



Province of Alberta

The 31st Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday morning and afternoon, May 7, 2026

Day 55

The Honourable Ric McIver, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 31st Legislature

Second Session

McIver, Hon. Ric, ECA, Calgary-Hays (UC), Speaker
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie-East (UC), Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees
van Dijken, Glenn, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock (UC), Deputy Chair of Committees

Al-Guneid, Nagwan, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Amery, Hon. Mickey K., ECA, KC, Calgary-Cross (UC),
Deputy Government House Leader
Arcand-Paul, Brooks, Edmonton-West Henday (NDP)
Armstrong-Homeniuk, Hon. Jackie, ECA,
Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville (UC)
Batten, Diana M.B., Calgary-Acadia (NDP)
Boitchenko, Hon. Andrew, ECA, Drayton Valley-Devon (UC)
Boparai, Parmeet Singh, Calgary-Falconridge (NDP)
Bouchard, Eric, Calgary-Lougheed (UC)
Brar, Gurinder, Calgary-North East (NDP)
Brar, Gurtej Singh, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Calahoo Stonehouse, Jodi, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, ECA, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Chapman, Amanda, Calgary-Beddington (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Assistant Whip
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UC)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
de Jonge, Chantelle, Chestermere-Strathmore (UC)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, ECA, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UC)
Dyck, Nolan B., Grande Prairie (UC)
Eggen, Hon. David, ECA, Edmonton-North West (NDP)
Ellingson, Court, Calgary-Foothills (NDP)
Ellis, Hon. Mike, ECA, Calgary-West (UC),
Deputy Premier
Elmeligi, Sarah, Banff-Kananaskis (NDP)
Eremenko, Janet, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, ECA, Calgary-Peigan (UC)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., ECA, Calgary-Mountain View (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UC)
Glubish, Hon. Nate, ECA, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UC)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gray, Hon. Christina, ECA, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP),
Official Opposition House Leader
Guthrie, Hon. Peter F., ECA, Airdrie-Cochrane (PTP)
Haji, Sharif, Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Hayter, Julia K.U., Calgary-Edgemont (NDP)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, ECA, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Hon. Nate S., ECA, Drumheller-Stettler (UC)
Hoyle, Rhiannon, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., ECA, Taber-Warner (UC)
Ip, Nathan, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Assistant Whip
Jean, Hon. Brian Michael, ECA, KC, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche
(UC)
Johnson, Jennifer, Lacombe-Ponoka (UC)
Jones, Hon. Matt, ECA, Calgary-South East (UC)
Kasawski, Kyle, Sherwood Park (NDP)
Kayande, Samir, Calgary-Elbow (NDP)
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, ECA, Red Deer-North (UC)
Loewen, Hon. Todd, ECA, Central Peace-Notley (UC)
Long, Hon. Martin M., ECA, West Yellowhead (UC)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UC)
Lunty, Brandon G., Leduc-Beaumont (UC)
McDougall, Hon. Myles, ECA, Calgary-Fish Creek (UC)
Metz, Luanne, Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
Miyashiro, Rob, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Nally, Hon. Dale, ECA, Morinville-St. Albert (UC)
Nenshi, Naheed K., Edmonton-Strathcona (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition
Neudorf, Hon. Nathan T., ECA, Lethbridge-East (UC)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, ECA, Calgary-Bow (UC)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, ECA, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UC)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Petrovic, Chelsae, Livingstone-Macleod (UC)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, ECA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, ECA, Calgary-North West (UC)
Sawyer, Tara, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, ECA, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Hon. Joseph R., ECA, Cardston-Siksika (UC),
Government House Leader
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, ECA, Calgary-Shaw (UC)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, ECA, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, Hon. R.J., ECA, Highwood (UC)
Sinclair, Scott, Lesser Slave Lake (Ind)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UC)
Smith, Hon. Danielle, ECA, Brooks-Medicine Hat (UC),
Premier
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UC)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP)
Tejada, Lizette, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Turton, Hon. Searle, ECA, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UC)
Wiebe, Ron, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UC)
Williams, Hon. Dan D.A., ECA, Peace River (UC),
Deputy Government House Leader
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., ECA, Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UC)
Wright, Justin, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UC),
Government Whip
Wright, Peggy K., Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UC),
Deputy Government Whip
Yaseen, Hon. Muhammad, ECA, Calgary-North (UC)

Party standings:

United Conservative: 47

New Democrat: 38

Progressive Tory: 1

Independent: 1

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, KC, Clerk
Trafton Koenig, Law Clerk

Vani Govindarajan, Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and
Executive Director of Parliamentary
Services

Nancy Robert, Clerk of *Journals* and
Committees
Aaron Roth, Committee Clerk
Amanda LeBlanc, Managing Editor of
Alberta Hansard

Terry Langley, Sergeant-at-Arms
Paul Link, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Gareth Scott, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Lang Bawn, Managing Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms

Executive Council

Danielle Smith	Premier, President of Executive Council, Minister of Intergovernmental and International Relations
Mike Ellis	Deputy Premier, Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services
Mickey Amery	Minister of Justice
Andrew Boitchenko	Minister of Tourism and Sport
Devin Dreeshen	Minister of Transportation and Economic Corridors
Tanya Fir	Minister of Arts, Culture and Status of Women
Nate Glubish	Minister of Technology and Innovation
Nate Horner	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Grant Hunter	Minister of Environment and Protected Areas
Brian Jean	Minister of Energy and Minerals
Matt Jones	Minister of Hospital and Surgical Health Services
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Primary and Preventative Health Services
Todd Loewen	Minister of Forestry and Parks
Martin Long	Minister of Infrastructure
Myles McDougall	Minister of Advanced Education
Dale Nally	Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction
Nathan Neudorf	Minister of Affordability and Utilities
Demetrios Nicolaides	Minister of Education and Childcare
Jason Nixon	Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Joseph Schow	Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration
R.J. Sigurdson	Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation
Searle Turton	Minister of Children and Family Services
Dan Williams	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Rick Wilson	Minister of Mental Health and Addiction
Muhammad Yaseen	Associate Minister of Multiculturalism

Parliamentary Secretaries

Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk	Parliamentary Secretary for Settlement Services and Ukrainian Evacuees
Chantelle de Jonge	Parliamentary Secretary for Affordability and Utilities
Nolan Dyck	Parliamentary Secretary for Indigenous and Rural Policing
Shane Getson	Parliamentary Secretary for Economic Corridor Development
Chelsae Petrovic	Parliamentary Secretary for Health Workforce Engagement
Ron Wiebe	Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health (North)
Justin Wright	Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health (South)
Tany Yao	Parliamentary Secretary for Small Business and Northern Development

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Yao
 Deputy Chair: Mrs. Johnson
 Ellingson
 Kasawski
 Kayande
 Rowswell
 Stephan
 Wiebe
 Wright, J.

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Wiebe
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Dach
 Boparai
 Bouchard
 de Jonge
 Elmeligi
 Hoyle
 Stephan
 van Dijken
 Wright, J.

Select Special Citizen Initiative Proposal Review Committee

Chair: Mr. Lundy
 Deputy Chair: Mrs. Sawhney
 Ellingson
 Nixon
 Pancholi
 Sawyer

Select Special Committee on Electoral Boundaries

Chair: Mr. Lundy
 de Jonge
 Ganley
 Gray
 Sawyer
 Wiebe

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Lovely
 Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring
 Batten
 Getson
 Haji
 Johnson
 Lundy
 Sawyer
 Singh
 Tejada

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Lundy
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Wright
 Chapman
 Cyr
 Dyck
 Miyashiro
 Petrovic
 Sawyer
 Shepherd
 Wright, P.

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. McIver
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Yao
 Eggen
 Getson
 Gray
 Metz
 Petrovic
 Rowswell
 Sabir
 Singh

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Mrs. Johnson
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Cyr
 Armstrong-Homeniuk
 Bouchard
 Ceci
 Deol
 Dyck
 Hayter
 Lovely
 Sigurdson, L.
 Vacant

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Armstrong-Homeniuk
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Wiebe
 Arcand-Paul
 Bouchard
 Brar, Gurinder
 Brar, Gurtej
 Getson
 Gray
 Sinclair
 Singh
 Stephan

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Sabir
 Deputy Chair: Mr. Lundy
 Cyr
 de Jonge
 Eremenko
 Lovely
 Renaud
 Sawyer
 Schmidt
 van Dijken

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Dyck
 Deputy Chair: Ms Sweet
 Al-Guneid
 Armstrong-Homeniuk
 Calahoo Stonehouse
 Cyr
 Ip
 Petrovic
 Rowswell
 Yao

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

10 a.m.

Thursday, May 7, 2026

[The Speaker in the chair]

Prayers

The Speaker: Hon. members, let us pray. Lord, the God of righteousness and truth, grant to our King and his 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 ideals but, laying aside all private interests and prejudices, keep in mind their responsibility to seek to improve the condition of all. Amen.

Hon. members, we will now be led in the singing of *God Save the King* by Gabriela Barreiro. I would invite all to participate.

Hon. Members:

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

The Speaker: Thank you. Please be seated.

Introduction of Guests

The Speaker: Calgary-Glenmore.

Ms Al-Guneid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a great week. I've had three schools from Calgary-Glenmore this week, and today I have Connect Charter grade 6 students along with their educators: Mr. Sonico, Ms Pereverzoff, Mr. Ferguson. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Rutherford.

Member Calahoo Stonehouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour to introduce to you and through you and to all members of this House the brilliant and talented students from Rideau Park. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

The Speaker: Hon. members, we are pleased today to have Gabriela Barreiro singing *God Save the King*. Gabriela was head page last year and then went on to serve as an office assistant in the Sergeant-at-Arms office. Last week she completed her time at the LAO, and is now preparing to begin her third year in the bilingual bachelor of commerce program at the University of Alberta. Before that, she has a very exciting summer with plans of studying abroad in Europe. Gabriela has a long-standing passion for music and singing deeply influenced by her Colombian roots. Please rise and give Gabriela the warm, traditional welcome of the Assembly.

The Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services.

Mr. Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise and introduce to you and through you and to all members of the Assembly two great Calgarians who are up here visiting, Josh Lecoupe and my youngest brother, Shane Nixon, up having a look at what's going on with the Legislature today. I'd ask that both of them would rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

Mr. Haji: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Edmonton-South West it's my pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly Sukhi Grewal, president of the homeowners association in Windermere. Sukhi is a tax expert, an innovator, and a community volunteer. Please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Mr. Gurtej Brar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to introduce to you two of my constituents, Alexis Raven Warner and Casey Kellar, who have joined us in the gallery to see democracy in action. I ask them to please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

Dr. Metz: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce Brittany Onysyk. May is Celiac Disease Awareness Month. Celiac disease affects as many as 1 in 100 Canadians. As an individual with celiac disease she knows first-hand how limiting this disease is in everyday life, yet still it has to be taken seriously by people. She is here today to raise awareness. Brittany, please rise and receive our warm welcome.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Glenora.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm excited to introduce Maxwell Tebbutt. He's smart. He knows all sorts of things about the Greek gods and World War II. He is kind. He has an amazing backcheck. He's also very handsome and tall. Please, Maxwell, rise and receive a warm welcome from this Assembly for my nephew.

Member Boparai: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Rajpavit Singh Sidhu, a lifelong community advocate, my dear friend and supporter, and my constituency manager in Calgary-Falconridge. He's one of the best. Best wishes to him and his fiancée Jasleen on their wedding this summer. I ask that he rise to receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

Members' Statements

Affordability Measures

Ms Hoffman: This morning gas hovers around \$1.90 a litre. That's a record high. The UCP could put Albertans first by cutting 13 cents off immediately, but they refuse. They tell everyone to wait months at record high prices before they might, possibly, maybe do something for a little bit later. Everyone sees the price of groceries climbing month after month, but instead of acting, the UCP says that they will consult grocery retailers. I don't know about you, Mr. Speaker, but kids need food in their lunch pails, not politicians chit-chatting with billionaire monopoly men.

The Calgary Food Bank says that the number of families relying on their hampers has more than tripled since the time when the UCP formed government. While the UCP has increased the housing allowance for their MLAs who want a second residence in Edmonton, they refused to increase the minimum wage for more than 100,000 Albertans who haven't gotten a raise in seven years. For those on AISH unable to work, the UCP government decided to cut \$200 a month. Living on AISH was already incredibly difficult, but clawing this \$200 back has made it nearly impossible. They've cut seniors who rely on government income support. They've increased their accommodation fees. They've jacked up the copay for those seniors on their drug plan.

It doesn't need to be this way, Mr. Speaker. The UCP could have cut insurance costs, capped electricity rates, helped first-time homebuyers get into the market, capped ATM fees, made it easier to get out of your subscription services, but they refuse. They refuse to focus on affordability for everyday Albertans. We're proposing solutions on this side of the House, but they would rather push divisive referendum questions. They would rather hang out in box seats on private jets petting golden cats than do anything to lower the costs for ordinary families. Maybe those are their priorities, but I'm sure those aren't Albertans' priorities.

If the current Premier isn't up for the job, I know a guy who is.

Mental Health Week

Mrs. Sawyer: Mr. Speaker, this week Albertans across our province are marking Mental Health Week. It is a time to recognize that mental health is just as important as physical health and that everyone deserves access to timely, compassionate support. Mental health challenges do not discriminate. They affect children and youth, parents and caregivers, seniors, workers, and students. They show up in our homes, our workplaces, and our classrooms.

For too long stigma stood in the way of seeking help. Today we are working to ensure that help is not only available but accessible, connected, and recovery focused. Our government understands that strengthening mental health care means building a system that meets people where they are at, whether that's early intervention, community-based counselling, or intensive supports when needed.

That is why Alberta continues to make long-term investments in mental health and addiction services, including funding through Recovery Alberta to better integrate care and put recovery at the centre of the system. We are expanding access to supports like Counselling Alberta and 211 Alberta, making it easier for individuals and families to find help in their communities. We are investing in child and youth mental health with new funding to support mental wellness in classrooms and the expansion of CASA classrooms for students with complex needs. These initiatives recognize that supporting young people early can change the trajectory of their life.

Mental health is not a single program or a one-week conversation. It requires sustained action, strong partnerships and community organizations, and a shared commitment to compassionate intervention. During Mental Health Week we are reminded that connection matters. Support saves lives and recovery is possible. To anyone who is struggling: you are not alone. Help is available, and your government remains committed to building a province where mental health care is accessible, responsive, and grounded in dignity.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Decore.

10:10 Racism and Hate Crime Prevention

Mr. Haji: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week an Albertan leaving his mosque after Friday prayers experienced something no one in this province should ever endure. As he drove home with his wife from the Muslim Association of St. Albert, they were followed by a driver who shouted racist and Islamophobic slurs, used deeply offensive language, and issued violent threats. This was targeted, deliberate, and terrifying.

This incident did not happen in isolation. It occurred in an environment that is increasingly permissive of hate. When fear-based narratives are normalized, they give permission for harassment, intimidation, and violence. Hate does not emerge in a

vacuum. It grows when leadership is silent, when communities feel abandoned by those who are in power.

Many victims of Islamophobia and racism never report these incidents. They fear retaliation, they doubt accountability, or they believe nothing will change. That reality alone should alarm every single person in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, safety and belonging are not privileges. They are rights. Every Albertan, regardless of faith, race, or immigration background, deserves to feel safe on the streets, in their neighbourhoods, and in their places of worship.

This is a moment that demands leadership. All orders of government must act, but provincial government has a clear responsibility to set the tone and show leadership. This government has a moral obligation to confront Islamophobia and all forms of hate with urgency, clarity, and action. We must invest in prevention, reporting, and accountability. We must send a clear message that hate has no home in our province. I call on the Premier and the minister of public safety to show that leadership now because every delay puts more Albertans at risk.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Wildfire Season Preparation

Mr. van Dijken: Mr. Speaker, as we mark the 10th anniversary of the Fort McMurray wildfire, we honour the resilience of those affected and the firefighters, first responders, and volunteers who stood together throughout the disaster.

Wildfires are an enduring part of life in Alberta and something we continue to manage. As of today Alberta has recorded 149 wildfires this year, with 21 currently active across the province. The good news is that the majority remain small, and overall activity is well within seasonal expectations. Thanks to cooler spring temperatures, late snow, and periodic rain early wildfire risk has been moderated. However, as we move through May, we know conditions can shift quickly. That is exactly why Alberta is so well prepared.

Alberta Wildfire has fully transitioned into seasonal operations. Detection, monitoring, and rapid initial response resources are already active across our forest areas. Carry-over fires from 2025 continue to be closely managed, and mutual aid agreements remain in place, ensuring Alberta can both provide and receive support when needed. Mr. Speaker, readiness in this province is not reactive. It is continuous. Recruitment is under way, training is ongoing, and contracts for aircraft and heavy equipment are already in place. Our incident management teams are experienced, scalable, and ready to respond at a moment's notice.

This strong foundation is further reinforced by our government's \$400 million investment with De Havilland Canada to build five new water bombers right here in Alberta. This will increase aerial firefighting capacity by nearly 60 per cent, enhancing an already proven system. These aircraft will complement our skilled personnel, advanced detection systems, and co-ordinated provincial response.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta is not just ready; we're leading. With the right people, the right tools, and the right planning in place we are prepared for whatever the wildfires in . . .

The Speaker: Calgary-Buffalo.

Alberta Music Action Plan

Member Ceci: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, last week the minister of arts and culture introduced the government's long-awaited music action plan. Like all Albertans who care about our music industry, we want to see this plan succeed. At first glance there are positive

elements, including recognizing music as an economic driver that supports tourism, talent retention, and local businesses. However, we know that despite the minister's claim of robust stakeholder engagement, there are serious gaps in consultation. Why, for example, were choral groups not included? There are 2,900 choirs across Alberta with more than 340,000 members performing for over 1 million audience members annually, yet they were left out of this plan. We're also hearing from local musicians and venue owners who are asking the same question: how will this plan actually benefit them? Will financial supports reach working artists or remain concentrated at the top? How will for-profit venues, who barely make any profit but are critical parts of the venue ladder, be sustained?

Mr. Speaker, stakeholders have also been clear that the music commissioner could be a good step but only if that role has real authority, independence, and resources. Without that, it risks becoming little more than a symbolic title, a point of concierge contact without the power to shape funding, drive exports, or build the industry. The current plan does not guarantee the independence, nor does it outline a clear mandate, measurable targets, or a comprehensive strategy to grow Alberta's music economy.

That's exactly why the mechanism I proposed in Bill 211, the Arts and Creative Economy Advisory Council Act, was so important. It would have ensured arm's-length leadership, co-ordinated strategy, and long-term direction, not just co-ordination of existing programs. Without that kind of structure, Mr. Speaker, we are left asking: is it truly a plan to build Alberta's music industry or simply a new title without the tools to . . .

The Speaker: Calgary-Varsity.

Government Health Policies

Dr. Metz: Bill 29 shows the UCP will push their privatization agenda against all else. Rather than strengthening the public health care system by using proven strategies, the UCP are destroying it. Instead of investing in and stabilizing the public system so Albertans can get access to timely, reliable care close to home, we see the consequences of years of neglect.

Albertans struggle to find a family doctor as physicians leave the province or reduce their practices. Without access to primary care patients are left with few options. They eventually turn to emergency departments for issues that should have been treated earlier.

Bill 29 makes these problems worse. Quality health care is not about choosing items on a menu. It relies on clinical expertise and continuity of care. The UCP approach is making an already-strained system even harder for Albertans to navigate. Albertans are increasingly being left with the emergency room as their only access to the system. The result: longer wait times, hallway medicine, and exhausted health care workers. This is not a failure of health care staff. It is a failure of government policy.

Rather than recruiting and retaining the health professionals we need, investing in primary care, and expanding public infrastructure, the government is doubling down on privatization. At a time when affordability is a major concern, Albertans are asked to pay out of pocket for services that should be available within a strong public health care system. Fragmented services are more costly and cause delay for people. Small health issues become serious, placing more pressure on the emergency services.

Albertans deserve a health care system that's reliable, accessible, integrated, and built around their needs, not one that forces them to navigate it on their own or pay more to get the care they deserve.

Introduction of Bills

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

Bill 210

Consumer Protection (Fraud Prevention Measures) Amendment Act, 2026

Mr. Deol: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to introduce a bill being Consumer Protection (Fraud Prevention Measures) Amendment Act, 2026.

We are introducing this legislation to help give Albertans better tools to protect against fraud. Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 210 read a first time]

10:20

Oral Question Period

The Speaker: The first question belongs to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Foreign Interference in Provincial Referendums

Mr. Nenshi: Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. A jarring new report on foreign interference targeting Alberta shows just how fragile our democracy is. The report shows that bad actors from Russia and the United States are trying to influence the outcome of the upcoming separatist referendum that the Premier has promised. Given that bad foreign actors are trying to sway Albertans, does this government even understand the gravity of the situation, and what is the government going to do about it?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, several months ago questions arose regarding foreign interference in regard to the Alberta separatist movement. I, too, had these very same concerns. I certainly asked staff to reach out to the RCMP. The RCMP informed and we received information that there's no credible information that has been received to suggest that Alberta's separatist movement has been subject to foreign interference. However, I have also said that the situation is extremely fluid, and due to the new allegations that have been made regarding Elections Alberta's information breach, I hope the RCMP thoroughly look into this matter with . . .

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Nenshi: In fact, the RCMP has not confirmed the information the minister just stated, just the vague statement from the minister with no date and no time. There is foreign interference, and it's not new. The separatists have for weeks, months been talking about how they met with White House officials. We know that somebody paid a bunch of YouTubers from the Netherlands to spread disinformation about separatism. This is foreign interference, and Albertans deserve free and fair elections. Once again, what is the government doing to end foreign interference?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, we have two very serious investigations that are currently ongoing between Elections Alberta as well as the RCMP amongst working with other police services. We must continue to allow these investigations to take place. I can tell you what has occurred regarding the Elections Alberta breach is absolutely unacceptable, and we certainly have grave concerns regarding the Republican Party and these allegations that have taken place.

Mr. Nenshi: You know, the minister and the Premier spent years denigrating the women and men of the RCMP, and now we're told

we have to rely on the RCMP and not the government to protect us from the government's actions. This government has no plan. Let's not forget the separatists' claim to have shared that app and all Albertans' data with the White House. The House leader and the Premier are forever talking about their very special relationship with the Trump administration. Are they going to ask the Trump administration for our data back?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, the only party in this House that has defunded the police has been the members opposite. The NDP defunded ALERT. Do you know that the Alberta law enforcement response teams – I can tell you – deal with organized crime, and it was this government that did record investment in the Alberta law enforcement response teams to deal with organized crime and all the other things that are associated with that?

The Speaker: The second set of questions belongs to . . .

Mr. Nenshi: To summarize, the government is doing nothing about . . .

The Speaker: I'm not going to be long. You've got to let me finish. The second set of questions belongs to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: To summarize, the government is doing nothing about foreign interference.

Investigation of Electoral List Distribution and Use

Mr. Nenshi: Let's return to the issue of the massive data breach. The Premier's staffer who attended the infamous meeting used to work for Jason Kenney. We're being asked to believe that when his old boss's private information was shared with people who threaten to harm that old boss every day, who hate him, that staffer did nothing. Nobody called Jason Kenney to warn him about the threat to him. Is the government really that immoral, that they would look the other way when a political rival's life is in danger?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice.
Oh, sorry. Is there a point of order I see? Okay. At 10:24.
Go ahead, Minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We've said time and again that we take the protection of personal information extremely seriously, and those responsible need to be held accountable under the law. We know that Elections Alberta, an independent office of the Legislature, is looking into the matter. They're conducting an investigation, but we also know that the EPS and the RCMP are conducting their own investigations as well. We want these processes to play out. These are independent offices and independent organizations. That's how our system of democracy works. We'll wait for those investigations.

Mr. Nenshi: You know, the Premier has an old friend called Artur Pawlowski. You remember him. That's the guy that she tried to get off from criminal charges when she was told she does not have the power to pardon people and was found in breach of the Conflicts of Interest Act, the first Premier in Alberta history to do so. Now Mr. Pawlowski is openly threatening Jason Kenney online, and we know that Mr. Pawlowski probably has Jason Kenney's home address. Has the Premier called her old buddy Artur and told him to back off?

The Speaker: Hon. member, I didn't hear anything about government policy there. Nothing. [interjections] Order. But the government can respond if they choose to.

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, any threat made to a current or former public official is currently absolutely unacceptable. Whether it be the Calgary Police Service, the Lethbridge Police Service, RCMP, Edmonton Police Service, I can tell you that any complaint that comes into them will be taken extremely seriously. I hope that whatever allegation is made is investigated to the full extent of the law.

The Speaker: Is it the third set of questions to the Leader of the Official Opposition?

Mr. Nenshi: Second, third.

The Speaker: Okay. Corrected.

Mr. Nenshi: It's interesting to hear the minister say that because let's remember that the entire Artur Pawlowski scandal started because the Premier was trying to protect her friends at the Coutts border blockade, the same people who allegedly were sharing the personal information of police officers and judges. The government didn't seem to care much about those people's safety then, and they don't seem to care about their safety now. What is the government doing right now to protect people at risk? Before the minister says it, the answer is not: you can always call 911 if someone is at your door.

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning from the member opposite is clearly a distracting tactic from the fact that when the time came, the member opposite failed to act. The member knew that there was a data breach. The member knew that the data . . .

The Speaker: Hon. member, what you're talking about is a subject of a point of privilege currently, so you're going to have to find something different to talk about in your answer, please. [interjections] Order. Order.
The hon. member.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Suffice it to say that the member's action across the aisle continuously fails to reach the threshold of human decency. The line of questioning opposite is, frankly, ridiculous. [interjections]

The Speaker: Okay. Now only one at a time, and typically when you ask a question, the only one that shouldn't be heckling is the one that asks the question because they should really want to hear the answer.

The third set of questions belongs to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: This is seriously the worst political strategy I've ever seen. This government knows their own staffer was in a meeting and didn't tell anybody, and they're blaming me for not calling the Premier. These straws don't even exist to grasp. Let's be clear. The Premier's staff was there. They claimed that they didn't know about this Elections Alberta letter, but the Elections Alberta letter actually says that Elections Alberta is not investigating. It's a complete red herring. In particular, what would this government have done if they had that information two weeks ago given that they're doing . . .

The Speaker: Order. I just caution everybody that we all, when we're recognized, get 35 seconds and not more than that.
The Justice minister.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think the first thing that we would have done is that we would have informed Elections Alberta, unlike the member opposite, who got up yesterday and said that he wished he had notified Elections Alberta but he didn't because he thought they wouldn't do anything. We want these independent offices who are tasked with this very exact task to do the work that they need to do. Elections Alberta has an investigative wing. They are performing a current investigation. The RCMP and the Edmonton Police Service are also conducting their own investigations. We must not interfere with those investigations.

Mr. Nenshi: The Solicitor General thinks that you shouldn't call the cops and you should tip off the government instead, yet that's somehow not interfering with an investigation. Real leaders admit when things go wrong. The Premier once claimed that she would apologize and change course if things went wrong, but this government never does that. [interjections] They just go into the blame game as the House leader is doing now. They blame Elections Alberta for misinterpreting their legislation. They blame the RCMP for not investigating fast enough. They blame me for not doing the Premier's job. Who will they . . .

10:30

The Speaker: Order. Order. A second caution about stopping when 35 seconds are up.

The Justice minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The hypocrisy is difficult to believe. We understand . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. That's everybody, Leader of the Opposition, and you've been cautioned for the second time now that when you ask the question, you're the one that probably should listen to the answer despite what's going on around you.

A fresh 35, Justice minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again, the hypocrisy is ridiculous. You can see the difference between a government that is leading Alberta and leading it ahead of the rest of Canada, ahead of the rest of North America, and, indeed, the world, as compared to an opposition in disarray and chaos. We're going to let Elections Alberta, the Edmonton Police Service, and the RCMP perform their investigations without interference by government. That's how it is supposed to happen. Unlike the members of the NDP, who have been pushing for interference, on this side of the House we respect their independence.

The Speaker: Hon. member, the caution I gave the other side about not mentioning the point of privilege actually applies to both sides.

Your next question.

Mr. Nenshi: Blame, deflect, insult, deny, yell, bluster: it's all this government has ever got. They never apologize, not once, for the harms that they do to Albertans, for putting people at risk. Instead, they blame. They blame teachers. They blame doctors. They blame kids with disabilities. Above all, they blame immigrants, they blame Indigenous people, and now they blame me for not doing the Premier's job. Albertans deserve better, so I'm giving, at the end of this week, a chance for them to . . .

The Speaker: Order. Order. That's three in a row. You've got to stop at 35.

The Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear a question about government policy in that long diatribe, but what I can say is that

what we do take responsibility for is the success of this province: the investment that we continue to attract, the jobs that are created here by the private sector, and the fact that Alberta continues to be the best place to live, to play, and to set up a business. I hear it all the time, and the Premier continues to negotiate with the federal government to make sure Alberta has the best deal within Confederation, because that's what the Premier's job is to do. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. The one that asks the question should be hearing the answer.

Take another 20 seconds. Go ahead.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unlike the classroom in university, this is a two-way street. Questions are asked and questions are answered. You don't get to just talk at the government when you're the opposition leader.

So, Mr. Speaker . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: We'll hear the – take another 20 seconds.

Mr. Nenshi: Heckling is allowed.

The Speaker: You don't get to argue with the chair. Heckling is allowed, but when the person that asks the question is the loudest voice I can hear, that shouldn't be the case.

Go ahead with the answer.

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, could you imagine being in his classroom? Now I truly believe all the Rate My Professors comments that are online.

Back to the point. On this side of the House we're going to continue to do what's best for the province of Alberta and the people who live here by attracting investment and making sure . . .

The Speaker: The next set of questions belongs to the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud.

Electoral List Disclosure and Citizen-initiated Petition Certification

Ms Pancholi: On Monday the separatist movement delivered its petition to Elections Alberta. One of its leaders, Mitch Sylvestre, also sits as a constituency president of the UCP. Mr. Sylvestre told media that he was shown the leaked personal data of millions of Albertans obtained by David Parker and thought it was, quote, illegal, but like the UCP, Mr. Sylvestre did nothing about it. He thought it was illegal but didn't report it to anyone. Since the Premier seems to believe she's the Privacy Commissioner, Elections Alberta, and the RCMP and all privacy breaches should only be reported directly to her, unless it's her staff, of course, that know about it, did Mr. Sylvestre report this illegal activity to the Premier?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much again, Mr. Speaker. The answer to that is that the Premier was very clear about when she learned about it, when the rest of government learned about it. Unlike this government, the leader of the NDP learned about it more than a week before it was made public to the rest of government officials. The Leader of the Opposition sat on it, kept it under his hat, and waited to record Instagram videos rather than letting the public know about this serious breach.

Mr. Nixon: You hid it.

Mr. Nenshi: Calling the cops is hiding it?

Mr. Amery: It's highly inappropriate. Putting Albertans at risk is unacceptable.

Mr. Nenshi: What about when the cops are called on you for all the things you've done?

Mr. Schow: Point of order.

The Speaker: A point of order is noted at 10:35.

Mr. Schow: That's low, even for you.

Mr. Nenshi: So is shooting horses.

The Speaker: Order. Order. On both sides. Stop.

Folks, you've got 50 minutes. You know how it works. One person gets 35 seconds; they need to be heard. The other person gets 35; they need to be heard. Let's try that.

Ms Pancholi: At the end of March the separatist petition organizers claimed to have just met the required 178,000 signatures. Then David Parker got a hold of the electors list, and suddenly they had another 130,000 signatures on the petition in a month. Hmm, what a coincidence. Yesterday the Minister of Justice acknowledged that the petition is suspicious by stating that Elections Alberta will use a more robust process to verify the signatures than was used before. Would the minister agree that nothing less than verification of every single signature on that petition will be enough to satisfy Albertans who have rightly lost trust in this process?

The Speaker: That may be an important question, but it wasn't really on government policy; it was on the behaviour of Elections Alberta. But if the government wants to respond, they can.

Mr. Amery: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Look, we have faith in the processes that Elections Alberta is implementing to verify signatures. We know that they have a 95 per cent or greater confidence rate in the verification of signatures, and they've already announced that they're going to implement additional safeguards, additional verification processes in order to ensure the legitimacy of the signatures that were submitted earlier this week. We're going to let that independent office do its job. We have faith in the processes that they've implemented, and we respect Elections Alberta.

The Speaker: On government policy, please. Go ahead.

Ms Pancholi: This has been a complete mess from the very beginning, when the UCP first promised a referendum to separatists to keep their jobs. The rules have been changed three times during the process. The first court decision determining that the petition was unconstitutional was overturned. Another court has now put an injunction on it. There are credible reports of foreign interference, and now the largest data breach in Alberta history means every single signature is suspect. This is a mess that the UCP created, and they are dragging the entire province down with them. Isn't it finally time for the UCP to put the people of Alberta ahead of themselves and put an end to this disaster for good?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again, Elections Alberta did not mention anything about the UCP. In fact, they identified the Republican Party of Alberta as the ones who may have caused the source of the data leak. The NDP would love to

make this a partisan issue while disregarding the safety and the well-being of Albertans in this province. This is about the private details . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. I can't hear the answer. Carry on.

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, this is about the private data of Albertans, of the judges, of the police officers, of the vulnerable, of victims of domestic violence and intimate partner violence, and, in fact, all Albertans. It is not a partisan issue for the NDP to score cheap political points about.

The Speaker: You've got to stop. Time is up.

Okay. I'm just going to say this for everybody's benefit on both sides. Heckling is allowed, but when you can't hear the question or the answer, that's probably a good place to reel it in a little bit.

Foreign Interference in Provincial Referendums (continued)

Member Eremenko: The Global Centre for Democratic Resilience released a report that confirms what we have been warning the UCP about for months. Foreign actors like Russia and the United States are exploiting the chaos created by separatists to spread disinformation, undermine Canada's national security, and threaten Alberta's democracy. Now friends of the Premier have leaked the personal data of millions of Albertans, playing into the hands of those who seek to profit from our division. Why does the Premier continue to ignore the threat of foreign interference?

10:40

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth. We have concerns regarding foreign interference, which is precisely why we reached out to the RCMP and received information from the RCMP that suggested that the Alberta separatist movement has not been subject to foreign interference. Again I implore the RCMP: we want to make sure that they're investigating this. It's a very fluid situation. The dynamics have changed. Again, I have faith in the RCMP. They're going to do their job.

Member Eremenko: Given that the separatist movement is one thing, what about investigations into the petition? What about investigations into the potential interference of the referendum campaign and advertising and other influences on social media that have a direct stake in our separation from the Canadian Confederation? Given that whenever the separatist movement runs into trouble, the UCP jumps to the occasion to change the laws in their favour, will the Premier finally denounce this dangerous separatist movement that threatens our personal data and our national security?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, I will stress again that we have two extremely important investigations that are currently ongoing, one with Elections Alberta, the other with the RCMP as well as other police agencies. We must allow them to do their job. We will not politically interfere with those investigations.

Member Eremenko: Given that those investigations are not looking into foreign interference – they are looking into malfeasance and malintent right here in Alberta by the UCP's friends – and given the data breach means they are more likely to have access to the personal data of 3 million Albertans and given that Albertans have no way of knowing whether or not their name is on the separatist petition without their consent, how can anyone trust that the UCP can govern this province safely, much less hold

a referendum on separatism free of foreign and domestic interference?

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, as I've stated before, this is a very fluid situation. There is new information that has come to light, which is why I certainly encourage and implore the RCMP to look on all factors that might be dealing with this Alberta elections information breach.

Building Indigenous Mentorship and Pathways Pilot Program

Mr. Yao: Mr. Speaker, Alberta continues to see strong growth across sectors, and with that comes an increasing need for skilled workers. At the same time Indigenous youth represent a growing and important part of Alberta's future workforce. New initiatives like the building Indigenous mentorship program are an encouraging step towards connecting Indigenous youth to these opportunities. To the Minister of Indigenous Relations: can you share more details about this program and how this \$300,000 investment will be spent? [interjections]

The Speaker: Are we getting heckled from the side that has the question and the answer? That doesn't seem very reasonable to me. The Minister of Indigenous Relations.

Mrs. Sawhney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. This \$300,000 grant supports the building Indigenous mentorship and pathways pilot program. This pilot takes a holistic approach by combining mentorship, community outreach, and practical career navigation supports. It will deliver three Indigenous trades mentorship symposiums, each paired with a trade fair to connect youth with employers, unions, and training providers. The funding supports full program delivery and expanding access to resources.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Yao: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you so much to the minister for that answer. Given that ensuring new programs reach the right people and are delivered by experienced partners are keys to success and given that this pilot appears to be a community-based approach that reflects local workforce needs, particularly in regions where trade shortages can have real impacts, to the same minister: can you tell us more about who will benefit from this program and why the Building Trades of Alberta was selected to deliver this very important support from the province?

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, this pilot focuses on Indigenous youth in Calgary, Edmonton, and Fort McMurray, regions where trade shortages can have local impacts, and it is expected to reach about 450 participants, including educators and recruiters. Participants will gain culturally grounded mentorship, industry connections, and insight into training and career opportunities. This will help build local talent where it's needed most. Educators also benefit from stronger ties to the trade sector.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Yao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Minister of Indigenous Relations. That is fantastic work.

Given that initiatives like this not only support workforce development but also contribute to long-term economic growth and support meaningful reconciliation across communities throughout our province and given that pilot programs can be especially valuable in helping government and partners learn what works best

before expanding further, again to the Minister of Indigenous Relations: can you speak about the longer term vision for this program and how it supports both Alberta's economy and reconciliation efforts?

Mrs. Sawhney: Mr. Speaker, this program supports economic growth and reconciliation by expanding access to skilled trades careers that offer stable and meaningful employment. By connecting Indigenous youth with mentorship, information, and networks, it helps build a stronger local labour pool, especially in regions facing shortages. As a pilot it allows us to assess outcomes before a potential future expansion. Our goal is to ensure Indigenous youth have the tools, the connections, and confidence to pursue long-term careers in sectors critical to Alberta's future.

Electoral Boundaries Committee Review

Member Kayande: Mr. Speaker, last week NDP MLAs participated on the government special committee to redraw electoral boundaries. We participated not out of any faith in the process, because it's completely illegitimate, but to try to mitigate the damage this government is inflicting on our democracy. However, the UCP rejected any public consultation about how our electoral map is drawn. Instead, they'll be happy to carve up communities like Red Deer, Lethbridge, and Calgary in secret. Why shouldn't Albertans get a say about where they cast their ballot in the next election?

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the public will always have a say in where they cast their ballots. That's why there has been public consultation prior with the previous committee, and that's why we have another committee to move to 91 seats to ensure that all the province of Alberta and all the voters in this amazing place have effective representation, which is the whole purpose of redrawing the boundaries every eight to 10 years, to ensure effective representation across the entire province. We have urban. We have rural. We have mid-size cities. They all deserve a voice.

Member Kayande: Given that the government's move to reject the only legal report from the independent Electoral Boundaries Commission is unprecedented, unfair, and likely unconstitutional and given that UCP staffers were handing out secret maps that just so happened to correspond with the ridiculous gerrymandered minority report before it was even released and given that this government has yet again changed the rules about our democracy, how can Albertans have any trust that this government won't rig the process to rig the maps to rig the next election?

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll refer the members of the Chamber back to page 66 of the report, which says, "Much of the objection to our interim report is based on the loss of two rural seats. I lament this, as do my fellow Commissioners." It's about effective representation.

But the member opposite brings up a good point. It's about trust, and there are two choices here. You have a government who is continuing to keep taxes low, attract investment, and help the private sector to create jobs or the opposition, who wants to raise taxes, including the largest job-killing carbon tax in the history of the province. That's what you get, more of the same going forward, from them. It's why they're on the opposition side.

Member Kayande: Given this government just raised taxes on my constituents by a thousand dollars per household, given that we can now confirm a UCP staffer knew about the recent massive data leak but did not report it to the authorities and given that the UCP shot down any public transparency over their unconstitutional scheme to let MLAs redraw the riding maps and pick their voters, will the UCP admit that they already got a new map that they plan to jam through, or will they just do the right thing and finally accept the commission's report?

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to remind the member of two things. One, in this Chamber we address the chair, not the cameras. Two, members of the Assembly do not redraw the map despite the arguments coming from the members opposite throughout debate over the last several weeks, which they have publicly and openly in this Chamber tried to convince the public to draw the map in their favour. The only people in this Chamber who are trying to draw the map are the members opposite. Shame on them. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. I didn't call anybody's name right now, but I'm about to. We should only hear from Calgary-Klein.

**10:50 Investigation of Electoral List
Distribution and Use
(continued)**

Member Tejada: Mr. Speaker, when faced with the choice to do what's right for the people we serve or to serve themselves, the UCP picks themselves every day of the week. When the Premier's staff learned that the personal information of 3 million Albertans was leaked to the UCP's close separatist friends, was anything done about it? No. Can the Premier or anyone over there apologize to the millions of Albertans who have been put in danger by this government's negligence?

The Speaker: Edmonton-Riverview, were you attempting to call a point of order there? I didn't . . .

Ms Sigurdson: No. I was just coming to my chair.

The Speaker: Okay. All right. I apologize. I just didn't want to ignore you if that's what you were doing.
Go ahead, Minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again the NDP continues on a narrative that simply doesn't exist. They alleged as recently as yesterday that the party president for the UCP was at these meetings. He was not. Political staffers attend all types of political functions. That staffer has said that he had no idea that the list or the data that was being presented in that forum was illegal. Certainly, the organizers didn't mention that. The moment that we learned about it, we took immediate action.

Member Tejada: Given that the private data of 3 million Albertans was made available to any bad actor who knew how to look for it and given that this exposure put already-vulnerable survivors of domestic violence at even greater risk and given that the Premier's own staff knew and failed to take action that could protect Albertans who needed it most, will the government admit that they failed to protect Albertans because they were too busy cozying up to the separatists?

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, we've said time and again that the data breach and the data leak is absolutely unacceptable. The protection of personal information is of utmost importance to this government, and those responsible need to be held accountable. There is no disagreement with anybody in this Assembly about that. The way that our system works is that the offices that are tasked with investigations are doing their job. They will do it free of government interference. I hope that they do it free of opposition interference. We need to let these offices and the RCMP do their job.

Member Tejada: Given that domestic violence survivors in this province rely on government to ensure their personal information is kept out of the hands of bad actors and given that their data was irresponsibly made public by the UCP's close and personal friends, the separatists, given that the Premier's office knew and failed to alert authorities and is now more invested in who they can blame, once more, why does this government work harder to cling to power than it ever does for the people of this province?

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, that is simply inaccurate. It's highly inappropriate to use partisanship and political posturing to argue that the government isn't doing anything. We have an independent office. It's called Elections Alberta. They have an investigative wing. They are conducting an investigation on this. We know that policing agencies all across this province, led by the RCMP, are conducting their own investigation as well. That's how our system works. Government does not interfere with independent policing agencies. We let them do their job, we let them make their findings, and we let them present those findings. We'll deal with it in the appropriate time as well.

Alberta Separatism

Mr. Guthrie: Albertans are hearing one message in public and another behind closed doors. We now know there is a struggle within the UCP as constituency associations are being pushed to take a position on independence. At the same time, separation advocates say that they already have a party, the UCP. Now serious questions have emerged about the petition process, including unauthorized disclosure of voter information. To the Premier: will you unequivocally state this government's commitment to Canada, or will you continue hedging your position to suit the room?

The Speaker: The hon. the Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question from the newest member of the NDP caucus. What I can say is that it seems that the questions are a bit outdated and stale. We've said many times now and we'll say it again that we believe in a strong, sovereign Alberta within a united Canada. The reason we say that is because Alberta has rights within Confederation, the rights to defend our natural resources and extract those and do what's best for the people here. That's what the Premier is doing as we speak right now. Unfortunately, the members opposite and the Member for Airdrie-Cochrane have failed in that endeavour, and that's why they're in opposition.

The Speaker: Interestingly, one doesn't get to comment on the presence or nonpresence of a member of this House at any time.

Mr. Guthrie: Given that this member can only answer with insults and given that the Premier's office has confirmed that UCP staff were present at meetings where unauthorized voter information was shared and given that Albertans are entitled to know where their

representatives stand on fundamental issues and given that at least one UCP MLA had the will to publicly state his position on separation, to the Premier: will you require caucus to clearly state where they stand on independence, or is silence this government's strategy?

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, this government has been vocal – very vocal – about how we support a strong Canada, a strong, independent Alberta within Canada. This country does not survive without a strong, thriving Alberta, led by our Premier. I will reiterate that the results speak for themselves. Year over year we've seen a hundred thousand new jobs created right here in Alberta by the private sector because as a government we've created an environment where those private-sector jobs can be created and people can thrive. Why won't the members opposite get on board with success? What else more do you need to see? The numbers speak for themselves.

Mr. Guthrie: Given that we'll take silence for \$100, please, Alex, and given that uncertainty, especially separation, creates economic risk and undermines investor confidence and given that leadership requires clarity, not shifting positions, and given that MLAs took an oath to Canada and given that unauthorized disclosure of voter information undermines the legitimacy of the entire separation referendum, to the Premier: will you cancel this tainted process? If not, will you commit to putting forth the Forever Canadian question on Alberta remaining in Canada? Yes or no?

The Speaker: The Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On this side of the House we continue to believe in direct democracy, something the Member for Airdrie-Cochrane did believe in until he decided to break his oath and leave caucus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I can say is that we will continue to respond and listen to what matters most to people in Alberta, and that's making sure that Alberta remains a strong international player in a market that needs more of our province's resources, needs more of our province's products. We're doing our best to get around the world and sell those products. The numbers speak for themselves, billions and billions of investment every year.

The Speaker: The next question belongs to Edmonton-Ellerslie.

FSCD Program Wait Times

Mr. Gurtej Brar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of my constituents has two special-needs children. Her younger child needs urgent support, but the issue is that they are still waiting since 2024 for support for their first child. That child's application is approved, yet years have gone by with no caseworker, no contract, and no services. It is an understatement to say that they are overwhelmed. A simple question: why is the government forcing my constituents and families to wait for years for FSCD supports?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, this government has increased every line item associated with disabilities, including for children with disabilities. In fact, underneath the leadership of this government, since they took over from the NDP, they've increased disability supports by \$1 billion, which is a 41 per cent increase. The real question is: why did every member of the Official Opposition repeatedly for the last several years stand up in this House and vote against money for people with disabilities, including in Budget 2026 on the record where they voted against people with

disabilities? This government continues to invest despite the NDP.

Mr. Gurtej Brar: Given that families are waiting years even after their application is approved and given that children are missing out on critical early support and development and given that parents are being pushed out of work and it's putting real pressure on them, does the minister not understand these delays are harming children during the most important years of their early development?

11:00

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we do understand how important this issue is. That's why we increased funding for disability supports by \$1 billion, a 41 per cent increase from what the NDP did. But again, the question is why the disability advocate of the NDP, the Member for St. Albert, voted against supports for disabilities. Why did the member asking the question vote against supports for disabilities? Why did the NDP vote against support for disabilities repeatedly in this House? The NDP don't put their money where their mouth is, but this side does. That's why we invest in supports for disabilities despite the Official Opposition.

Mr. Gurtej Brar: Given that families are waiting two to three years for FSCD services and given that parents feel abandoned and ignored and given that every single day of delay means lost development for a child, will the minister commit today to make supports available once the application is approved? And since two of my constituents are in the gallery, will he commit to meet them today to hear their concerns directly?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, what I will commit today is to continue to fight against the NDP, who have come to this Legislature for years and years to vote against increases to disability supports, to put forward budgets that were less than the United Conservative government did, to vote against increases for children with disabilities, which that member did and every member of the Official Opposition did. We're not going to be lectured by a party that came to the Legislature and fought against funding children with disabilities. Instead, we're going to continue with our increases to support the people of Alberta. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Transmission Grid Reliability

Mr. Rowswell: Mr. Speaker, solar power is increasingly promoted as the next best energy source despite its reliance on sunlight, vast land requirements, short operational lifespan, rare material inputs, and the enormous energy needed to manufacture and replace panels. To the Minister of Affordability and Utilities: how do you respond to those who argue that solar panels can replace fossil fuels despite ongoing concerns about reliability, affordability, and baseload capacity?

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Affordability and Utilities.

Mr. Neudorf: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the member, who is exactly right. We cannot gamble Alberta's energy security on whether the sun shines or not. Our families, hospitals, and businesses depend on affordable electricity that works around the clock regardless of the weather. Solar has a place, but it can't replace the reliable, dispatchable baseload power of natural gas. That's why we won't repeat the mistakes of the NDP. Their hasty transition away from fossil fuels now costs Albertans billions, as seen on their utility bills and the high cost of transmission.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Mr. Rowswell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that fossil fuels have long provided steady, on-demand power and contributed to Alberta becoming one of the most prosperous provinces in Canada and given that large-scale solar power projects face challenges in reliability, especially due to their dependence on good weather, to the same minister: how can we ensure energy transition policies do not compromise grid reliability or ignore the foundational role of fossil fuels in meeting Alberta's energy needs?

The Speaker: The hon. the minister.

Mr. Neudorf: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thanks again to the member. We focus on putting Albertans first, not ideology. That's why we stood against the federal clean electricity regulations, that would have made our grid 100 times less reliable. Through our recent MOU we got them suspended, which is unlocking up to \$18 billion of new natural gas investment that will ensure that the reliability and affordability of power within Alberta's grid continues. We will continue to defend the role of natural resources and natural gas powering this province. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Let's just hear from Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright.

Mr. Rowswell: Mr. Speaker, given that building and replacing solar infrastructure requires enormous amounts of energy and rare resources often supplied by oil, gas, and coal and given that fossil fuels continue to offer unmatched energy density and support our energy infrastructure, to the same minister: can you please explain how our government is balancing environmental objectives with marginalizing the industries and the workers that underpin Alberta's economy?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Neudorf: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and again to that member. The grid alerts of 2024 proved that our energy sector needs to be able to evolve responsibly, and that's why we're doing it through balancing reliability, affordability, and sustainability. That's why we're exploring long-term solutions like nuclear energy to provide reliable, emission-free power for the future while ensuring we have the baseload power that we need today. I want to thank our incredible electricity sector for keeping our province powered and moving our economy forward every single day, putting Albertans first.

Health Care System

Member Hoyle: The UCP is pushing yet another bill that opens the door to for-profit, two-tier health care where if you can't pay, you wait. Meanwhile Albertans are being treated in overcrowded hallways. Some are dying before they even get seen. Families are afraid to go to the hospital when they need care. This government is failing to retain nurses and doctors, ignoring front-line workers, and cancelling the first new hospital in Edmonton in over 40 years. This isn't leadership; this is abandonment. Will the Premier stop this privatization agenda and build the south Edmonton hospital that's so desperately needed?

The Speaker: The hon. the minister of hospitals.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In fact, we're taking the \$5 billion that was going to be the most expensive hospital perhaps in Canadian history, and we're using that to build far more acute-care capacity across Edmonton and the capital region. That includes bed

towers at the Misericordia and Grey Nuns. Already those two projects would have more beds than the south Edmonton hospital. We've also announced a stand-alone Stollery, and two urgent care centres will be built in the area. To the member's question about our ability to attract nurses, we've brought in over 12,000 since 2019 and over 2,000 new physicians, so I'm not sure what exodus the member opposite is referring to. Perhaps it was under the NDP. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Member Hoyle: The question was on retaining nurses and doctors, which this government isn't doing.

Given that we also introduced a motion calling on this government to confront this crisis in our hospitals, a crisis putting patient safety and Albertans' lives at risk, given that what we asked for was simple – collect and report data on violence and deaths in emergency departments, then use that data to direct funding where it's needed most – given that this government will not admit there's a crisis and there's more focus on optics and blame than real solutions, why is the UCP refusing to invest the resources needed to keep Albertans safe in hospitals?

The Speaker: The minister of hospitals.

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We absolutely acknowledge that our hospitals are under pressure, particularly in our major urban centres, which have seen record population growth over the last five years. As an example, at the Royal Alex hospital we've doubled the security complement. We're bringing in a weapons screener, which will be up and running this month, at the Royal Alex, and we've implemented new policies around bags and visitation to increase the safety of patients and staff. Parents will of course be able to accompany their children, as will the children's siblings, but we're going to make it safer and operate better.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Member Hoyle: Given that legal experts warn that the UCP's health privatization violates the Canada Health Act, the law that guarantees care based on need, not on ability to pay, and given that this government has a responsibility to protect public health care yet under their watch Albertans are seeing two-tier care, hallway medicine, closed ERs, and growing safety risks across this province, given that these policies break the promises the UCP made to Albertans in the last election, will this government admit that they said one thing and did the opposite when they promised that no Albertan will ever pay to see a doctor?

The Speaker: The hon. the minister of preventative health.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the member opposite is incorrect, and I want to set the record straight. The Cambie Surgeries Corporation versus British Columbia case did not find that dual practice violates the Canada Health Act. In fact, it simply confirmed that British Columbia was within its rights to set its own restrictions under the provincial law. The Cambie ruling is clear. Provinces may choose to limit dual practice, but nowhere – nowhere – does it say that they are required to ban it. We have the opportunity, and we have the right . . .

The Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. members, in 30 seconds we will continue with the daily Routine.

11:10

Tabling Returns and Reports

The Speaker: Edmonton-West Henday.

Member Arcand-Paul: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have several documents that I referred to last night in debate, six in total. The first is a report which is called Decision Making & National Unity under Threat: Foreign Interference, Cognitive Sovereignty, and the Alberta Referendum.

The second one is a notice of application filed earlier this week by Mikisew Cree First Nation regarding Alberta's failure to consult, including concerns regarding the expedited 120-day approval process and requesting the co-operation agreement to be reviewed.

The third is a letter to the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada from the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation regarding the co-operation agreement and concerns about Indigenous consultation and the AER.

A letter from the Otipemisiwak Métis Government from the district council of Fort McMurray regarding the co-operation agreement and concerns about Indigenous consultation and environmental impact assessments by the Alberta government.

The fifth is a submission from the Montana First Nation which highlights Alberta's failures with consultation and cumulative effects regarding the co-operation agreement.

Then the last is the Fort Chipewyan Métis Association letter regarding concerns with the AER and Indigenous consultation by the province of Alberta.

Thank you.

The Speaker: It was fairly tight for six tablings. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

The Justice minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise today with the five requisite copies to table the Calgary drug treatment court's newly released recidivism study showing that 70 per cent of graduates have no new substantive criminal convictions six years following graduation and a 78 per cent reduction in criminal convictions.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Just introduce it and try not to argue it. Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite five copies of a CBC article written prior to the 2015 election heralding and commemorating the 1986 election of 16 NDP MLAs, forming the Official Opposition for the first time on May 8, 1986. We stand on their shoulders.

The Speaker: The Minister of Arts, Culture and Status of Women.

Ms Fir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to table the requisite five copies of the Alberta music action plan and creation of the Alberta Music Commission, a first-of-its-kind strategy in Canada, a made-in-Alberta plan to amplify opportunities of creative and economic success for the music sector.

The Speaker: Are there any other tablings? Okay. Lac St. Anne-Parkland.

Mr. Getson: Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I have a complete list of tablings of all the members opposite who have turned down their wage increases or any of the other benefits increasing their things, and for the record it's completely blank.

The Speaker: Well, when you do tablings, you don't get to read the tabling to the House; only talk to the subject matter. [interjections] Order.

That takes us to points of order. The one from 10:24 was withdrawn. I think we've got 10:35 and 10:36. Let's see; 10:35 from the government side.

Point of Order Allegations against a Member Improper Inferences

Mr. Schow: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I suspect these are the ones that I called. My times are off, but I do have some unofficial records that I kept, and if it pleases the chair, I would just like to combine them because I think they're both relevant and germane to each other.

The point of order that I'm raising under 23(h), (i), and (j): at the time noted, the Minister of Justice had just finished an answer, and the Leader of the Opposition, from a sedentary position – which I can only assume the ambient mics picked up and so did the Blues – said: when will the police be called on all the things you've done? Now, my understanding, however, Mr. Speaker, is that this was actually a response to something that was said from a sedentary position from the minister of seniors and social services, and I probably just massacred that ministry. Just a moment. The Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services. I apologize to Sondre's favourite son.

That comment was made to him. I then said from a sedentary position, "That is low, even for you," to the Leader of the Opposition, and for that I will apologize and withdraw. Then what followed up was also a bit unfortunate because it is called a point of order before because what the member said in response was, "So is shooting horses."

To recap this entire interaction, the Leader of the Opposition said to the minister, "When will the police be called for all the illegal things that you've done," and then I said, "It's low for you," and then he said, "So is shooting horses." Mr. Speaker this, of course, is referencing a legal case that the minister was involved in many years ago that was dealt with. What I can say is, one, you cannot accuse a member in good standing in this Chamber of breaking the law. You cannot, and the courts have settled this already. Second, shooting horses is also something that the Member from Edmonton-Gold Bar has been called out of order for referencing on a number of occasions.

I don't want to belabour this point because we have a point of privilege to get to as well as government business, and I'm sure that you'd rather do other things than listen to these points of order. However, it is important to note that we must be held accountable for the things we say and do in this Chamber. I am not immune to that myself, Mr. Speaker. I've made apologies as recently as yesterday, but I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to apologize for these comments suggesting the member has broken the law and then also referencing shooting horses, which has been ruled out of order in the past. Under 23(h), (i), and (j), I submit this argument to you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The Opposition House Leader.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The context that led to this discussion, I think, is material because the Minister for Assisted Living and Social Services chose to, from a sedentary position, heckle the Leader of the Official Opposition repeatedly, "You hid it," speaking about the data breach, and the subject of a point of privilege later this afternoon. He deliberately antagonized and started yelling at my leader, "You hid it." The leader responded: I called the RCMP. The minister said, "You hid it." The Leader of the Official Opposition said, "Calling the [RCMP] is hiding [something]?"

Again, engaging on a point of privilege, the minister should know better and should not have been attempting to heckle the Leader of the Official Opposition who was not even speaking at that moment, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Government House Leader has the quote incorrectly. I believe that the Leader of the Official Opposition talking about how calling the cops is not doing nothing said something to the effect of, “What about when the cops have been called for something you’ve done,” which is a matter of debate, referring to previous situations with the horses. This was all terrible behaviour incited by somebody heckling about something that is a matter of a point of privilege. It is frustrating to me that this is the level of decorum in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I will apologize to you because as I argue this, I think the best course of action is simply to apologize and withdraw. None of this should have happened. It’s incredibly frustrating to me, but we are at the end of the week, so I will apologize and withdraw, and I hope we can move on.

The Speaker: Thank you, Opposition House Leader. I will agree with both sides that the behaviour has been below the level that this Chamber and our jobs would require of all of us. You’re right in saying that sometimes at the end of the week when the frustrations can build up, it gets worse, but that’s not really an excuse. It’s just as we say around here: context.

11:20

When we do finish this day, eventually, let’s go home to our families or wherever we want to go and just – yeah. Let’s relax and try to do, maybe, better than today next week, shall we? That puts these matters to rest for today.

Privilege

Obstructing Members in Performance of Duty

The Speaker: The House leader for the Official Opposition.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Government House Leader argued yesterday that the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona’s actions or inactions have “compromised the right of the individual members . . . to be free from obstruction, interference, intimidation, and molestation.” I’m going to proceed to argue that this does not rise to a point of privilege for several reasons. At the beginning of my remarks I would simply like to open by saying that in the case of the breach of the elections information of 3 million Albertans, the Leader of the Official Opposition, upon discovering this at a meeting that had government staffers at it, the very next day picked up the phone and called the RCMP to report what he had seen. This Assembly is not the RCMP, this Assembly is not Elections Alberta, and this Assembly is not the Privacy Commissioner.

With that opening comment, Mr. Speaker, any obstruction, interference, intimidation, or molestation at this point is hypothetical. If it has occurred or does occur as a result of this data breach, it will not have taken place in this House and certainly not as the result of any of the actions of the members of the Official Opposition caucus nor the members of the government caucus.

Secondly, to claim that because the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona said or did not say or do certain things in this House at certain times, members of this House could theoretically be obstructed in their duties by unknown people outside of the House does not constitute a point of privilege nor does it make logical sense. To claim that because a member in this House did or did not say or do something another member’s parliamentary duties were obstructed or could be obstructed is an extraordinary claim.

I will provide the authorities which I note the Government House Leader mentioned but did not provide in his arguments yesterday. The test for obstruction can be found in *Maingot’s Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, second edition, on page 235. “[Any] obstruction must be connected to parliamentary work (parliamentary proceeding) and be occasioned by improper means.” While a member’s duties and responsibilities may be interfered with by something outside of their work in the Legislature – *Maingot’s* cites examples of a member being denied access to visit a penitentiary by administrators – such instances do not rise to obstruction precisely because they do not relate to a member’s parliamentary work and did not incur in a parliament or in a Legislature.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice is exceedingly clear that a breach of privilege cannot be found unless a member is actually obstructed in their parliamentary duties. It can’t be based on a hypothetical situation which could occur.

In ruling on such matters, the Speaker examines the effect [that] the incident or event had on the member’s ability to fulfill their responsibilities. If, in the Speaker’s view, the member was not obstructed in the performance of their legislative and deliberative duties, then a prima facie breach of privilege cannot be found.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, 3.73.

Per Speaker Bosley, any obstruction in the form of a “threat or attempt at intimidation cannot be [merely] hypothetical, but must be real” and must have actually occurred. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, 3.72. The extent to which an obstruction has been found as a breach of privilege is demonstrated in the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. One example notes an instance where a member’s parliamentary duties were impacted by an obstruction outside of the parliamentary Chamber in 1989. Members were physically stopped on their way to the Chamber by RCMP who were blocking a roadway during a demonstration on Parliament Hill. In this case, the prima facie matter of privilege existed. The matter was referred to the standing committee, which never reported on that matter. Section 3.75.

In this case, there’s nothing for the member to apologize for precisely because he did nothing that could have obstructed another member in the performance of his or her duties. The facts are completely different. I will note that the Government House Leader in his arguments did not describe any member who was obstructed from performing their duty in this Chamber. While it may be the Government House Leader’s opinion that the member’s statements could in the future cause other people to obstruct, intimidate, or molest a member at some point in the future, that opinion about what might occur does not rise to an actual obstruction or to a point of privilege. While any member’s personal data being exposed is a concern, that risk does not on its own constitute an obstruction or an instance of intimidation and certainly not one caused by the member or by any statements he made or may not have made that the Government House Leader may have deemed misleading or inaccurate.

I will again note that in his arguments the Government House Leader chose to use paraphrases and no quotations from anything that has been said in this Chamber, to my read of his arguments.

This argument is predicated on a potential future obstruction or interference that may occur outside the Assembly at the hands of unknown people. This point of privilege is not accusing the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona of interfering or obstructing other members. It is alleging that because he failed to do something – again I will note that he called the RCMP at the time – an interference may take place involving unknown persons who are not members of the Assembly and are not bound by its rules and obligations.

Additionally, in his remarks the Government House Leader also alleged that the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona failed to report information about this data breach to the Assembly and claimed that this would also contribute to a breach of members' privilege to be free from obstruction. Again, I will repeat that this Assembly is not the RCMP, is not Elections Alberta, is not the Privacy Commissioner. As the Government House Leader said yesterday, his argument is based on the Leader of the Opposition's inactions, not his actions.

Mr. Speaker, members in this Chamber enjoy the privilege of freedom of speech, but that privilege also carries with it the freedom not to speak or to refrain from comment. It is a freedom from compulsion outside of some very specific circumstances, which are very clearly laid out in the standing orders. Members are not obligated or compelled to speak in this Assembly on any given topic. This situation is absolutely not one of those specific circumstances outlined in our standing orders.

Privilege does not create a positive duty. There is no positive obligation placed on members to report potential wrongdoing in the Assembly at the first hint of potential wrongdoing by people outside of this Assembly because the Assembly is not an investigative agency, Mr. Speaker, or a law enforcement agency. If this were the case, members opposite would have been required to report to the Assembly at the first moment they became aware of any malfeasance involving health procurement contracts with Sam Mraiche, just to draw a comparison.

Furthermore, the Assembly does not enforce laws. There is no positive obligation to disclose concerns regarding a law enforcement issue to the Assembly in the law. The Assembly is not a law enforcement agency or intelligence body, and reporting information about an ongoing general public safety concern should be addressed with the appropriate law enforcement agency, which was done, not to the UCP.

Members do have a duty to follow the law, which means reporting wrongdoing to the authority and upholding the public interest. In this case the member in question followed his duty. When the member was made aware of the possibility that the Centurion Project database misused the personal information of Albertans, he immediately alerted the RCMP K Division on the morning of April 17, the same day that he learned about the potential breach. He then made a follow-up call to K Division to confirm receipt of that e-mail that very same day. Had the information been broken earlier or shared to anyone outside of the relevant authorities, it could have compromised Albertans' safety and the general public interest, which, I will remind all, is our first priority as members of this Chamber.

Now, how could that have caused further harm? Mr. Speaker, the more people who are aware of this live database that was sitting on the Internet, where anyone with a fake e-mail account could sign up and search friends and neighbours and 3 million other Albertans, the more people who knew about it, the earlier it was disclosed to the public without being taken down, the more people could have been creating accounts, looking at data while the system was live and filled with that private information. By not announcing this in some public way but instead reporting it to the appropriate authorities, the Leader of the Official Opposition was protecting the data of those 3 million Albertans.

I will note that while the Government House Leader has characterized the Leader of the Opposition's statements as misleading, he has absolutely stopped short of claiming that the Leader of the Opposition has misled the House. This is because the claim would have no merit. Statements made outside of the Assembly do not constitute breaches of privilege that members have inside the Assembly.

The Government House Leader also suggested that members' privileges were breached when the Leader of the Opposition made "misleading and inaccurate statements in the Assembly." His only support for this claim was to mischaracterize what was actually said by paraphrasing comments of the Leader of the Official Opposition at a press conference held outside of the Chamber. The Leader of the Opposition stated that a Rob Smith was on this Zoom call. Whether it is the same Rob Smith who serves as the UCP president was unknown at the time the statements were made, and that was acknowledged at the press conference.

11:30

The instance cited by the Government House Leader concerns a Rob Smith, who is not a member of the Assembly. Privilege cannot be breached in relation to comments that may or not have been made about this individual. I would refer you again to your ruling on April 22, in which a point of order regarding an allegation against a nonmember was not found, and also on page 622 of the third edition of *Procedure and Practice*, which states clearly that nonmembers may be referred to by name, especially in extraordinary circumstances of national or provincial interest.

As has been raised and demonstrated countless times in this House, the relationship between the members of the government and the separatist movement in Alberta is friendly. A member of the Premier's own staff was on the same Zoom call where the separatists were showing off their access to the electoral list. Members opposite were also aware of this data breach and did not report it, and this was admitted to by the UCP caucus. If the Leader of the Official Opposition was obliged to report to the Assembly, which he is not, the same would apply to the members opposite who may have known this information.

Again, this is not a breach of privilege, but if it were, it would also capture the conduct of the Premier and members opposite, who were potentially made aware of the data breach at the hands of separatists and failed to notify the Assembly or, more importantly and more appropriately, the RCMP, Elections Alberta, and the appropriate authorities. As the Leader of the Official Opposition has stated, quote: if you discover your neighbour has robbed a bank, do you call them before you call the police? End quote.

Without knowing which political party may have shared electors lists and understanding the deep connections between the separatists and government members, it absolutely made sense to follow the law and report this to law enforcement and not to another political party who also has access to the electors list, Mr. Speaker. This government's respect for ethics and law has been questionable at best. The government has repeatedly changed the laws to remove any barriers between the separatists and their referendum. This government has weakened the investigative powers of Elections Alberta against Elections Alberta's public advice and in a way that now materially seems to impact this case based on news releases from Elections Alberta.

There are other ethics and law judgments that have been questionable by the government, but I will not digress into that at this point, Mr. Speaker. But the ethical record of this government has been a factor as we have managed this situation. Given this record one can see why there may be some reluctance on our part to alert members about potential wrongdoing before law enforcement has been alerted while the database was live and anyone could create an account and access it and before an investigation had been started.

As the Official Opposition our duty is to hold the government to account, not to give them a friendly heads-up about an illegal action by their friends in the separatist movement and certainly not before it was reported to the authorities and an investigation was started.

Personally, as a member of the 3 million strong Alberta public whose information was made available, I am glad that it was reported to the RCMP and that more people were not given access and the ability to search our information. I will note that Members of the Legislative Assembly are a very small portion of the number of vulnerable Albertans who are put at risk by this.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, this is not a point of privilege. The authorities describe that to find a breach of a member's freedom to carry out their parliamentary duties free from obstruction, intimidation, interference, or molestation, there must be a real demonstrated instance of those duties being obstructed. The Government House Leader did not and could not describe a member of this House who was obstructed in their parliamentary duties. Based on the authorities and the previous rulings I believe this matter cannot be deemed a point of privilege.

The Government House Leader has raised this point out of a theory that because the Leader of the Official Opposition, upon appropriately reporting his concerns to the RCMP, did not do something which he had no duty or obligation to do, other people outside of this Legislature might at some point in the future obstruct, intimidate, or otherwise interfere with members carrying out their parliamentary duty. The Leader of the Opposition had one legal duty upon being made aware of this breach, to report to the legal authorities, which he did on April 17. It cannot be said that the Premier and the members opposite did the same after a member of their staff learned the same information at the same time. To find that privilege was breached because the Leader of the Official Opposition did not say or do something in the Legislature could be a breach of his own privilege of freedom of speech as a member, which also carries with it a freedom from being unduly compelled to speak.

To find a point of privilege because of an inaction would be to compel speech outside of what is required in our standing orders and would violate the member's freedom of speech. It would also prevent him from exercising effectively his duties as the Leader of the Official Opposition. A member of this Chamber cannot reasonably be deemed to have breached the privilege of another member by not taking a specific action. This would be a rejection of the jurisprudence of this Chamber and other parliaments around the privilege of freedom of speech, and the test for an obstruction of a member's duty is high.

I would urge you, Mr. Speaker, to dismiss this frivolous point of privilege that, to quote the Justice minister earlier from question period, seems to be intended to "score cheap political points."

I look forward to your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. member.

Having heard the submissions from both sides, I will consider this carefully and will report back to the House, I expect, Monday. Thank you for that. For now that puts this matter to rest until then.

Orders of the Day

Private Bills Second Reading

Bill Pr. 1

The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026

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

Ms Sigurdson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak on behalf of my colleague the Member for Calgary-*Buffalo*, who is the sponsor of Bill Pr. 1, The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026. This bill updates financial rules and modernizes the

club's name. The Ranchmen's Club is a historic institution in Alberta. It is located in my colleague's riding, Calgary-*Buffalo*. The club was established way back in 1891 and is Alberta's only platinum-ranked private club. It is among the top 1 per cent of private clubs world-wide for excellence, amenity, quality, and service. Members are given the opportunity to network, cultivating relationships.

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

With that, I move second reading of Bill Pr. 1, The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026, on behalf of my colleague the MLA for Calgary-*Buffalo*.

The Acting Speaker: Any other members to speak? Seeing none.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 1 read a second time]

Bill Pr. 2

Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026

The Acting Speaker: The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mrs. Sawyer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move second reading of Bill Pr. 2, Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026.

This bill proposes amendments that, when passed, will empower Prairie College, as it is now known, to expand its program offerings to include the granting of baccalaureate, master's, and doctorate degrees.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you.

Any others wishing to speak?

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 2 read a second time]

11:40

Private Bills Committee of the Whole

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

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

Bill Pr. 1

The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill?

Seeing none, we'll call the question.

[The clauses of Bill Pr. 1 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Bill Pr. 2

Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to this bill?

[The clauses of Bill Pr. 2 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.
The Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Yes, Mr. Chair. I move that the committee rise and report bills Pr. 1 and Pr. 2.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

The Acting Speaker: The Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mrs. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports the following bills: Bill Pr. 1, Bill Pr. 2.

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

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Acting Speaker: Opposed? So ordered.

Government Motions

The Acting Speaker: The Government House Leader.

Time Allocation on Bills 25, 28, 29, and 32

42. Mr. Schow moved:
Be it resolved that
- (a) when further consideration of Bill 25, An Act to Remove Politics and Ideology from Classrooms and Amend the Education Act, 2026, is resumed, not more than one hour be allotted to any stage of consideration of the bill,
 - (b) when further consideration of Bill 28, Municipal Affairs and Housing Statutes Amendment Act, 2026, is resumed, not more than one hour be allotted to any stage of consideration of the bill,
 - (c) when further consideration of Bill 29, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2026, is resumed, not more than one hour be allotted to any stage of consideration of the bill,
 - (d) when further consideration of Bill 32, Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 2026, is resumed, not more than one hour be allotted to any stage of consideration of the bill, and
 - (e) upon the expiry of the time allotted under clauses (a) to (d) for each stage of consideration of a bill, every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at that stage shall be put forthwith.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Government Motion 42 would program four government bills in order to promote quality of debate, diminish time wasted in divisions, and expedite the passage of these important bills so that they can be positively implemented to impact the lives of Albertans. The government motion programs the bills mentioned, as they were read out in the motion. These bills would have an important, positive impact on Albertans' lives, and it is important that this government use these pieces of legislation for the intended purpose, which they've all been argued, Mr. Speaker. Given that I've mentioned four instead of one, I'll just reference them all as a whole.

Now, this motion also ensures that these bills are passed in a timely manner after receiving thorough consideration and debate in the Assembly over five hours each. By using a programming motion instead of time allocation, nearly five hours of time that would have been spent on the motions and divisions is saved and can instead be spent on valuable debate that occurs in the Assembly. In short, more time to debate the legislation, less time standing around waiting between division bells for voting.

A programming motion also can guarantee that the opposition may force a motion of five hours of debate on government bills as opposed to time allocation, which guaranteed only a minimum of three hours. The bills affected by Government Motion 42 will still receive the most amount of debate of all government bills dealt with this spring. The debate from the opposition tends to lose quality quickly, but, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate their engagement on these bills nonetheless. By limiting debate to five hours, pressure is put on the opposition to prioritize quality over quantity. I've often said this. Now, the opposition will have the opportunity to debate the use of a programming motion for one hour, longer than the five minutes previously permitted under the time allocation motions. The government believes that programming motions present a reasonable solution for the opposition, guaranteeing them more debate for clearer timelines.

So, Mr. Speaker, overall, this is a net positive for the Chamber. It's a net positive for Albertans as we ensure that more quality of debate is brought to this Chamber and less time is spent standing around waiting to vote, which is 15 minutes every time a division bell is rung, under the previous standing orders. I look forward to future robust debate as we continue to draw near to the end of this legislative session and implement and pass the bills, without presupposing the outcome, that will benefit the lives of all Albertans.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With that, I move Government Motion 42.

The Acting Speaker: Okay. The Official Opposition House Leader.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the moving of Government Motion 42 and the government's continued, heavy-handed use of mechanisms to limit the amount of time. Not only the Official Opposition but Albertans are impacted by these pieces of legislation. Both legal and subject matter experts: limiting the amount of time that they have to analyze these pieces of legislation, and allowing the government to prioritize only its use of this legislation, to paraphrase what the Government House Leader said.

I am unsurprised to hear the government extol that these bills will have had the most amount of debate in this session, Mr. Speaker, as this is a government that will always celebrate that they are spending the most ever on education, ignoring the fact that the overall amount is insufficient and doesn't account for population growth and inflation. Really similarly, the "most amount of debate" in this case is an absolutely shameful amount of debate on four pieces of legislation that have massive impact on Albertans' lives and families.

The government is chiding the Official Opposition about the quality of our debate, which is laughable given the concerns that have been brought forward by Albertans on bills 32, 28, 29, and 25. We certainly have no need for the government to impose limits on our freedom of speech and limits on our ability to engage in our role as legislators in this place through programming motions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, programming motions, in this case, are the changes that came about from Government Motion 28 that the

government imposed on this Assembly in a heavy-handed, autocratic way earlier in this session. You can look on the Order Paper that exists today and still see Government Motion 29, where the government was prepared to use time allocation to limit the amount of time that we could even talk about the changes to our standing orders and how business is conducted in this place.

11:50

Mr. Speaker, this change to programming motions being sold as if it will allow for more time in debate because we'll spend less time on divisions is completely misleading. Obviously, this Chamber has often granted unanimous consent to lessen the amount of time of divisions. These types of things can get negotiated. It is absolutely a red herring and not a reason to do this. The only reason the government is moving Government Motion 42 is because the level of debate in this Chamber, paired with opposition to this government's agenda out in the public, is increasing every single time these items are up for debate. The high quality of debate in here is reflecting what we are hearing from our constituents, what we are hearing from experts, what we are hearing from people who are directly impacted by these policies.

The four pieces of legislation that are being limited with this programming motion include changes to the electoral boundaries, after this government used Government Motion 37 to take a constitutional majority recommendation from the independent boundaries commission, throw it out the window, and bring in a completely illegitimate process that has never happened here before, that we believe is unconstitutional, and people outside of this Chamber would agree. To allow MLAs to draw the electoral map because the majority recommendation was one the government didn't support: that is just one of these four pieces of legislation.

This bill is also – apologies. This programming Motion 42 is also limiting debate on Bill 28, the municipal affairs and housing statutes, and I can summarize this. The UCP, again, exerting more control over municipalities. We see over and over that this government has no respect for municipalities and, whenever possible, this government will seek to enrich itself with more power and control in all aspects. I will say that on Bill 28 the public discourse on this continues. As more and more people become aware of this, outrage is what I am seeing, Mr. Speaker. When I visit community leagues and talk to constituents, the questions that they have for these bills – by limiting the time and debate, they are limiting Albertans' access to this information. That goes the same for the other two bills, which I haven't even had a chance to speak to. Shameful.

The Acting Speaker: Any others wishing to speak to the motion? The Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to this motion from the government. You know, Dr. Jared Wesley, political scientist at the U of A, recently wrote on his Substack an extensive article about how we need to be communicating with Albertans about the crisis of liberal democracy in Alberta these days. Dr. Wesley says:

The Alberta government's approach to politics is not normal. Its supporters will say otherwise, but you can remind them that no other governments in Canada are rigging rules to [support] their political aims with as much frequency.

Dr. Wesley goes on:

Other governments may seek to consolidate power in the premier's office, but none are actively removing checks and balances to abuse their power to this extent.

This is a neutral voice. This is not a partisan individual. This is someone with deep knowledge and experience in politics, and he is calling this government out.

He lays out three very simple principles by which to judge a government's behaviour. He says that we look at whether they believe that everyone must play by the same rules. As Dr. Wesley says:

The most basic expectation in any democracy: no one gets special treatment, and no one gets to rewrite the rules simply because they don't like the outcome.

What we are debating here right now, Mr. Speaker, is a motion, enabled by the government, changing the rules in this House to make it easier for them to limit debate. This is a government that thrives on changing the rules to its benefit because it can't stand on its merits.

Dr. Wesley goes on. He says the second principle is that government must be accountable.

In a democracy, governments have to explain themselves, face scrutiny, and accept limits on their power . . . our institutions are built around the principle that elites will hold each other in check and that we will hold them accountable through elections.

He says:

These institutions are eroding in Alberta today.

He specifically speaks about

limits on legislative debate, including the routine use of time allocation to push bills without scrutiny.

Again, that is precisely what we have in this motion today, Mr. Speaker, this government ducking democratic accountability, as we've seen them repeatedly do. Their record is catching up with them. Their actions, their behaviour, their repeated self-dealing for themselves and their friends: Albertans are sitting up and taking notice, and this government does not want to face the scrutiny of this Legislature so they are limiting our time for debate.

Let's talk about some of those bills that, in fact, they are limiting that time of debate on. Bill 32, electoral boundaries, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about the degradation of democracy in our province. Susan Samson, former mayor of Sylvan Lake, member of the Electoral Boundaries Commission, here's what she has to say about the government's actions: I am totally demoralized and dismayed that our work was discounted and not accepted; this government rejected the report and instead has their committee of MLAs that will redraw the maps. She says, quote, this is a real stab in the heart for democracy, grassroots democracy being challenged.

The Government House Leader says that we have to race that through as quickly as possible. He says that that's for the good of Albertans, Mr. Speaker? No. That is to the detriment of every Albertan as this government continues to degrade our democracy in this province.

Bill 28, by which the Minister of Municipal Affairs is giving himself more power to investigate a library than the Minister of Justice is willing to give Elections Alberta to investigate the most significant breach of data in Alberta's history. The Minister of Municipal Affairs, in Bill 28, is giving himself more power to investigate than the Minister of Justice is allowing the Chief Electoral Officer and the Election Commissioner. Keith Gerein, columnist at the *Edmonton Journal*, calls Bill 28 "a massive and unaccountable sledgehammer to hold over public libraries," another massive invasion of Albertans' privacy, Mr. Speaker.

Again, this government says that we have to limit debate and we have to force that through as quickly as possible, and they claim that's for the good of Albertans, Mr. Speaker. No. This government only acts for the good of itself. This time allocation motion today is about undermining Albertans' access to democracy. It's about undermining accountability. It's about this government ducking and hiding at a time when they are under increasing scrutiny, and rightfully so, as more and more people stand up and say that this is not normal government. This is not good government. This is not a

government listening to the people of Alberta. This is not a government that likes direct democracy. No. It's a government that loves directing democracy, power, and control, and that's why we'll vote against this motion.

The Acting Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-North West.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I speak in opposition to Motion 42 here this morning. I think that it's deeply ironic that we are limiting debate on these four bills because in the time that I've been in the Legislature, more than anybody else in this place, I've never seen such generational changes as the health bill, Bill 29, bringing in two-tier, private, American-style health care to the province of Alberta. We haven't seen anybody dare to do this in this House ever, and it's now just part of a suite of bills that are now being limited in regard to the debate.

Another one, the boundaries commission: again, an unprecedented attack on the democratic principle of an independent commission drawing the boundaries of our electoral districts and moving that to a UCP-dominated committee for them to draw the boundaries. I mean, again, this defies not just democracy, as my colleagues mentioned, but it defies logic and reason as well. If this government thinks that they can get away with that kind of thing without scrutiny, they're dead wrong, absolutely wrong.

For the Minister of Advanced Education, who claims that he's an economist, this is a terrible waste of money as well and time and effort. There are better people over there somewhere. Dig deeper, UCP members. Dig deeper and do the right thing.

In regard to the municipal affairs bill, I didn't get much of a chance to debate on it, but the part that I find most egregious about this – and it has not been debated sufficiently – is the minister's ability to reach into libraries and to control what books are being used, to ban books, and to set regulation on libraries. Well, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I use my library card every single week, and I make the choices of what books I am choosing to sign out and for my family and for my grandchildren as well. This is not a prop; this is a library card. Many of these ministers, many of these people over here probably don't even know what it is because they haven't darkened the door of a library except to go in and ban books. That is a big reason why I am voting against Government Motion 42. It's absolutely ridiculous.

12:00

The education bill. Again, I met with a group of teachers last night, and they said: we can't even begin to even know how to comply with education Bill 25 because we are human beings and we teach human subjects about human nature, and all of those things have inherent bias in them. The idea that we're not teaching reading and writing and logical thinking and mathematics in our schools is absolutely insulting to those teachers. They know that they do so. They know that they've done more than they ever have in regard to basics. I know that as education minister I compelled schools to make sure that they were teaching mathematics and teaching language and logical thinking skills and critical thinking skills.

This government comes around after saying that they wanted to, you know, secure some truce with the teachers. Within 24 hours they went back to attacking teachers with Bill 25. I find it disgusting, and we have not debated this sufficiently to ensure that the needs of our families, of our teachers, of our society are met through these important bills that are before us here today.

The next time this government chooses to make generational changes to the boundaries commission, to our education system, to try to privatize health care, to take away powers from municipalities,

they better think twice because Albertans will not stand for it. They're watching what's going on here today, and they will make sure that they vote with their ballots in the next election.

Part of the reason that this government wants to cheat on the Electoral Boundaries Commission is that they know the mounting pressure is moving against them. They like to hide behind polls and whatever things they tell each other and tell themselves to reassure themselves: "Oh, don't worry. Don't worry. We'll fix the boundary commission. It's not a big deal." These things add up over time. Albertans: you must appreciate the intelligence they have and the memories they have about how this government has operated not just in the last few months, but in the last seven years.

Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: Thank you. I'll remind all members of the Assembly that any use – I would consider a library card to be a prop. It wasn't egregious. But I would ask all members to refrain from utilizing props during their time of speaking.

The Member for Calgary-North East.

Member Gurinder Brar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1774 a member of Parliament from Bristol, U.K., said:

Parliament is a deliberative assembly of one nation, with one interest, and that of the whole, where not local purposes, not local prejudices ought to guide but the general good resulting from the general reason of the whole.

I want to stress that Edmund Burke clearly said that general good results from the reason of the whole. With the time allocation motion the UCP government is limiting debate, discouraging reasoning, and working against the general good.

Before we go any further, let us look at the history of time allocation motions in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, the facts, the numbers, and the stats are clear. The UCP has used more than 54 per cent – 54 per cent – of all time allocation motions in the history of the province, and it just doesn't stop there. They have used the notwithstanding clause against the most vulnerable children not once, not twice but three times. They have used the notwithstanding clause against teachers, parents, and our future generations by ramming Bill 2 in a single day using this time allocation motion.

My constituents elected me because they want lower insurance rates. My constituents elected me because they want more schools in our communities. They want a safe and a better future for everyone in these communities. Today they are wondering when they're watching this debate: why is this government limiting debate to discuss the issues that impact their lives? Why is this government discouraging reasoning to find solutions to their problems? Why is this government not allowing the elected officials to represent the concerns of their constituents?

These are serious questions, Mr. Speaker, and they deserve serious answers because when democracy is threatened, entire society is threatened. Why can't this government let the members of this House represent their constituents? Why can't this government let the members of this House debate on the bills that impact the lives of their constituents? Why can't this government let democracy work through debate, through scrutiny, and through the voices of the people who sent us here?

The UCP's time allocation motion is the cruel hand that chokes the breath out of our democracy. The UCP is suffocating democracy right now, right in front of our eyes. We need a government that liberates democracy, not suffocates it, and we can do it in three simple ways. Let the members express their opinions, views, and ideas in this Assembly. Second, stop limiting debate. The third is the simplest one, Mr. Speaker: just believe in democracy.

When the UCP says limiting debate is about convenience, it is not. It is about avoiding scrutiny. It is about avoiding accountability. It is about avoiding the very people who elect us, trust us, and have serious impacts on their lives of the bills that we pass. Democracy is not convenient. It was never meant to be convenient. It is complex, it is messy, it is tedious, but that is not the flaw in democracy. That is democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad we live in a democratic society. There will be elections next year. Albertans will get to choose their government. Albertans will have a better choice than this government because they deserve a better government. They will elect the NDP government, a government that will not limit debate but encourage it, a government that will not suffocate democracy but let it breathe, a government that will not avoid reasoning but agree with Edmund Burke that general good results from the reason of the whole.

I'm reminded of the poem from Walt Whitman.

I will plant companionship thick as trees along all the rivers . . .
and along the shores of . . . lakes, and all over the prairies,
I will make inseparable cities with their arms about each other's
necks,
By the love of comrades,
By the manly love of comrades.
For you these from me, O Democracy, to serve you ma femme!
For you, for you I am trilling these songs.

The Acting Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-South West.

Mr. Ip: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate this opportunity to speak today to this closure motion. I want to begin with a quote from the proceedings of the Special Senate Committee on Senate Modernization, a 2016 report by the Canadian Senate. There's a very interesting quote that I want to mention. It says: of all the core functions of democracy, the most fundamental to the exercise of democracy is debate; it is through the process of debate that all other functions are performed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that summarizes one of the very, very key functions, if not the key, of what we do in this Chamber. We debate. That's what we do. So this time allocation motion is once again another attempt by the UCP government to silence the very core function of this Chamber, which is to debate. It is an attempt to weaken accountability and erode the democratic traditions of this Legislature. Since coming to power in 2019 the UCP government has made a mockery of the sacred traditions of this Chamber. Let me remind all members of this House that the Legislature is not meant to be a rubber stamp for the Premier's office or this government.

In grade 6 social studies students learn that the Legislative Assembly exists so that elected members, elected representatives, government and opposition alike, can debate laws, raise concerns from constituents, propose amendments, and hold the Premier and her cabinet accountable. Grade 6 students learn that at each stage of debate there is or should be rigorous debate and discussion and opportunities for improving the bill, including any amendments and thoughtful scrutiny and review.

12:10

Mr. Speaker, that's what's supposed to happen, but I'm disheartened by the fact that while we go through the motions in this House, that sort of meaningful exchange doesn't happen. Thoughtful debate and consideration have been routinely shut down by this government, and the message that the UCP is sending is that they see debate, frankly, as an inconvenience.

Let me point out the fact that time allocation was never intended to become a routine mechanism for government to use. In fact, it is an

extraordinary – extraordinary – tool. Under previous governments in Alberta throughout this province's history, whether it was the Progressive Conservative government, the Liberal, or even the Alberta NDP, time allocations were used very sparingly, very, very rarely, and generally reserved for exceptional circumstances. But what we're seeing now with this government especially is that it's now normalized. It's now transformed, really something that is an extraordinary procedure into a standard operating procedure.

As my colleagues have mentioned, this government has used time-limited motions over 85 times and counting since taking office. Guess how many times it was used when the Alberta NDP were in power. Just four, Mr. Speaker. Just four. The UCP is responsible for 54 per cent – 54 per cent – of all time allocations in Alberta throughout our 100-odd years of history. Since coming into government in 2019, they're responsible for 54 per cent. That is extraordinary.

On this side of the House we understand that there is a sacred responsibility we have collectively inherited from our forebears, that it is paramount that we're not just good governors but good stewards of democracy. On this side of the House we understand that even if you don't agree with the position, debate is what we do in this Chamber. Referring back to my original quote from the Senate report, debate is what we do. It's why we're here, and limiting debate or anything else that can be seen as stymieing the voices of all Albertans is eroding democracy.

For that reason and so many others, I can't support this motion. Thank you.

The Acting Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Mr. Gurtej Brar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose Government Motion 42. I oppose it because the motion is part of a growing problem in this Legislature, the steady erosion of debate, accountability, and democracy under this UCP government. In a democracy debate matters. Debate is not delay. Debate is not inconvenience. Debate is how elected representatives bring forward the voice of the people who sent us here. But in this House limiting debate has become the new norm under this UCP government, and all of us should be deeply concerned about that.

Every MLA in this Chamber represents thousands of Albertans. Those Albertans expect their concerns to be heard. They expect laws to be carefully studied. They expect government decisions to face proper scrutiny. But this government has treated debate like an obstacle instead of responsibility. Since 2019 this UCP has used time allocation again and again to cut off discussion in this Legislature. Time allocation should be rare. It should be only used in exceptional situations. Instead, this government has turned it into their routine political weapon. As my colleague mentioned, before 2019 the Alberta government 69 times introduced allocation motions over nearly 50 years, but since this UCP came into power, they've used it more than 80 times, more than seven times the historical average.

Think about that for a moment. This government alone is responsible for more than half of all the time allocation motions used in Alberta since 1937. This is not balanced, this is not leadership, and this is not healthy democracy. That is government shutting down debate because it does not want to hear criticism. We saw it again in this session. During the fall 2025 sitting alone the government introduced time allocation 13 times, Mr. Speaker, and now in this spring session they have already used it again to force through their deeply controversial boundary redraw process.

Albertans are paying attention, Mr. Speaker. They see bills being rammed through this House. They see debate cut off. They see opposition MLAs silenced before many even get a chance to stand

and speak for their constituents, and it goes beyond time allocation. This government has ended session early when it suited them. They have limited opportunities for meaningful discussions, and despite years in office they have refused to pass a single private member's bill from the Official Opposition. Not one. That sends a clear message. It tells Albertans that this government believes good ideas only can come from one side of the House. It tells Albertans that co-operation and collaboration are not welcome here.

Mr. Speaker, democracy is strongest when government is willing to listen even when they hear something they do not like. Strong governments do not fear debate, confident governments do not silence scrutiny, and governments that truly respect democracy do not repeatedly change the rules to avoid accountability.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Albertans deserve better than this. They deserve a Legislature where debate is respected, where elected representatives are allowed to fully speak for their communities, and where democracy is treated as something valuable, not something to control or manage.

This House does not belong to one political party. This House belongs to the people of Alberta. Every time debate is cut short, it is the voice of Albertans that is being cut off as well.

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

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise. Well, it's actually not really my pleasure to rise and talk about this government shutting down debate yet again, not listening. It's obvious every day. They'll say it in here: "We will take nothing from these people. We will not listen to these experts. Science? What's science? We're not listening to that. We're going to listen to this podcaster."

Madam Speaker, I'm joking, but what has become incredibly evident in this place is that this is a government that is so entitled and so unwilling to look outside their little weird bubble. They are governing in a bubble and, as a result, harming Albertans. What they're doing is eroding democracy every day. All of my colleagues have listed examples. I have no need to list them again. It is unbelievable. There's a reason that national reporters are watching Alberta, because it is a Dumpster fire. Almost every week there's national reporting about a story that is just unbelievable in terms of corruption and danger and harm, and it just goes on and on.

You know, last night I talked about some of the warnings we could take from the United States in terms of gerrymandering or the constant erosion of democracy, but if you look around the world – this government doesn't like us to call it American-style health care, which it is. They like to call it European or whatever, which is ridiculous, but whatever. Let's give them some European examples of erosion of democracy that did not go well for government.

History gives us lots of warnings about what happens when governments with large majorities begin treating debate like an obstacle instead of a safeguard, which they are. One of the clearest examples comes from the United Kingdom. Unfortunately, I watch U.K. politics a lot. My son moved there six years ago. He's now a U.K. citizen as well as Canadian, so I do pay attention. In the United Kingdom during the lead-up to the Iraq War, which was in 2003, a long time ago now, then Prime Minister Blair's government had a commanding majority in Parliament – you may remember that – and the government tightly controlled debate and timelines, pushed legislation and motions forward so quickly that there wasn't time for debate. Hmm, who does that sound like?

12:20

At the time critics argued that there had not been enough scrutiny of the intelligence being used to justify the war, just like we heard

from the Americans as they did their deep dive on the disaster that was the Iraq War. Years later the U.K. government brought in something called the Chilcot Inquiry – it was a massive public inquiry into the Iraq War – and concluded that peaceful options had not been exhausted, that the intelligence presented to Parliament had been expressed with a certainty that was not justified.

Now, regardless, of where people stood on the war itself, the cautionary lesson for democracies, which is important, is that when governments become too confident in their power and their numbers, they make mistakes for speed. We've seen that again and again, where they will jam through their legislation only to find out it's illegal or they have to come back and fix it or they forgot something or it's ridiculous or there's too much push-back. It just goes on and on and on.

Another example. In just a few weeks this government is going to transfer 80,000 severely disabled people to a new program they call ADAP because: it'll be great; they can work. That's going to be a disaster. We don't have the regulations. We don't have any details. Municipalities are saying: please pause and please let us look at the impact on our municipal services and people with disabilities who are our residents. Just yesterday – actually, the day before yesterday – Calgary, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Claresholm, Camrose, Edmonton – oh, where else? There's a few more. Lethbridge did I already say?

Ms Chapman: Rocky Mountain House.

Ms Renaud: Rocky Mountain House.

If I've forgotten any, I apologize. These councils and mayors have written letters in different ways to this government urging different things, but they're all saying the same thing with one voice: please stop. We are weeks away. People that were already assessed as severely disabled: that doesn't change because this ridiculous government comes up with a new program and suddenly people are going to work and it'll be all great.

That's what happens when you have a government that has the numbers, that thinks they no longer need to listen to the people that sent them here, the rest of Albertans, and members of the opposition. Believe it or not, we also represent people. We also bring intelligent ideas to this place and debate. By this government standing up, blocking their ears, which they've done, Madam Speaker – oh, wait; it was tinnitus, wasn't it? – when they put block things or whatever you call those ear things in their ears so they didn't have to listen to debate. They might as well do that because they don't listen to us. [interjections]

They're laughing right now as we're standing up and saying that we were sent here to debate really important things like electoral boundaries, like disability supports, like democracy in general. They're laughing because they don't think we should have more than 60 minutes to debate this piece of legislation. There are 87 of us, and we get 60 minutes. They want to make it – well, it's going to be 89. Then they want to add two more.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-West Henday.

Member Arcand-Paul: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This motion is just a continued abuse of power by the UCP, and that's all this is. It's a bit rich given that earlier today the House leader spoke about how the UCP actually listens to Albertans. All I have to say to that is LOL. We are all Albertans in this Chamber, whether they like it or not. This side of the House represents Albertans of over 2 million who want us to bring up serious concerns to the UCP's bad decisions. We listen to our constituents. This limiting of debate, once more, just shows how unserious the UCP are about actually

listening to the concerns of Albertans. This is why I urge all members in this Chamber to vote against this motion.

The House leader moved that one of the purposes of this motion is to ensure “future robust debate as we . . . [reach] the end of this . . . session.” Madam Speaker, let us remind us of the fact that the UCP have set the sessional calendar. If they wanted to put forward and robustly debate their nasty, ideological bills, then give us more time in this place instead of putting forward these motions. But they will not do that because the UCP are against transparency, accountability, and, we have seen over the last several weeks, ethics. On this side of the House we would sit all summer to stand up for the folks that put us in this House to work for them. While that side may want to stall debate and the voices of Albertans, that is not our interest, and we will not take any advice from this authoritarian government.

We represent Albertans. We bring facts into this Chamber despite the members opposite not wanting to hear them or the never-ending ad hominem attacks. Of course, the House leader could not refrain from such attacks by saying that the opposition loses quality of debate in his motion this morning by giving us a few more minutes to debate by lowering the time for the bells to ring. The quality of our debate on this side of the House is quite wonderful. I am very proud of this team, and I wish the other side would rise to their feet a few more times to speak to these bills and even to this motion to justify these actions, but they don’t.

For a government that sits up in this Chamber, arrogant as can be that the legislation they’re putting forward is good for Albertans – but then to turn around and abuse their powers that they continue consolidating into the hands of the few: the executive branch of our system, the cabinet, or their several committees that they create, including the illegitimate boundaries committee, whether it’s creating that mustang court to redraw the riding boundaries of this province of Alberta, book banning, an act directly out of the MAGA playbook.

Madam Speaker, I bring this up because we know the courts are clear. I know there are some lawyers on the other side and perhaps some armchair lawyers, too, who understand that government decisions are not free from immunity of legal scrutiny. The law says that banning books in Canada is contrary to the Charter. No one in this House wants children to have access to pornography. To state otherwise is gross and the worst type of partisanship and the worst part of politics.

Limiting debate of these highly emotional bills proposed by the UCP that take away the rights of Albertans is an abuse of power. The UCP should be ashamed for stifling the voices of half of our province because they do not want us to do our jobs in the people’s House. By suggesting that these bills have a positive impact on Albertans’ lives when their costs of living have skyrocketed and the UCP refuses to bring any relief to the bank accounts of Albertans who are feeling the pinch every time they fuel up or pay their housing costs – ideological bills attacking the libraries or the very hard-working municipal government officials that represent the cities that all of us represent in this place.

Madam Speaker, closing debate on these very important conversations that Albertans elect us to have in this place, especially on Bill 32, as they did in Motion 37 just a few days ago, also moved by this House leader, is very bad, especially given the House leader’s comments that we have five hours instead of three hours under time allocation. It’s a joke, and no one is laughing. Perhaps that’s why the UCP is also laughing when we talk about them being undemocratic and their decisions taking away the rights of Albertans. This motion is no different. While the other side may not like what this side of the House has to say, His Majesty’s Loyal Opposition, we have the responsibility of holding the government accountable, especially when it overreaches and consolidates power in authoritarian ways.

Madam Speaker, Albertans deserve so much better.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there others to join the debate? The hon. Member for Calgary–Glenmore.

Ms Al-Guneid: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have heard a lot of passionate speeches from my colleagues on Government Motion 42, that would limit debate in the Legislature, and it’s passionate because we care. We actually care about representing Albertans and representing our constituents, and we take this job seriously. We actually feel the responsibility of being here.

Time and time again the UCP continues with their tactics to ram through bills using time allocation, cut debate on egregious bills, end legislative sessions early, and refuse to pass a single private member bill from the Official Opposition. It’s almost like the UCP doesn’t like showing up to work, and it’s lazy governance, Madam Speaker. It is lazy governance. We are paid by taxpayers to show up here. We work for Albertans. Let’s not forget that. They are our bosses, so we need to show up and actually do the work.

The UCP cut debate short, limit other members’ rights, our rights, to speak and represent our constituents, push through awful legislation without the Legislative Assembly’s duty to scrutinize laws under debate. The UCP doesn’t care about democracy, but it’s important for the members opposite to understand how the UCP actions harm civic engagement and Albertans’ ability to learn and to be in the know of what’s happening in our province. This motion is eroding parliamentary scrutiny and oversight, and that’s literally our job as the Official Opposition. Time allocation forces a vote before all concerns may have been voiced, and the UCP is turning the Legislature into a rubber stamp for the UCP’s horrible agenda rather than a thoughtful legislative body.

12:30

Madam Speaker, this motion is limiting debate on the bill responsible for redrawing Alberta’s electoral maps through a UCP majority committee. It’s limiting debate on the ridiculous book bans they’re doing in libraries because they do not want Albertans to know more. This is silencing minority voices. The primary role of the opposition is to critique and propose alternatives. This pattern of cutting debate strips us, the Official Opposition, of this right, which is also the public’s right, which is Albertans’ right. Albertans and our constituents deserve to know about these horrible bills that the government keeps ramming through in every session.

Madam Speaker, forcing votes under a time allocation is reducing government accountability, which is obviously the UCP’s goal here. They don’t want people to know, avoiding tough questions so they can ram through questionable legislation before Albertans can actually know. Between a crisis in affordability, kids, life, schools, it’s very hard to keep up, and limiting debate limits Albertans’ ability to know, limiting the opportunity for the media and the public to fully understand the implications of these questionable bills.

I think, Madam Speaker, that the tragedy of all this is that the UCP is normalizing what is normally an exceptional measure. Yes, time allocation is absolutely a parliamentary tool. It exists for a reason. If we see historically, these tools were meant for emergencies, when the Legislature needs to deliver an enabling bill to solve a big problem that has a big impact on the province, not these awful bills, and it cannot be a pattern. The UCP is making a mockery of our institutions, and this is becoming business as usual in every legislative session.

Finally, Madam Speaker, there is an impact on the legislative quality, as my colleague the Member for Edmonton–West Henday, in what we deliver to Albertans as legislators. This is rushed law-making of flawed legislation that will pass into law without debate, without scrutiny, without oversight or enough questions from the

Official Opposition. Eventually it leads to public disengagement and cynicism.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this motion.

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

Dr. Elmeligi: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. It's my pleasure. It's my first time speaking to time allocation, actually, in this House, which is interesting because we've actually debated time allocation every single semester that we've been in the Legislature since I became an MLA. Oh, wait. That's my first point.

Time allocation is becoming a normal conversation in here, and that is part of the problem. I think a lot of people at home don't really understand what time allocation is, although they're learning because we do talk about it all the time. Time allocation is a motion whereby debate is limited to an hour for each stage of a bill. By its very definition it is limiting democratic debate because it gives us less time to talk about what's important to Albertans.

I know that this government is still struggling with the fact, Madam Speaker, that there are 38 opposition MLAs and two independent MLAs right now, which means that there are actually 40 people in this House who are representing constituents who do not have a UCP MLA, and all of us have opinions and thoughts to represent our constituents in this House on bills. When the government creates time allocation motions, we do not have an opportunity for fulsome debate. That's just – do the math.

Now the government has introduced this, like, super time allocation where they can assign time allocation to multiple stages of multiple bills all at once. It's kind of – I don't want to use the word “cheating” because it's not really cheating. It's like just saying: “We don't really want to do all the work. We don't want to do all the work. We just want to do a little bit of the work.”

An Hon. Member: Lazy.

Dr. Elmeligi: It is lazy, but it's more than that. It's pretending like that's acceptable. In any other job that I have had in my varied career, if I showed up to work and said, “Well, I don't want to do the whole thing; I just want to do 20 per cent of the work today,” I would be fired.

Ms Al-Guneid: You'd be fired.

Dr. Elmeligi: I would be fired.

That is essentially what we are doing when we limit debate. We are paid by Albertans. I am paid by the taxpayers of Banff-Kananaskis to stand here and represent their views in debate. That's what I am here to do. So when we have time allocation, we're actually hindered from doing our job to represent Albertans.

In the motion the wording is that after the allotted time “every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at that stage shall be put forthwith.” That is not what is happening here, Madam Speaker. It's easy to imagine a situation where that would be the case, where if all members who had wanted the opportunity to speak had it, filibustering starts to happen, but that's not the case here. Bills 25, 28, 29, and 32 have not been fulsomely debated.

This time allocation motion will pass; I won't even get the opportunity to speak to Bill 25, which is the politics and ideology in the classrooms, removing politics and ideology by injecting politics and ideology into the classrooms. I won't have an opportunity to share with our amazing minister of education my thoughts on how we need to have treaty flags in every school in Banff-Kananaskis because we celebrate our Indigenous relations every single day in my riding, and we have treaty flags all over the place. I won't get to tell the minister how great I think that is. I

won't get to tell the amazing minister of education how important I think it is that all books are available in schools.

Ms Chapman: Okay. Let's tone it down a bit.

Dr. Elmeligi: Sorry. I also won't get to share with our even more amazing shadow minister of education my thoughts on what other pieces should be in Bill 25.

I won't have a chance to debate Bill 29 either, and I won't have a chance to share with the ministers of health, all four of them or 26 of them, however many there are now, my thoughts on having private health care. I won't get to say any of that because we've allocated those bills.

I think it's really disingenuous to pretend that each of these bills has had a fulsome debate and all questions have been posed because that's not true. I see the minister smiling at me, and I say to him: I look forward to sharing my thoughts with you at another time.

Mr. Nally: Through the chair.

Dr. Elmeligi: Through the chair, I look forward to sharing my thoughts with the minister at a later time because I can't do it here in this House.

The solution to this is to actually just do a better job before we get to the point where we're debating the bills, rather than cutting the debate before we have a chance to fulsomely debate.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Calgary-Beddington.

Ms Chapman: Thank you so much, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and offer my thoughts on time allocation. Thank you to the Member for Banff-Kananaskis for her comments. I would say to the minister of education: if you want more comments about how fabulous and amazing you are, you could definitely consider reducing the use of time allocation. That would give us more time in debate, and who knows what kind of compliments may flood and flow over to the other side. [interjections] Let's roll the dice on it. Let's roll the dice on it.

Yesterday when I was in debate, Madam Speaker, I was speaking to Bill 28, and I thought forward to today because I knew that we were going to be doing this debate today on this time allocation motion. During that debate the bill sponsor, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, rose and he wanted to intervene. At the time I thought, you know: what a shame. It would actually be nice if we had the time to engage in some debate, to have conversations across the aisle, but I was unable to accept his intervention because I had such a limited amount of time to speak to the bill.

12:40

I have some pretty incredible librarians and urban planners in my life who had very specific concerns about the bill that they wanted to ensure I could get on the record for them. I was so pleased that I had the opportunity to do that for them, but it meant I really didn't have the time to engage the bill sponsor about the bill, and that is where I think that time allocation truly fails us. It does limit those opportunities for us to have fulsome discourse.

Now, particularly when we are talking about Bill 28, Madam Speaker, a lot has been said. Of course, with any kind of omnibus bill like that, that touches on so many pieces of legislation, so many organizations and stakeholders are impacted by the changes that come with a bill like Bill 28, and it is a real shame that we barely had time. I didn't even get through half of my notes yesterday. Organizations like the coalition of public libraries, RMA, ABmunis – I had three or four other organizations who have spoken with concerns on Bill 28, and I didn't have the opportunity to put those

concerns on the record and to put them in front of the minister. It's a shame because the minister was in the Chamber to listen, and it would have been nice if he could have participated in the debate, but of course we were quite limited in our time. That's the opportunity.

There's no way to know, of course, how much engagement that the minister is doing with the folks who don't agree with him. It's very comfortable for people to build a little echo chamber around themselves of just the yes-men, the people who nod: "Yes, Minister. What a great bill. What a great bill." Actually, there are a lot of people who have very real concerns, and you want to get those concerns out so that the government can amend their terrible legislation, right? You can keep some of it – it's not every part of the legislation – but there are parts of it that municipalities have really enormous problems with.

It doesn't take a lot of critical thinking to see why there are people who have dedicated their lives to understanding how to do good urban planning, so land-use planning, transportation network planning. These people are professionals. They study. They work in the field for many years. And to suggest that we should put a piece of legislation in that allows a minister who has no background in land-use planning, with the support of a ministry that has no expertise in land-use planning – that's the thing. It's not even about the minister. It's about the public service behind him. The public service at the provincial level doesn't know anything about land-use planning because it's not their job. It is the job of municipalities, and that is where the expertise lives.

So the fact that we have these bills in front of us and we are . . .

The Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, hon. member, but the time has come in which I may now ask the question.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 42 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 12:44 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Amery	Jones	Sawyer
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Schow
Boitchenko	Loewen	Sigurdson, R.J.
Bouchard	Long	Sinclair
Cyr	Lovely	Singh
de Jonge	Lundy	Stephan
Dyck	McDougall	Turton
Ellis	Nally	van Dijken
Fir	Neudorf	Wiebe
Getson	Nicolaides	Williams
Glubish	Nixon	Wilson
Horner	Petrovic	Wright, J.
Hunter	Pitt	Yao
Jean	Rowswell	Yaseen
Johnson	Sawhney	

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Deol	Ip
Arcand-Paul	Eggen	Renaud
Brar, Gurinder	Ellingson	Schmidt
Brar, Gurtej	Elmeligi	Sigurdson, L.
Chapman	Gray	

Totals: For – 44 Against – 14

[Government Motion 42 carried]

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 31

Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026

The Speaker: The hon. minister of red tape reduction.

Mr. Nally: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move third reading of Bill 31, the Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about something that the NDP will never understand, making life easier for Albertans instead of harder. That's what this bill does. It cuts outdated rules, it speeds up government decisions, it removes barriers that waste people's time and money. It continues the work that our government has been doing since 2019 to make Alberta the best place in Canada to live, work, build a business, and raise a family.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that the NDP won't support this legislation because every step of the way they've opposed the work that we've done to cut red tape to support businesses and to strengthen Alberta's economy. The reality is simple: the NDP don't trust Albertans. They trust bureaucracy. When Albertans see a problem, they ask how to fix it. The NDP ask how many committees, approval reports, consultants, and gatekeepers they can ask first. They ask Avi Lewis what he would do. That's the difference between us, and Albertans feel that difference every single day.

Mr. Speaker, under our government Alberta has eliminated more than 220,000 regulatory requirements. You're welcome. We've cut red tape by 35 per cent. You're welcome.

The Speaker: Remarks through the chair, please, Minister.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you to the members opposite: you're welcome. We've saved Alberta businesses and families more than \$3 billion, and, through you to the members opposite: you're once again welcome. We've been recognized nationally as the best province in Canada for red tape reduction.

Now, this isn't because we chase awards, but because we understand something that the NDP never did. Every unnecessary delay costs somebody money. Every pointless approval frustrates someone trying to build a business, get a project approved, or simply live their life. This is about making life better. It's about jobs. It's about investment, Mr. Speaker, and when government gets in the way, family and workers pay the price.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

That's why this is now our 11th red tape reduction bill. Unlike the NDP who treated government growth like a success story, we actually believe that government should work for the people that actually pay for it.

Madam Speaker, Bill 31 proposes changes to 18 different pieces of legislation across eight ministries. These changes matter because they deal with real frustrations Albertans face every day. The delays matter. The unnecessary barriers matter. The endless process and paperwork matter. When government wastes your time, makes simple things harder, or slows down decisions that should be straightforward, that has a real impact on families. It has a real impact on workers and businesses. If the members opposite had understood that, perhaps we wouldn't have lost 180,000 jobs on their watch.

1:00

This bill fixes real problems with practical solutions, and that matters to Albertans. Madam Speaker, one of the biggest changes to this bill is Alberta time. Albertans are tired of changing their

clocks twice a year. They're tired of the disruption, tired of the confusion, tired of learning how to reprogram their ovens, and they're tired of an outdated system that no longer reflects how people actually live. This bill ends twice-a-year clock change moves, and it moves Alberta to permanent Mountain Time: Alberta time. No more spring forward. No more fall back. Just one consistent time all year long.

I'll tell you what, Madam Speaker. Albertans are a lot more interested in having daylight after work than they are listening to another lecture from the NDP about why ordinary people can't have common-sense changes that make their lives better, because when families get home during the winter, they don't want it to be pitch black at 4:30 in the afternoon. They want to take their kids skating. They want to take their kids to the outdoor rink. They want to walk the dog, go for supper, spend time outside, and actually enjoy their evenings. That's real life, but the NDP always approach... [interjections]

You know, I wish that the member – there are 14 people watching Alberta Leg. TV, and I wish they could see it right now. They would see the NDP lighting their hair on fire because we're doing what Albertans want. Make no mistake. Albertans have spoken loudly and clearly. They want to stop changing the clocks.

Now, the NDP always approach these conversations in the same way. They want more studies. They want more delay, more reasons why government can't do anything. Madam Speaker, Albertans are tired of politicians making simple things complicated, and while the NDP criticized this proposal, they still can't explain why they think Albertans would prefer 4 a.m. sunrises in the summer under permanent standard time, because that's the alternative. Our government is choosing common sense. That means we're going to get an extra hour of sunlight in the evening rather than a 4 a.m. sunrise.

Now let's move our conversation to iGaming. Online gambling already exists. Millions of dollars are already leaving Alberta every single year through unregulated websites, but the NDP approach to issues like this is predictable: ignore reality, pretend the problem doesn't exist, and then act shocked when things get worse. Our government is taking a different approach. We are creating a regulated market with real consumer protections, stronger oversight, and modern rules that can actually keep up with technology. These amendments allow advertising standards to be set through AGLC so protections can be updated quickly and enforced properly. Unlike the NDP, we understand that modern economies require modern regulation, not endless bureaucracy.

Finally, Madam Speaker, let's talk about provincial parks. This bill gives parks staff clear operational authority so they can make routine decisions faster and reduce unnecessary delays. That means less paperwork, less process, more focus on delivering results for Albertans. That's the entire philosophy behind this legislation: government should help people get things done, not stand in the way.

Madam Speaker, the NDP will vote against this bill because they fundamentally believe bigger government is always the answer. More control, more process, more bureaucracy: that's their instinct every single time. Well, our instinct is different. We trust Albertans, we trust businesses, we trust job creators, and we believe government should respect people's time and stay focused on delivering results. That's why Alberta is leading the country in jobs growth. It's why we are the economic engine of this country.

We are often labelled as an oil and gas jurisdiction, and don't get me wrong. We are blessed with a bountiful resource of oil, gas, even our geology, with the carbon capture, so there's no doubt that we have a huge economic engine of this country, but we are so much more than oil and gas. Madam Speaker, the one that I take the most

pride in is De Havilland. Whoever thought that Alberta would be making airplanes? It's incredible, the different business opportunities. We're seeing billion-dollar investments in technology and data centres, and we've got the Air Products, the largest hydrogen producer in the world. They chose Alberta. They chose Alberta to build their first net-zero hydrogen facility, blue hydrogen, because we are a business-friendly jurisdiction with low taxes, reduced red tape, and they embraced that.

Dow Chemical, the world's first net-zero ethane cracker, chose Alberta. This is significant because they will average one ethane cracker that will be built somewhere in the world every year. One ethane cracker, and we got the world's first net-zero ethane cracker. They chose Alberta because of our reduced regulation and the fact that we are a business-friendly environment.

Bill 31 continues building an Alberta that is freer, faster, more competitive, and easier to live and work in. I urge all members of this Assembly to support this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Dr. Elmeligi: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Wow. There are just a lot of things I want to respond to in that speech. I'm going to try to stay focused. I will just say, though, that – you know, the minister talks about the Conservative policy ideology perspective of small government. More than half of that caucus is a minister. That is not a small government. That's the biggest government in Alberta history. Along with all of those ministries – everybody gets a ministry – comes a whole bunch of bureaucracy. So it's a bit rich for the member opposite to talk about how the NDP likes bureaucracy when they've created more bureaucracy than any government ever before.

Okay. The minister is not wrong. I am opposed to this bill for red tape reduction not because I'm opposed to reducing red tape but because I actually think some of the bill increases red tape, which I'll get to in a moment.

The minister talked quite a bit about the daylight saving allocations and changes in this bill. He said repeatedly how this is what Albertans want. I just want to take a moment to remind the minister that there was a referendum about daylight saving, and Albertans voted against it, so it's actually the opposite of what Albertans want. It's just a little bit funny. I think the minister's memory is perhaps getting tainted by the fact that we're in the last week of session. We're all feeling a little bit tired, so I'm just going to take this time to remind him that Albertans actually voted against daylight saving.

I will also point out that Albertans have never had an opportunity to vote on standard saving. So while I agree that probably the majority of the population does want to stop changing their clocks, I'd love to see where the minister gets his data from because there has never been a referendum with just that simple question, but also Albertans have never been asked if they would like to go to standard time. I can tell the minister that most of the comments that I've received to my inbox and from my constituents around stopping changing the clocks has been in support of not changing our clocks anymore but has been asking about why we haven't been asked to go to standard time. Some people have suggested that that's part of the fall referendum because they don't want to do daylight saving time.

Yesterday I tabled an article from the ski hills talking about how daylight saving is going to be really detrimental to the Lake Louise, Sunshine, Nakiska, Norquay ski hills and their plans for the winter. I just want to take some time to go into a little bit more of why daylight saving is detrimental to the ski industry. The ski industry is a huge economic driver in my riding of Banff-Kananaskis but

also for the province's tourism sector during the winter. If people are coming to Alberta during the wintertime, they're probably coming to ski for at least a part of their vacation. A lot of Albertans use our Lake Louise, Sunshine, Norquay, Nakiska ski hills for recreation also. I know we've all enjoyed the slopes in my riding. They're pretty great.

When I found out that I had constituents who were very upset about this, I did a totally unheard thing, Madam Speaker. I reached out to them to learn more about what the problem here was. The first problem that the ski hills have is that this was a referendum question. This government talks a lot about direct democracy and wanting to listen to Albertans, but I guess not as it applies to daylight saving. As I previously said, there was a referendum, and now the government is choosing to ignore it.

The minister and the Premier have said that industry was consulted on this change to daylight saving, but that was not the case for the ski hills. When they approached the government to share their concerns, they were dismissed. They were told that we have to do this because B.C. is on daylight saving, and apparently we have to do whatever B.C. wants to do now. But this is a big deal for the ski hills, and there are a few reasons why.

1:10

First of all, skiers love to get first tracks. If you are a skier, if you know skiers, you know that skiers like to be on the hill first thing in the morning. When first tracks are potentially going to start at 11 a.m., that's not really first tracks anymore because the sun is coming up later because, as my colleague from Edmonton-Gold Bar explained, the Earth is round and revolves on its axis and around the sun, which means that the days in the winter are just shorter. They just are. They're quite a bit shorter.

What happens when ski hills have to open later? It's not just a matter of shifting their hours to be opening and closing an hour later in the day. A lot of times ski hills have to conduct safety measures like avalanche control, and they can only do that when it gets light outside. So if the sun isn't coming up until 10 a.m., that means that they can't do safety measures until 10 a.m., which means first lift would be even later than that. So people who want to get first tracks will wake up when they wake up at, like, 8 or 9, or maybe they're going to get their kids off to school at 8:30 in the morning, and then they'll have to sit around and wait for the lifts to open for a couple of hours. That might not seem a big deal if you live in Calgary and you have to drive to the hill, but if you live in Canmore and Banff and you're at the hill already, it's a little bit annoying.

The important part about this is that most people stop skiing around 3 or 3:30 in the afternoon because they have après-ski plans, they have dinner plans, or whatever. The point is that when the ski hills do extend their hours later in the day, they still find that most people leave the hill around 3 or 3:30 in the afternoon because they have evening plans. It changes how people are going to be using the ski hill, it changes the amount of skiing time that is available for people, but, importantly, it introduces this element of uncertainty and unpredictability into the whole tourism sector.

One of the things I learned in my conversation with the ski hills is how all of these businesses are very intricately connected to each other. If people ski an hour later, does that mean that they will also leave the hill an hour later? Does that mean that they will also get to the happy hour an hour later or have their dinner reservation an hour later? Does that mean that the Banff Centre needs to start offering concerts and evening events an hour later? Does it shift the whole entire activity of the town an hour later? There are ripple effects of this change that could affect a lot more than just the ski hills, and that introduces a whole bunch of uncertainty and question marks I think that we all have.

The other thing is that December 21 is equinox. It's also a time when people are doing their Christmas holidays in the mountains. Having that predictability of a ski hill that opens at first light and first light being at 9:30 a.m. is important because our ski hills are actually connected to a whole bunch of other ski hills in the same time zone in Colorado and Utah. Ski hills work together to sell package trips to people to come ski North America, come ski the biggest hills in North America. People come, and they have this expectation that all of our ski hills are in the same time zone, and they get into the pattern of skiing, which is the same between all of the hills. Moving to daylight time reduces that consistency, creates more unpredictability and more confusion for tourists because even if they're doing road trips, they will be going forward an hour in time and driving west. That's just a little bit of a mind game. There is concern among the tourism industry that that will create people being late for flights or late for buses or late for tickets because they won't be expecting to go forward in time when they're travelling in a westerly direction.

Of course, tourism can adapt and systems can adapt, but it takes time. If the minister thinks that daylight saving is going to reduce red tape for the tourism sector in Banff-Kananaskis, he's sorely mistaken. This measure will increase a whole bunch of red tape as all of these businesses figure out how their intermixed relationships will change.

I also just want to emphasize that, you know, I've lived in Banff-Kananaskis. I've lived in Canmore for almost 20 years. I've worked with ski hills in varying capacities over the years. I have not always agreed with the ski hills. They are – yeah. I'll just say that I haven't always agreed with ski hills. I tend to be – I don't know if this will surprise you, Madam Speaker – an NDP voter. The ski hills tend to be quite conservative run in who owns them and how they operate. We have disagreed over time, but we agree on this. Introducing unpredictability into tourism creates a problem for tourists who want to come and have their experience be totally seamless and not confusing. This will confuse people. That negatively impacts tourism, and in those conversations I'm a little bit – I think that the members opposite should be concerned that they're losing votes from some of the most conservative people in my riding who are no longer feeling quite so conservative.

The government wants to double tourism by 2030. It wants to double tourism spend. It has all of these efforts to grow tourism, yet every chance it gets, it hobbles the success of the tourism industry: increasing the levy, increasing taxes for rental cars, and now moving to daylight saving, which will dramatically affect tourism success in my riding. It's not in line with the referendum, it's not in line with direct democracy, it's not listening to Albertans – Albertans weren't even asked on this – so it's a little bit offensive for the minister to even say that he's listening to Albertans on this. He's not because we weren't asked.

I also want to raise concerns in this act about the AER, which I have spoken about in this House many, many times. There are aspects of this act that restrict the power of the AER to act on inquiries in relation to abandoned orphan wells and ground disturbances. It also restricts their ability to hold hearings or to require public hearings. That sounds like red tape, Madam Speaker, but it's actually reducing accountability of the AER, which is already at issue, which myself and my colleagues have raised multiple times in this House. We have already seen dramatic interference from the Minister of Energy and Minerals in the decision-making of the AER by forcing a coal mining application to go through even though it was already rejected. We've also seen the minister interfere in requiring public hearings to be cancelled for other coal mines. All this bill does is make that interference possible and legal, and that is egregious.

Also, changes to the Land Stewardship Act around regional plans and subregional plans. I agree that subregional plans should be a part of the Land Stewardship Act, but subregional plans do not replace regional plans. The whole hierarchy of land-use planning was created so that regional plans provide this overarching vision, subregional plans provide a higher level of detail, but how those subregional plans piece together to feed into the regional plan is really critical to accomplishing large landscape-scale objectives around land and water stewardship and Indigenous engagement and involvement in land management. Changing how that works, putting more emphasis on subregional plans, might be easier because regional plans are really hard to do, but it's not actually meeting the original objective of the Land Stewardship Act and why it was brought forward by a Conservative government previously. I am concerned about that.

I'm also concerned about the Land Stewardship Act allowing for increased powers for the minister to amend regional and subregional plans. I don't have a lot of faith in our current Minister of Environment and Protected Areas to even understand what land-use planning is, let alone have the power to start amending regional and subregional plans. I don't think that that should be a minister's responsibility. There are land-use planning experts and a lot of other experts across Alberta that have a lot more to say about the effectiveness of regional plans and how they should be amended. A minister should be relying on those experts, not making decisions for him- or herself.

I guess, in conclusion, I really just want to say that daylight saving is a big deal for the tourism sector. The minister should have done a lot more due diligence talking to different tourism stakeholders and operators about how this would change their operations, how it would affect the people who are using those services, and he chose not to. So for the minister to stand here and say – any time any one of the UCP talks about direct democracy, I will laugh out loud from now on. There was a referendum on this. People said no. The government is doing it anyway. You're not listening to the people.

1:20

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton–Gold Bar.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and offer a few comments on Bill 31 at third reading. I want to start off by addressing some of the comments that were made by the minister when he introduced this bill for third reading. I'm paraphrasing, of course, but he said something about how this government takes action instead of striking another committee to study the problem further. I know that that's not true. I know that this government has a penchant for striking pointless committees.

I don't want to go into great detail about all of the things that the government has wasted Albertans' time on, but I do want to highlight the nuclear energy engagement report that was recently released. The panel reflected findings that they spent months and countless millions of dollars to collect that included such mind-blowing, innovative policy solutions as “enhancing the public's understanding of nuclear energy through early, accessible, fact-based information.” You know, if I hear the government say that they're going to adopt that recommendation, I am, of course, reminded of those fake infomercials that *The Simpsons* used to play that starred Smilin' Joe Fission as the mascot of nuclear energy. I expect that perhaps the Alberta government will just copy and paste those onto their Twitter account to help the public understand nuclear energy.

They recommended “determining and communicating Alberta's role in decision-making.” I thought that that was the point of the panel, to determine Alberta's role in decision-making around nuclear power. Spoiler alert, Madam Speaker. Nuclear power is federally

regulated, so the Alberta government doesn't actually have much to do when it comes to nuclear power regulation.

They also recommended “strengthening coordination with federal assessment, licensing, and regulatory processes.” I'm not sure exactly how you co-ordinate with a federal government that has sole responsibility for regulating that sector, but you know, these guys got paid money, so they had to put something down on paper, I guess.

“Continuing long-term relationship-building and policy dialogue with Indigenous communities.” Yet we heard last night from my friend from Edmonton–West Henday exactly how the government says that they need to build long-term relationships and increase policy dialogue with Indigenous communities while at the same time passing the 120-day act that eliminates that role.

They also recommend “supporting meaningful participation by municipalities, First Nations, and Métis Settlements in future proposed project review processes” and “strengthening Alberta's readiness through emergency planning, and further analysis of economic, workforce, and market implications.” Just fantastic work by the nuclear engagement report. I'm surprised that they didn't also recommend, you know, enhancing motherhood and increasing Albertans' access to pictures with cute puppies and kittens. Like, that is the kind of inane stuff that this government supports.

It's rich for the minister to come here and lecture us about our penchant for pointless committees when they've spent millions of dollars on a nuclear engagement report that produces absolutely nothing meaningful. I sincerely hope that our former colleague on this side Deron Bilous made good money on this. I don't know how he sleeps at night, earning his living writing these kinds of reports, but, hey, that's his choice.

I also want to respond to comments that the minister made in my debate at Committee of the Whole, I think second reading. I don't know. It's ironic that we're talking about time change, Madam Speaker, in a place where time has no meaning whatsoever. When I was talking about the creation of time zones, the minister kept chirping: World War I, World War I. I'd be interested to know which side he was cheering for in World War I, but that's a separate point entirely. What he was implying was that time zones weren't actually created until World War I, but he was wrong on that point, as he is wrong on many points.

Time began to be standardized in the modern world in the mid-1850s. Up until the 1850s, Madam Speaker, every community kept its own time by measuring when the sun was at its highest point overhead. That meant that if you were travelling from Edmonton to Calgary, for example, the time in Edmonton was slightly different from the time in Calgary because the time the sun is directly overhead on any given day is a different time in Calgary than it is in Edmonton. That was how humans kept time around the world, by directly observing . . .

Mr. Nally: Time change was World War I.

Mr. Schmidt: If the minister wants to continue to prove his wrongness, I guess he has the right to close debate at the end of this session. I would appreciate it if he kept his wrongness to himself for the next hour or so.

Anyway, humans up until the mid-1850s kept time by observing when the sun was directly overhead at their own location, which wasn't a big deal at the time because the speed of human travel was not very quick. You know, we travelled by walking or riding on horseback or other methods that were incredibly slow, so we didn't really notice the inconvenience that it caused to have every local community on its own time zone, effectively.

But when the railroads were invented and people could travel from community to community in relatively short amounts of time,

this created all kinds of problems. If you left a train station in Calgary, for example, you would need to know what time you were arriving in Edmonton, but if both communities are operating on their own time zone, it was really hard for people to do that.

Prior to government stepping in and standardizing time, railways kept their own time, which was a partial solution, but it caused some interesting problems, Madam Speaker. Specifically, in the United States I think there were at the time five different railroad companies, all of whom kept their own time, and none of them corresponded to each other. That caused a lot of railway accidents when railway companies using their own time zones were trying to send railcars down the same tracks. You can imagine that it caused a lot of collisions.

The development of rail travel really necessitated the need to standardize time, which happened in the U.K. with the adoption of Greenwich Mean Time, Madam Speaker. With the adoption of standardized time zones came this concept that because – again, UCP members, prepare yourselves for shock. The world is round, and it rotates. It rotates once every 24 hours, which means that for every 15 degrees of longitude you travel one hour. The idea behind creating a standardized time zone system was that you would create 24 separate time zones around the world evenly divided by 15 degrees of longitude, and that 15 degrees of longitude was set so that right in the middle of that zone was where the sun was directly overhead at noon, so at any point within that 15 degrees of longitude you would be within a half an hour.

Anyway, we're now creating a time zone that is effectively 26 degrees of longitude wide in the wintertime. It will stretch from the western boundary of Alberta all the way into western Ontario. Kenora, Ontario, in the wintertime will see the sunrise at approximately 8 in the morning while our friends in Grande Prairie won't see the sunrise come until 10 o'clock in the morning. That's two hours' difference. It defeats the role of time zones, Madam Speaker.

[The Speaker in the chair]

The only other thing that I want to say before I close is that I am personally very upset that we are adopting daylight saving time now because I was robbed of an hour of sleep this spring, and I will never get that hour back. You know, I know that the members opposite have an easy time catching up with the sleep that they lose while sitting here and not debating bills, but the rest of us are owed an hour of sleep, Mr. Speaker, and I wish the Premier would give us that back.

For those reasons, I encourage everyone to vote against Bill 31.

1:30

The Speaker: Are there any other speakers? The Member for Edmonton-Meadows.

Mr. Deol: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to rise in the House to speak to Bill 31. My colleague the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar spoke very eloquently about the time standardizations and some of the important aspects under this bill.

I just wanted to touch on a bit of, like, different context, what this bill does and how it builds the credibility of this government, as the minister attempts to claim in this House. I've been in this House for the past seven years, since the first time the UCP government was formed in 2019. Since then, you know, this government created the red tape reduction ministry. It seems like every time they introduce something, they try to deal with it. They're still struggling to justify if this ministry is there to really reduce red tape or is this ministry itself red tape.

We've seen the failure. I will not go back to how this ministry started dealing with the issues they claim that they were trying to help with with no real knowledge and answers to the media, to the public.

This UCP government, also under the previous Premier Jason Kenney and the current Premier, somehow, you know, started creating the narrative that they're in love with a lot of the referenda. They believe in public consultation. They just believe in public bills. They just wanted to hear directly from the people, and then they wanted to act on that even though we know that all political parties and political representatives in this House are based on their political agenda and the political platform they proposed to Albertans, and based on that, they get votes and they get elected and they come here.

That is the basic verdict we have in this House, to do the things we promise to Albertans to act on, but at the end of the day, when everything is done and you're back to the House, things do change. We know what happened to the health care promises. We know what happened to the education promises. A number of things under this UCP government turned a different direction.

Coming back to the referendum, this government is somehow trying to frame the narrative that this government is a big fan of the referendum and the feedback directly coming from Albertans even though they have discussed all those things as, you know, political manifesto, but then they come back and they want to go back on the same topic to attempt to create credibility. That costs Albertans plenty of money.

The referendum that was done in 2021 on daylight saving: it's not only that Albertans participated in that. That's the one good aspect of it. It also cost those Albertans tons of money that they are accountable for. They are the ones who pay the taxes to run all these efforts. Albertans spoke about it, and they didn't want to change it, the change the government was asking if they should go forward with or not. They said no. They're happy. They're happy with it as it is, with the daylight timing we have in the province, but at the end of the day, five years later, what we see is that the government is moving on that anyway. The question had been raised to me many times in stakeholders meetings in the communities in my riding. What does it mean to vote for something if the government is not going to listen to us anyway? That is what this government is exactly doing.

More than that, you know, my colleague has very effectively expressed, like, how it has personally lost him sleep or affected his daily activities. Based on that, you know, people have to deal with their kids, their families, their jobs. A number of businesses: actually, their daily operations depend on the time zones, sunlight they have during the winter, during the summer, so they get impacted. They spoke on this. The worst part of this is that the government decided it, you know, single-handedly. They do not care what Albertans say. They do not care what the businesses think about it. They don't care at all.

Similarly, I've seen that, you know – the issue under this is the change related to the Alberta Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Commission. This bill will allow transfer or sale of personal information tied to government assets, and that will include Play Alberta. We are already dealing with a very, very important, critical issue in this House related to a data breach, and there is public outcry around this government's approach, how this government is handling that issue. This bill ensures no guidelines, no privacy. If this bill passes and this government decides tomorrow – because this bill allows this government to move forward and sell the very private data of those people.

The other thing I just wanted to say is about the infrastructure act that is being impacted. I cautioned people and I cautioned the government members during the bill briefing, that was the infrastructure Bill 13 in the last session. The government tried to create the centralized list of the surplus properties. Everything the government was telling us turned out to be wrong information.

Now this government is trying to implement something under this bill that will weaken the accountability and transparency of this

government. There are so many reasons. It's an omnibus bill. You go through every single act being affected. That raises a lot of concerns and requires really good opposition, strong opposition to this bill. I encourage all the members to please vote against this bill.

Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. member – order.

Member Ellingson: Oh, sorry.

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

Ms Sigurdson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to add my voice to the debate on Bill 31, the Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. You know, it's quite a substantial bill. It's like kind of a small book, 134 pages. It's what we call an omnibus bill, and that's a bill that has several acts that will be changed. I remember only too well, when we were government back in 2015 to 2019, that if ever we brought in a bill that had more than one act in it: outrage from the UCP. They wanted very much to be able to vote on a specific act and not have to have it all lumped together.

1:40

But here, guess what? We have several. We have the Alberta Land Stewardship Act, we have the Condominium Property Act, we have the Daylight Saving Time Act, we have the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act, we have the Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis Act, we have the Gas Resources Preservation Act. Anyway, there are so many more. You know what? We might even agree with some aspects of this bill, but because it's all lumped together, we can't vote for it. We're voting against this bill because there are some very significant and egregious parts to it.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, which troubles me to no end, this government, this party, the UCP, is showing time after time their lack of integrity. They say one thing and they do another, and it's clear by what they're talking about with time zones. Back in 2021, when they were in government, there was a referendum, and that referendum came out and said that Albertans didn't want to change things, but the UCP doesn't care. They brought forward legislation, this Bill 31 right now that we're debating in this House, saying that: "No. We actually are going to do whatever the heck we want to, and we're not going to have integrity. We're not going to fulfill what the citizens of Alberta have voted for."

You know, this year we're going to have a referendum with several questions in October, and I just want the citizens of Alberta to watch very closely. Let's see if this government will actually respect the results, or again, like they did in this case, will they reject it and do whatever they want, showing once again that they don't have integrity? I mean, that's a fundamental aspect of being a governing party, of being a party of any kind, whether you're in the loyal opposition or whether you're the governing party, that you actually fulfill on what you say you're going to do or what you believe.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, I feel very saddened, because I see it every day in this House. Earlier today the Member for Cardston-Siksika said, "Oh, the NDP doesn't believe in direct democracy," yet I mean, it's so incongruent with what they're doing. This is another example of them rejecting a referendum that they put forward to the citizens of Alberta, but then they didn't fulfill or follow through on what the citizens said, yet they blame us for not believing in direct democracy. Give me a break.

Then, also, the minister who this bill is representing, the Member for Morinville-St. Albert, just also said something in this House a few minutes ago that showed, you know, significant lack of integrity. He sort of said: "Oh, the NDP. All we care about is big

government. That's all we want." Yet their government is the historically largest cabinet ever in Alberta. When Rachel Notley was first elected Premier in 2015, she had 12 people in her cabinet, and at the end of her four-year mandate she only had 19. Guess how many these guys have? Guess how many they have? They have 25 ministers, and that's gone up to 27. It just shows that what they say and what's the reality don't go together.

I just really ask them to be much more aware, because obviously they can't seem to say and fulfill on the things and have congruence in what they're doing. I mean, the minister is absolutely wrong about what he just said about the UCP, thinking that their government is somehow minuscule or something, somehow small, yet it's the largest cabinet, the largest number of ministries in Alberta history. Like, it just boggles the mind.

Do they know what they're saying? Perhaps not, and that makes – and I, you know, ask the citizens of Alberta to really pay attention, because if this is the cavalierness with which they govern, then we should all be very afraid. Frankly, I've been afraid for some time sitting in this House and listening to what the UCP has said.

Getting back to this bill, I just, you know, want to once again say that some of the aspects of it we may even want to vote for, but we can't because it's all mashed together, so we as a caucus, as members of the loyal opposition, will be voting against this bill, and I encourage all members of the Assembly to do the same.

Thank you.

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

Ms Chapman: Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to get a couple of comments on the record in regard to Bill 31, particularly around the daylight saving time piece. Now, I was born here, I've lived here my entire life, and I sure do love those late summer nights. I definitely have a lot of nostalgia about them. I still hold a grudge against my mother, who would put me to bed. You know, she'd pull down that blackout blind, and the sun would just come in all the way around it, and I could hear the other kids out still playing. I have not forgiven her for that, lovely woman that she is. I will never forgive her for such a thing.

I do love those late nights, but what I don't like, Mr. Speaker, is children having to walk to school in the dark. Now, in Calgary we have early-start and late-start schools, not in any way based around the needs of the child and what are the right or appropriate times for a child to start their school day. They are for the convenience of busing because, of course, as transportation budgets have been squeezed for school boards, buses are now having to run double or triple routes, which necessitates this early-start, late-start system.

My kids have the very great pleasure of being on an early-start school. Now, I know that sounds great because, you know, they're finishing their day at 2:30. Certainly, they like it at that end, but for the three months of the year where we are walking to school in absolute pitch-black conditions, we don't love it. We cross a very busy collector road. It took me seven years, Mr. Speaker, of advocating to my local city council person to get some traffic calming at this location where all children have to cross this collector road. I really amped it up after the time when a car came screaming out around the corner so fast that I yanked my kid back by his backpack. His little shoes came off in the road, and we all watched the car just flatten them. Just these flat little shoes on this pitch-black road because the car couldn't see us.

My kids already do that for three months of the year. All Alberta children are going to be doing that now at minimum for three months of the year. For some of them it's going to be half of the school year where they are walking to school in the dark. What I don't see in this bill is anything to mitigate the very real safety concerns that parents

have. Gosh, we want to be able to send our kids out and have them be independent and walk to school on their own. How do we feel safe doing that when they are doing it in the dark, and there's nothing in here? Where's the extra money for traffic calming to ensure that our kids have safe routes to travel to school? Not all parents have the time, ability, or desire to drive their kids to school. They would like it to be like how it was for us when we were kids. We sure as heck were walking ourselves to school every day.

You know, while I understand the argument of staying on one time, I really must object quite strongly to the very real safety concerns that I think are a result of being on daylight saving time. I'm very disappointed that this government is in no way owning up to those concerns. No plan coming forward. Maybe now that I've had a chance to say it in here, we'll see a plan come forward on how we're actually going to fund and move forward on infrastructure to keep our kids safe on that travel to and from school.

With that, I will conclude my remarks. Certainly, we'll be voting in opposition to this bill.

The Speaker: The Member for Edmonton-North West.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say a couple of things in regard to Bill 31. First of all, in talking about changing the time, we've heard a lot of arguments about things that weren't thought through properly. I think the ski hill arguments are very compelling. Something needs to be done with that. It's an industry that we're counting on to grow both domestically and internationally, and we need to make sure that, you know, some time change thing doesn't get in the way of that.

1:50

The other one, that my colleague for Calgary-Beddington just mentioned in regard to school times, opening and closing: again, I think that's a real issue that we need to deal with.

Part of the reason – I can think now back on how this time change thing came to be. It was less about dealing with the time change in a timely way but, rather, what else was going on at the same time when they brought this forward. This is exactly the same time that this government was stopping the election boundary commission majority report. In fact, there was a huge kerfuffle around that. There still is. It's a breach of democracy. Thousands of people are angry about it, so this government said: "Quick, what are we going to do? Oh, let's do the time change bill. That'll knock them off the scent of a real scandal." Of course, it didn't, but here we are with this, I think, a bill that hasn't been quite thought through properly because it was being used to mitigate the gerrymandering scandal that this government had going on at the same time. You know, just saying that that's probably why there are some holes in this Bill 31.

The other part I want to talk about is an interesting change to the Professional Governance Act. I was just discussing this with the Advanced Education minister and the minister who drafted this, who's the sponsor of this bill. It's actually a pretty good idea, right? Of course, in Bill 40 that we had last year, a lot of professional associations were contacting me about concerns that the government was trying to maybe stack the boards for their professional association: APEGA and, you know, nurses and all of these different professional boards. They said: well, maybe make a provision that the government can have less than half of the appointments on a board. I thought, "Okay, I can do that," so I made an amendment to Bill 40 last year for this very thing, and it was struck down. I was heartbroken, but I got over it.

But, lo and behold, on page 104 of this bill, there it is, saying to limit government power to appoint people to professional boards to

less than 50 per cent. So there you go. Got one from the opposition side. It doesn't happen very often. I just wanted to mention that. I won't take credit to it directly. I will say that the professional associations were the ones who pointed this out to me. I just humbly brought it forward, and now . . .

Ms Gray: It was a good amendment.

Mr. Eggen: It is a good amendment. I quite like it, you know. It doesn't happen every day, so there you go.

So two things: number one, there are a couple of half-baked elements to Bill 31 in regard to time because the government is trying to use it as a smokescreen to their very, very stupid election commission interference with drawing the boundaries; number two, the Professional Governance Act is actually stronger now because the government is backing away from trying to stack the boards.

Thank you.

The Speaker: I don't see any more speakers on third reading of Bill 31, the Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act.

Does the mover wish to close?

Mr. Nally: I'll waive that.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 1:54 p.m.]

[Ten minutes having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

Amery	Jones	Sawhney
Armstrong-Homeniuk	LaGrange	Sawyer
Boitchenko	Loewen	Schow
Bouchard	Long	Sigurdson, R.J.
Cyr	Lovely	Singh
de Jonge	Lunty	Stephan
Dyck	McDougall	Turton
Ellis	Nally	van Dijken
Fir	Neudorf	Wiebe
Getson	Nicolaides	Williams
Glubish	Nixon	Wilson
Horner	Petrovic	Wright, J.
Hunter	Pitt	Yao
Jean	Rowswell	Yaseen
Johnson		

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Eggen	Ip
Arcand-Paul	Ellingson	Renaud
Brar, Gurtej	Elmeligi	Schmidt
Chapman	Gray	Sigurdson, L.
Deol		

Totals: For – 43 Against – 13

[Motion carried; Bill 31 read a third time]

Mr. Schow: Mr. Speaker, the time has come where I get to rise and tell everybody: you don't have to go home, but you can't stay here because I am about to adjourn the House. I do move to adjourn the House until Monday, May 11 at 1:30 p.m.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 2:07 pm]

Bill Status Report for the 31st Legislature - 2nd Session (2025-2026)

Activity to Thursday, May 7, 2026

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

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

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

Bill 1 — International Agreements Act (Smith)

First Reading — 6 (*Oct. 23, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 77-85 (*Oct. 28, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 109-18 (*Oct. 29, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 133-35 (*Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 184-87 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 250-52 (*Nov. 6, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force November 26, 2025; SA 2025, cI-3.8]

Bill 2 — Back to School Act (Horner)

First Reading — 26 (*Oct. 27, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Second Reading — 27-28 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 29-35 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 35-36 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 37-45 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 45-46 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve.*), 47-54 (*Oct. 27, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Oct. 28, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on October 28, 2025; SA 2025 cB-0.5]

Bill 3 — Private Vocational Training Amendment Act, 2025 (McDougall)

First Reading — 65 (*Oct. 28, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 135-37 (*Oct. 30, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 187-93 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 215-16 (*Nov. 5, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 334-37 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 371-73 (*Nov. 19, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c17]

Bill 4 — Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Ellis)

First Reading — 121 (*Oct. 30, 2025, passed*)

Second Reading — 193-201 (*Nov. 4, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 216-24 (*Nov. 5, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 289 (*Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned*), 323-34 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 408-13 (*Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 447-55 (*Nov. 24, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Nov. 26, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force November 26, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c18]

Bill 5 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Schow)

First Reading — 271 (*Nov. 17, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 322-23 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 407-08 (*Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 589-90 (*Nov. 27, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 11, 2025; SA 2025 c23]

Bill 6 — Education (Prioritizing Literacy and Numeracy) Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Nicolaides)

First Reading — 150 (Nov. 3, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 252-60 (Nov. 6, 2025 aft., adjourned), 289-98 (Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned), 337-39 (Nov. 18, 2025 aft., adjourned), 341-51 (Nov. 18, 2025 eve., adjourned; amendments introduced), 455-65 (Nov. 24, 2025 eve., adjourned; amendments introduced), 504-14 (Nov. 25, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 681-86 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 713-21 (Dec. 3, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c19]

Bill 7 — Water Amendment Act, 2025 (Schulz)

First Reading — 121 (Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 224-35 (Nov. 5, 2025 aft., adjourned), 298-307 (Nov. 17, 2025 eve., adjourned), 351-55 (Nov. 18, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 480-93 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 536-43 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 661-63 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c27]

Bill 8 — Utilities Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Neudorf)

First Reading — 478 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 663-70 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 737-44 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 766-71 (Dec. 4, 2025 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c26]

Bill 9 — Protecting Alberta's Children Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 319-20 (Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Second Reading — 378-91 (Nov. 19, 2025 aft., adjourned), 493-501 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., adjourned), 549-54 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 676-79 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., adjourned), 815-22 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 855 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 873-80 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Third Reading — 891 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., adjourned on division), 892-900 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025; SA 2025 c24]

Bill 10 — Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (Nally)

First Reading — 271 (Nov. 17, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 374-78 (Nov. 19, 2025 aft., adjourned), 514-21 (Nov. 25, 2025 eve., adjourned), 543-49 (Nov. 26, 2025 aft., adjourned), 670-76 (Dec. 2, 2025 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 728-29 (Dec. 3, 2025 aft., adjourned), 744-45 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 789-94 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c25]

Bill 11 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (LaGrange)

First Reading — 426 (Nov. 24, 2025 , passed)

Second Reading — 555-64 (Nov. 26, 2025 eve., adjourned), 590-96 (Nov. 27, 2025 aft., adjourned), 637-46 (Dec. 1, 2025 eve., adjourned), 808-15 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 856 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 867-73 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division with amendments)

Third Reading — 913-14 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., adjourned on division), 916-22 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c21]

Bill 12 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (No. 2) (S) (Horner)

First Reading — 478 (Nov. 25, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 693-98 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., adjourned), 731-37 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 745-50 (Dec. 3, 2025 eve., adjourned), 850-55 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., passed with amendments)

Third Reading — 860-67 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c20]

Bill 13 — Regulated Professions Neutrality Act (Amery)

First Reading — 404 (Nov. 20, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 564-73 (Nov. 26, 2025 eve., adjourned), 629-37 (Dec. 1, 2025 eve., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 686-92 (Dec. 2, 2025 eve., adjourned), 801-08 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., passed)

Third Reading — 887-91 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 cR-13.3]

Bill 14 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 763 (Dec. 4, 2025 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 794-801 (Dec. 8, 2025 eve., adjourned), 844-50 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 856 (Dec. 9, 2025 aft., adjourned), 880-87 (Dec. 9, 2025 eve., passed on division with amendments)

Third Reading — 922-23 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., adjourned on division), 924-31 (Dec. 10, 2025 aft., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Dec. 11, 2025 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force December 11, 2025, with exceptions; SA 2025 c22]

Bill 15 — Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Ellis)

First Reading — 943 (Feb. 24, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 972-83 (Feb. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1141-48 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 1337-44 (Mar. 31, 2026 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Apr. 16, 2026 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force April 16, 2026; SA 2026, c5]

Bill 16 — Traveller Protection and Destination Development Act (Boitchenko)

First Reading — 963 (Feb. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1065-68 (Mar. 12, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1148-52 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 1216-19 (Mar. 24, 2026 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (Mar. 26, 2026 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026, cT-6.7]

Bill 17 — Fiscal Measures Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Horner)

First Reading — 1039 (Mar. 10, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1210-16 (Mar. 24, 2026 aft.), 1241-44 (Mar. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1270-73 (Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 1273-76 (Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed)

Royal Assent — (Mar. 26, 2026 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2026 c3]

Bill 18 — Safeguards for Last Resort Termination of Life Act (Amery)

First Reading — 1124 (Mar. 18, 2026 aft., passed)

Second Reading — 1332-37 (Mar. 31, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1462-65 (Apr. 14, 2026 aft., adjourned), 1524-28 (Apr. 16, 2026 morn., passed)

Third Reading — 1607-12 (Apr. 22, 2026 aft., passed on division)

Bill 19 — Appropriation Act, 2026 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 1140 (Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed)

Second Reading — 1222-27 (Mar. 24, 2026 aft., passed on division)

Committee of the Whole — 1248-58 (Mar. 25, 2026 aft., passed on division)

Third Reading — 1278-88 (Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Mar. 26, 2026 outside of House sitting) [Comes into force March 26, 2026; SA 2026, c1]

Bill 20 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2026 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 1197 (Mar. 23, 2026 eve., passed)

Second Reading — 1219-21 (Mar. 24, 2026 aft., passed)

Committee of the Whole — 1244-48 (Mar. 25, 2026 aft., passed)

Third Reading — 1276-78 (Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed on division)

Royal Assent — (Mar. 26, 2026) [Comes into force March 26, 2026; SA 2026, c2]

Bill 21 — Interprovincial Trade Mutual Recognition Act (Schow)

First Reading — 1261 (*Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 1344-49 (*Mar. 31, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1404-08 (*Apr. 2, 2026 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1453-55 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 16, 2026 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026, cI-9.5]

Bill 22 — Animal Protection Amendment Act, 2026 (Sigurdson, RJ)

First Reading — 1299 (*Mar. 30, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1399-1404 (*Apr. 2, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1618-20 (*Apr. 22, 2026 aft., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 1643-47 (*Apr. 23, 2026 aft., passed*)

Bill 23 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Amery)

First Reading — 1299 (*Mar. 30, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1455-62 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1492-98 (*Apr. 15, 2026 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1520-24 (*Apr. 16, 2026 morn., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Apr. 16, 2026 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force April 16, 2026, with exceptions; SA 2026, c4]

Bill 24 — Alberta Whisky Act (Nally)

First Reading — 1329 (*Mar. 31, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1393-99 (*Apr. 2, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1498-99 (*Apr. 15, 2026 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1532-36 (*Apr. 16, 2026 morn., adjourned*), 1607 (*Apr. 22, 2026 aft., passed*)

Bill 25 — An Act to Remove Politics and Ideology from Classrooms and Amend the Education Act, 2026 (Nicolaidis)

First Reading — 1329 (*Mar. 31, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1465-71 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1499-1504 (*Apr. 15, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1647-51 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., adjourned*)

Bill 26 — Immigration Oversight Act (Schow)

First Reading — 1353 (*Apr. 1, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1528-32 (*Apr. 16, 2026 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1620-24 (*Apr. 22, 2026 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1739-42 (*May 6, 2026 aft., passed*)

Bill 27 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Horner)

First Reading — 1353 (*Apr. 1, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1487-92 (*Apr. 15, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1612-18 (*Apr. 22, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1746-49 (*May 6, 2026 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1769 (*May 6, 2026 eve., adjourned*), 1769-71 (*May 6, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Bill 28 — Municipal Affairs and Housing Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Williams)

First Reading — 1385 (*Apr. 2, 2026 morn., passed*)

Second Reading — 1636-43 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., adjourned*), 1752-56 (*May 6, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1757-59 (*May 6, 2026 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 29 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (LaGrange)

First Reading — 1420 (*Apr. 13, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1651-57 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., adjourned*), 1716-23 (*May 5, 2026 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 30 — Expedited 120-Day Approvals Act (Jean)

First Reading — 1450 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1706-11 (*May 5, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1771-76 (*May 6, 2026 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1776-77 (*May 6, 2026 eve., passed*)

Bill 31 — Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Nally)

First Reading — 1627 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1711-16 (*May 5, 2026 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1749-52 (*May 6, 2026 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 1800-1806 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed on division*)

Bill 32 — Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 2026 (Amery)

First Reading — 1635 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1743-46 (*May 6, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1759-69 (*May 6, 2026 eve., adjourned*)

Bill 201 — Employment Standards (Protecting Workers' Pay) Amendment Act, 2025 (Ganley)

First Reading — 121 (*Oct. 30, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 154-65 (*Nov. 3, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 274-76 (*Nov. 17, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 202 — Conflicts of Interest (Ethical Governance) Amendment Act, 2025 (Kasawski)

First Reading — 248 (*Nov. 6, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 276-84 (*Nov. 17, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 427-31 (*Nov. 24, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 203 — Energy Storage Planning for Investment Act (Al-Guneid)

First Reading — 319 (*Nov. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 431-39 (*Nov. 24, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 608-13 (*Dec. 1, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 204 — Public Interest Disclosure (Publicly Funded Health Entity Whistleblower Protection) Act (Sweet)

First Reading — 534 (*Nov. 26, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 613-20 (*Dec. 1, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 1014-20 (*Mar. 9, 2026 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 205 — Non-Disclosure Agreements Act (Johnson)

First Reading — 1129 (*Mar. 19, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1169 (*Mar. 23, 2026 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Families and Communities*)

Bill 206 — Accessible Alberta Act (Renaud)

First Reading — 1063 (*Mar. 12, 2026 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 1081-94 (*Mar. 16, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1166-69 (*Mar. 23, 2026 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 207 — Primary Provincial Industries Recognition Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Dyck)

First Reading — 1269 (*Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1300-1311 (*Mar. 30, 2026 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1424-32 (*Apr. 13, 2026 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 1549-51 (*Apr. 20, 2026 aft., passed*)

Bill 208 — Tobacco, Smoking and Vaping Reduction Amendment Act, 2026 (Petrovic)

First Reading — 1507 (*Apr. 16, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1551 (*Apr. 20, 2026 aft., referred to Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future*)

Bill 209 — Consumer Protection (Affordability Measures) Amendment Act, 2026 (Eremenko)

First Reading — 1635 (*Apr. 23, 2026 morn., passed*)
Second Reading — 1672-84 (*May 4, 2026 aft., adjourned*)

Bill 210 — Consumer Protection (Fraud Prevention Measures) Amendment Act, 2026 (Deol)

First Reading — 1781 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed*)

Bill Pr1 — The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026 (Ceci)

First Reading — 1269 (*Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*), 1450 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)
Second Reading — 1972 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 1792 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed*)

Bill Pr2 — Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026 (Sawyer)

First Reading — 1269 (*Mar. 26, 2026 morn., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*), 1450 (*Apr. 14, 2026 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Second Reading — 1792 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1792-93 (*May 7, 2026 morn., passed*)

Table of Contents

Prayers	1779
Introduction of Guests	1779
Members' Statements	
Affordability Measures	1779
Mental Health Week	1780
Racism and Hate Crime Prevention	1780
Wildfire Season Preparation	1780
Alberta Music Action Plan	1780
Government Health Policies	1781
Introduction of Bills	
Bill 210 Consumer Protection (Fraud Prevention Measures) Amendment Act, 2026	1781
Oral Question Period	1781
Foreign Interference in Provincial Referendums	1781, 1784
Investigation of Electoral List Distribution and Use	1782
Electoral List Disclosure and Citizen-initiated Petition Certification	1783
Building Indigenous Mentorship and Pathways Pilot Program	1785
Electoral Boundaries Committee Review	1785
Investigation of Electoral List Distribution and Use	1786
Alberta Separatism	1786
FSCD Program Wait Times	1787
Transmission Grid Reliability	1787
Health Care System	1788
Tabling Returns and Reports	1788
Orders of the Day	1792
Private Bills	
Second Reading	
Bill Pr. 1 The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026	1792
Bill Pr. 2 Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026	1792
Committee of the Whole	
Bill Pr. 1 The Ranchmen's Club Ordinance Amendment Act, 2026	1792
Bill Pr. 2 Prairie Bible Institute Amendment Act, 2026	1792
Government Motions	
Time Allocation on Bills 25, 28, 29, and 32	1793
Division	1800
Government Bills and Orders	
Third Reading	
Bill 31 Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	1800
Division	1806

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

For inquiries contact:

Editor

Alberta Hansard

3rd Floor, 9820 – 107 St

EDMONTON, AB T5K 1E7

Telephone: 780.427.1875

E-mail: AlbertaHansard@assembly.ab.ca