun. 10, 2019 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 644-46 (*Jun. 10, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 5 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2019 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 779 (*Jun. 12, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 986 (*Jun. 19, 2019 aft.*), (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1135-36 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve.*), 1153 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1195 (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve., adjourned*), 1213 (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 6 — Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 2019 (\$) (Toews)

First Reading — 931 (*Jun. 18, 2019 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 984-86 (*Jun. 19, 2019 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1136-38 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve.*), 1153 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1195-98 (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve.*), 1213 (*Jun. 25, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 7 — Municipal Government (Property Tax Incentives) Amendment Act, 2019 (Madu)

First Reading — 356-57 (*Jun. 4, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 625-31 (*Jun. 10, 2019 aft.*), 653-60 (*Jun. 11, 2019 morn.*), 701-07 (*Jun. 11, 2019 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 811-13 (*Jun. 13, 2019 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 1138-45 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 8 — Education Amendment Act, 2019 (LaGrange)

First Reading — 421 (*Jun. 5, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 648-49 (*Jun. 10, 2019 eve.*), 707-25 (*Jun. 11, 2019 eve.*), 781-95 (*Jun. 12, 2019 eve.*), 848-74 (*Jun. 17, 2019 eve.*), 1145-53 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve.*), 1153-62 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve.*), 1180-86 (*Jun. 25, 2019 aft.*), 1255-57 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1258-59 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., adjourned*), 1266-78 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 9 — Public Sector Wage Arbitration Deferral Act (Toews)

First Reading — (*Jun. 13, 2019, passed on division*)
Second Reading — 874-84 (*Jun. 17, 2019 eve.*), (*Jun. 17, 2019 eve.*), 933-71 (*Jun. 18, 2019 eve., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 971 (*Jun. 18, 2019 eve.*), 1004-76 (*Jun. 19, 2019 eve., passed on division*)
Third Reading — (*Jun. 19, 2019 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 10 — Alberta Personal Income Tax Amendment Act, 2019 (Toews)

First Reading — (*Jun. 13, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 847-48 (*Jun. 17, 2019 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 971 (*Jun. 18, 2019 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 1138 (*Jun. 24, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 11 — Fair Registration Practices Act (Copping)

First Reading — 975 (*Jun. 19, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1186-94 (*Jun. 25, 2019 aft.*), 1244-51 (*Jun. 26, 2019 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1259-63 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 1263-65 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., passed*)

Bill 12 — Royalty Guarantee Act (Savage)

First Reading — 1088 (*Jun. 20, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1186 (*Jun. 25, 2019 aft.*), 1251-53 (*Jun. 26, 2019 aft.*), 1255 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1257-58 (*Jun. 26, 2019 eve., adjourned*), 1292-1293 (*Jun. 27, 2019 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 13 — Alberta Senate Election Act (Schweitzer)

First Reading — 1225 (*Jun. 26, 2019 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1292 (*Jun. 27, 2019 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 201* — Protection of Students with Life-threatening Allergies Act (Armstrong-Homeniuk)

First Reading — 277 (*May 30, 2019 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), (*Jun. 13, 2019 aft., reported to Assembly*)
Second Reading — 825-38 (*Jun. 17, 2019 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1122-24 (*Jun. 24, 2019 aft., passed with amendments*)
Third Reading — 1124-26 (*Jun. 24, 2019 aft., passed*)

Bill 202 — Child, Youth and Family Enhancement (Protecting Alberta's Children) Amendment Act, 2019 (Ellis)

First Reading — 277 (*May 30, 2019 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills*), (*Jun. 13, 2019 aft., reported to Assembly*)
Second Reading — 838-40 (*Jun. 17, 2019 aft.*), 1115-22 (*Jun. 24, 2019 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 1126 (*Jun. 24, 2019 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 203 — An Act to Protect Public Health Care (Feehan)

First Reading — *(Jun. 13, 2019 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills and Private Members' Public Bills), (Jun. 27, 2019 aft., reported to Assembly)*

Table of Contents

Prayers.....	1279
Introduction of Visitors	1279
Introduction of Guests	1279
Members' Statements	
Canadian Multiculturalism Day.....	1279
Government Policies and Parliamentary Debate	1279
Post-traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Day.....	1280
Somali Independence Day	1280
Religious Freedom and Human Rights.....	1280
Tom Wanyandie	1280
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees	1281
Tabling Returns and Reports	1281
Oral Question Period	
2017 UCP Leadership Contest Investigation.....	1281
Oil Transportation by Rail.....	1282
Gay-straight Alliances in Schools and Bill 8.....	1282
Condominium Governance Regulations	1284, 1286
Education Funding.....	1284
PDD Program Applications.....	1285
Alberta Senators, Federal Bills C-48 and C-69.....	1285
Justice Ministry Funding.....	1286
Support for Persons with Disabilities	1287
Minimum Wage for Youth	1287
School Infrastructure Capital Projects	1288
Infrastructure Project Prioritization	1288
Seniors' Housing.....	1289
Orders of the Day	1292
Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading.....	1292
Bill 13 Alberta Senate Election Act	1292
Committee of the Whole.....	1292
Bill 12 Royalty Guarantee Act	1292
Bill 2 An Act to Make Alberta Open for Business.....	1293

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

For inquiries contact:

Managing Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875