



Province of Alberta

The 31st Legislature
Second Session

Alberta Hansard

Thursday morning and afternoon, October 29, 2026

Day 62

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)
Campbell, Kyle, Calgary-Shaw (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)
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)
Government Whip
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),
Official Opposition Whip
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, Hon. Tara, ECA, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, ECA, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Hon. Joseph R., ECA, Cardston-Siksika (UC),
Government House Leader
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 (UC)
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, Hon. Justin, ECA, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UC)
Wright, Peggy K., Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview (NDP)
Yao, Tany, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo (UC),
Deputy Government Whip
Yaseen, Hon. Muhammad, ECA, Calgary-North (UC)
Vacant, Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland

Party standings:

United Conservative: 46

New Democrat: 39

Progressive Tory: 1

Vacant: 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
Lang Bawn, Managing Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
Paul Shafer, Acting Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms
James Matsune, Acting 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 Dreesen	Minister of Transportation and Economic Corridors
Tanya Fir	Minister of Arts, Culture and Status of Women
Nate Glubish	Minister of Technology and Innovation
Grant Hunter	Minister of Environment and Protected Areas
Brian Jean	Minister of Energy and Minerals
Adriana LaGrange	Minister of Hospital and Surgical 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 Assisted Living and Social Services
Demetrios Nicolaides	Minister of Education and Childcare
Jason Nixon	President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance
Rajan Sawhney	Minister of Indigenous Relations
Tara Sawyer	Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation
Joseph Schow	Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration
R.J. Sigurdson	Minister of Affordability and Utilities
Searle Turton	Minister of Children and Family Services
Dan Williams	Minister of Municipal Affairs
Rick Wilson	Minister of Mental Health and Addiction
Justin Wright	Minister of Primary and Preventative Health Services
Muhammad Yaseen	Associate Minister of Multiculturalism

Parliamentary Secretaries

Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk	Parliamentary Secretary for Settlement Services and Ukrainian Evacuees
Scott Cyr	Parliamentary Secretary for Transportation and Strategic Development
Chantelle de Jonge	Parliamentary Secretary for Affordability and Utilities
Nolan Dyck	Parliamentary Secretary for Indigenous and Rural Policing
Chelsae Petrovic	Parliamentary Secretary for Health Workforce Engagement
Ron Wiebe	Parliamentary Secretary for Rural Health (North)
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
de Jonge
Ellingson
Kasawski
Kayande
Rowswell
Stephan
Wiebe

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

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

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
Haji
Johnson
Jones
Lundy
Sinclair
Singh
Tejada

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Lundy
Deputy Chair: Mrs. Johnson
Armstrong-Homeniuk
Chapman
Dyck
Miyashiro
Petrovic
Shepherd
Sinclair
Wright, P.

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

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

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Mr. Bouchard
Deputy Chair: Mr. Cyr
Ceci
Deol
Hayter
Horner
Jones
Lovely
Sigurdson, L.
Singh
Vacant

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms. Armstrong-Homeniuk
Deputy Chair: Mr. Wiebe
Arcand-Paul
Brar, Gurinder
Brar, Gurtej
de Jonge
Gray
Horner
Jones
Sinclair
Stephan

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Sabir
Deputy Chair: Mr. van Dijken
Bouchard
Cyr
Dyck
Eremenko
Lovely
Renaud
Schmidt
Sinclair

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

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

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

10 a.m.

Thursday, October 29, 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 Mr. Sidney Manning. 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: Hon. members, seated in my gallery today is Mr. Sidney Manning, who led us in the singing of the royal anthem. We are pleased to have him return to sing this season. Mr. Manning joined Alberta Municipal Affairs as the provincial plumbing and gas administrator in 2009. He's been active in the construction industry for more than 40 years between code development, installations, and inspections. Sidney lives in Edmonton with his wife, Jolayne, and has two adult daughters. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

Hon. members, almost in my gallery today I have the family of retiring Legislative Assembly staff Gary MacLean; his wife, Sandy, who recently retired from Alberta Health Services after working for 34 years as an occupational therapist; their daughter Carmen; and their son Sean. Gary began working for the Edmonton Police Service on May 19, 1981, at the age of 19. Do the math there. During his 26-year tenure he worked in patrol division, arrest processing unit, the downtown division front counter, the court liaison unit, and the tactical section. He was then promoted to sergeant and patrol sergeant in the west division in recognition of his dedication and hard work. Gary began working at the Legislative Assembly security service on February 24, 2013, and is retiring today after 13 and a half years of serving this place. You've both given yourselves and your children something to be very proud of, and I would like to offer you my sincerest thanks for helping keep all of us safe. I would invite Gary's family to stand and the members of the Assembly to rise and give . . . [Standing ovation]

School groups today. We have Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Good. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to introduce to you and through you to all members of this Assembly a batch of builders, farmers, doctors, possibly even the future Premier of this province from Barrhead elementary school. They will thrive in our community thanks to the guidance from their teachers, who are also here. I ask all guests from Barrhead elementary to please rise and accept the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Other guests? We have the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to introduce through you and to you to all members of this Assembly a group that you know well. Representatives from the Rural Municipalities association have joined us today. Kara Westerlund, the president, along with members Jason Schneider, Kelly Christman, Warren Noga, Larry Clarke, Eugene Hrabec, and, of course, Wyatt Skovron. Thank you so much. Please rise and receive the warm welcome of the Assembly.

Ms Fir: Mr. Speaker, it's my honour to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly Nigerian community leaders in the gallery today as we recognize Nigerian Heritage Month and celebrate the community's rich culture, heritage, and contributions to Alberta. I ask that they please rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

The Speaker: The Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services.

Mr. Ellis: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I rise to introduce to you and through you two bright young individuals who are two brand new ministerial assistants very interested in law into my office. I want to ask them to please rise. Shadi and Jon, if you could please rise and accept the warm welcome of this Assembly.

Thank you very much.

The Speaker: Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd also love to give a huge shout-out to the incredible staff and students of Barrhead elementary school – I'm a proud graduate – and to teacher Lauren Chapman, who I went to school with in Barrhead, yet we haven't aged at all. Please rise once again and receive the traditional warm welcome of this Assembly.

The Speaker: Are there other introductions? The Minister of Assisted Living and Social Services.

Mr. Neudorf: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to introduce to you and through you and to all members of the Assembly Dorinda So, a nonprofit leader and executive director with PointA visiting my chief of staff Danielle Hartung from Ontario. I'd ask that she would rise and receive the traditional warm welcome of the Assembly.

Members' Statements

Health Care System Capacity

Mr. Haji: Mr. Speaker, Albertans should not have to wonder whether a hospital bed will be available when they or their loved ones need one, yet Alberta's hospitals are overcrowded, emergency departments are stretched beyond capacity, and health care workers are being asked to do more with less. The warning signs have been clear for decades. Loved ones are dying in waiting rooms after hours without care. The last full-scale, acute-care hospital built in Edmonton was Grey Nuns in 1988. Red Deer regional hospital opened in 1981 and the Chinook regional in Lethbridge opened in 1988. Instead of building the public capacity hospitals Alberta needs, this UCP government offers temporary measures and promises that too often never materialize.

They continue to build a two-tier health care system, widening the gap between care Albertans need and the capacity available to provide it. In 2009 Alberta had roughly two acute-care beds per every 1,000 residents. Today that figure has dramatically declined, and

Albertans feel the consequence every single day: crowded emergency rooms, longer waits, delayed surgeries, patients on stretchers in hallways, and exhausted staff.

Last flu season Albertans died while waiting hours for emergency care. This government promised triage liaison physicians within 30 days before they even announced their failed referendum, Mr. Speaker. Ten months later they are still nowhere to be seen. What did Albertans receive this weekend? A new task force called Acute Care capacity task force in Edmonton. Albertans do not need another panel, another task force. They need care and action, especially as new respiratory illnesses arise to press on hospitals already at or beyond capacity.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans deserve a government committed to public health care. Albertans deserve a government that commits to long-term planning, not patchwork.

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

10:10

Government Achievements

Mr. Yao: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under this UCP government Alberta is winning like never before. We didn't just talk; we delivered. While the NDP left our economy in ruins and failed to balance a single budget, we delivered six consecutive balanced budgets and six straight surpluses, marking our strongest fiscal record in 20 years. Alberta is stronger and more prosperous today because the NDP remains safely in opposition. We had a big summer, and the wins continue to pile up. Under this Premier our economy consistently outpaces the rest of Canada, and we lead nationally in job growth. In five years we've doubled the heritage savings trust fund to nearly \$32 billion, aiming for \$250 billion by 2050. We've hired a record number of doctors, bringing the total to over 14,661.

We're leading on housing nationally. Six communities in Alberta rank among Canada's most affordable cities. We directed Edmonton and Calgary to maintain pre-'24 infill bylaws to protect family homes from chaotic 16-unit duplexes that devalue entire neighbourhoods. We introduced legislation to hit illegal dumpers with fines up to \$1 million for corporations and \$100,000 for individuals, alongside jail sentences. Under this Premier the Prime Minister is now fast-tracking Alberta's 1-million-barrel-a-day Pacific link pipeline as a national interest project, with construction starting in 2027. We challenged destructive federal policies and won. The Alberta Court of Appeal recently ruled that Trudeau's no-more-pipelines law is unconstitutional. We secured billions of federal investments this summer in our military infrastructure, manufacturing, and affordable housing. Ottawa is now taking our advice on qualified judicial appointments.

The momentum is real. We cannot go back to the NDP holding our province's prosperity hostage ever again. Together this UCP government brought the Alberta advantage back, and the road ahead is brighter than ever.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Premier's Travel to the U.S.

Member Ceci: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've all grown accustomed to the Premier's colourful taste in travel. Who could forget her voyage to the Middle East, the prince's private jet, the luxury hotels? And while that must have been some trip, especially on Alberta's taxpayer dime, everyone knows that the Premier's real happy place is just a bit south, down in the good old U.S.A. Of course, she's been down to Mar-a-Lago to kiss the presidential ring, and more recently she used some of her time to saunter off to Nashville, Tennessee, ostensibly to engage in some personal R and R, even though Canada is in the midst of a trade

war sparked by her political hero, Donald Trump. Canadian workers suffer the impact of Trump's tariffs while this Premier holidays like a snowbird.

The Premier will protest that she's keeping diplomatic channels open while she's making moves, but while our side campaigned to save Canada from her costly separation referendum, she was doing business with the likes of the rep of the state tourism department and the head of the local chamber of commerce. High stakes stuff, indeed.

The Premier has all the wrong priorities. Instead of fixing health care and education, she spends millions on a failed referendum. Instead of fighting for Canada, she was building her personal American dream.

Albertans are desperate for change and some good government, and they're going to get it as soon as they vote out this tired UCP.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Lacombe Research and Development Centre

Mrs. Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this year I rose to speak about the federal government's decision to close the Lacombe Research and Development Centre. I expressed concerns about what this decision could mean for central Alberta and agricultural research across the prairies. The federal government has now made it clear it is moving ahead with this closure. This is despite the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food recommending that the proposed closure be paused and even reversed. Producers, researchers, industry, and local governments have all underscored the importance of this facility as well as its own parliamentary committee recommending a different approach.

For more than a century researchers in Lacombe have been doing work that matters to Alberta and to the world. Their work has helped develop crops, improve livestock production, advance forage and soil management, and find practical solutions to the changes facing prairie agriculture. It directly supports the producers who feed Albertans and Canadians. Recently members of the Lacombe Research and Development Centre Joint Task Force met with provincial officials to discuss the future of agricultural research in Lacombe. This included potential partnerships with organizations like the University of Alberta, Western Crop Innovations, and Results Driven Agriculture Research, RDAR.

While these conversations are encouraging, they also underscore the importance of protecting the expertise and research capacity that generations have worked to build. For central Alberta this is about jobs, expertise, and research institutions that have served our agricultural community for generations. For Alberta it's about continuing to invest in the science and innovation our producers need to remain competitive, resilient, and productive. When Alberta agriculture succeeds, our province and our country succeed. That is why this decision matters and why I would urge the federal government to recognize its value and reconsider this decision.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Indigenous and Métis Relations

Member Calahoo Stonehouse: Mr. Speaker, last week First Nations sent a historic message to this UCP government by voting in record numbers on this ridiculous, wasteful, and, frankly, embarrassing separation referendum. From all three treaty territories First Nations and Métis voters lined up in record numbers for hours to protect their treaty rights. Folks dealt with every kind of barrier imaginable that this government could throw at them, from ridiculous ID requirements, poorly staffed polling stations, long lines, not enough ballots across the province.

The Siksika Nation raised serious concerns about inadequate resourcing and insufficient ballot supplies. Chief Crowfoot requested a formal explanation about why First Nations communities kept running out of ballots. It wasn't just Siksika. It was also Whitefish Lake, Kainai Nation, Samson Cree Nation, Louis Bull Tribe, and the Ermineskin Cree Nation. Every single one of them ran out of ballots not once, not twice, but sometimes three times. Clearly, this government was not prepared yet again and undermined First Nations.

This Premier and her government were warned. First Nations chiefs voted in a nonconfidence vote on this government. Then First Nations went to court to uphold treaty rights from ridiculous separatist antics. Consultation and consent are the law on this land. Clearly, this Premier is afraid because she didn't listen to those warnings, and instead of facing national chiefs, regional treaty chiefs, and fellow Premiers, she avoided explaining to them why she allowed Jeffrey Rath and Mitch Sylvestre to attack our treaties and the Canadian Constitution.

Premier, Albertans won't forget, and First Nations certainly won't forget the cost of this government's incompetency. And now you're banning treaty and Métis flags from our schools? End the separatist court case, quit wasting taxpayers' time and money, remove the separatists from your caucus, apologize to Albertans, and just resign.

Calgary-Shaw By-election

Member Boparai: Mr. Speaker, it's a fact that there are no safe UCP seats in Calgary. Last month voters in south Calgary delivered an orange wave, sending my colleague the MLA for Calgary-Shaw to the Legislature with a historic victory in a previously safe UCP seat. Why? Calgarians are tired of being taken for granted. Families are tired of having no schools for their kids and no hospital beds when they're sick. People are tired of paying record-high prices for groceries while this Premier and her UCP government continue to waste money on the wrong priorities. They're tired of a Premier who would rather demonize immigrants and people she invited to come build their lives here than focus on the needs of every Albertan.

Calgarians know that the Alberta NDP will deliver. We will fight for our schools. We will bring down the cost of living. We will work with cities like Calgary, not against them. We will always reject separatism and American-style private health care.

Just one month after kicking the UCP out of Calgary-Shaw, Calgarians across our city stood up and rejected the UCP's costly, wasteful failure of a referendum. Calgary has said no to the Premier picking judges, Calgary has said no to health premiums, and Calgary has said no to separatism. The UCP must face the facts. Calgarians are tired. They know there is a better alternative. If they try to change the map and gerrymander the next election, they can't change what is coming: a better government, an Alberta NDP government, a better Alberta.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

10:20

Oral Question Period

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

Citizen-initiated Petition Requirements

Mr. Nenshi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we saw the Premier completely lose her cool, and I have learned that this is a tell. She often seems to do it when she knows that even she has gone too far. Let's get back to see if she answers the question, in the clear light of morning, of her relationships with Mr. Rath and the separatist leaders.

She admitted that she regularly texts separatist leaders, works with them on her legislation, and gives them instructions on what to do next. Is she in the habit of telling her purported political enemies what to do to get this referendum that she promised them?

Ms Smith: Well, the member opposite has a tell as well. He asserts things I did not say and then attributes them to me even though they are things that he says. That is precisely what he did in the preamble to his question.

Mr. Speaker, I engage with Albertans all the time. When we pass legislation, as we did in April of 2025, that changed the rules about how many signatures you needed and what time frame, there were a number of different groups coming forward trying to figure out: when they file, do they file under the new rules? Do they file under the old rules? It's my job to help explain when legislation and regulations are coming, and I did that.

The Speaker: The hon. . . .

Mr. Nenshi: Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: Oh, I promise you. You're getting introduced, but you've got to wait for it.

Mr. Nenshi: I'm sorry.

The Speaker: The hon. opposition leader.

Mr. Nenshi: Thank you, sir. Mr. Speaker, I didn't write the text messages that the Premier has admitted to writing in which she told the separatist leaders what to do. She thought she was using the separatist leaders for her own political gain while Mr. Rath thought he was using her for his. Who's looking out for Albertans in all of this? I bet no one in her caucus knew that their boss had this close relationship with the separatist leaders, the fact that she instructs them on how to use the law for their own advantage. Now that the truth is finally out, what else has the Premier been colluding with them on?

Ms Smith: Well, Mr. Speaker, I answered the question, and I'm going to answer it the same way. When people ask me how our legislation works, particularly citizen initiative legislation, I'm happy to explain the timing of regulations. I was happy to meet with Corb Lund as well to tell him a little bit about the timing of regulations and rules and how they would apply to his initiative as well. That's just part of the job. You've got to talk to people when they're trying to engage with government. We believe in the citizen initiative process, and we needed to be clear because there was a change of legislation that was happening at that time.

Mr. Nenshi: Quote: we're going to have to get those Alberta girls making more babies. Unquote. That's Mitch Sylvestre. Quote: our immigration and deportation department. Unquote. That's Jeffrey Rath talking about deporting Canadians from Alberta. These are the Premier's friends. These are the people she gives her cellphone number to. These are the people she tells what to do in her own words. These are the people she's directing. These are the people she's changing the law for. Did any member of her caucus know that she actually works for the separatists?

Ms Smith: Do any members of that side know that Jeffrey Rath was actually a contributor to the NDP Party for several years, in 2015 through to 2019? [interjections] He's actually an NDP supporter, Mr. Speaker, so maybe the member opposite should answer for his statements.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our proposals on immigration received the majority support because they're very reasonable. We are asking to take more control over economic migrants. We are asking to ensure that those who are temporary pay a fair share of their premiums. We'll go slow, but we're going to get it right.

The Speaker: The second set of questions belongs to the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: I find it fascinating that her own caucus is heckling her now, and we can't even hear her. Let's be clear that Jeffrey Rath don't got my cellphone number, and I certainly don't tell him what to do.

Electoral Boundaries Committee Review

Mr. Nenshi: What we hear from the Premier is: guest workers . . . [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. Order. One person has been recognized, and while we don't disallow heckling, if I can't hear the person recognized, then the heckling is too loud.

Please continue.

Mr. Nenshi: This is what we hear from the Premier: guest workers, Liberal-appointed judges, now election denialism. Her vocabulary all comes from her great mentor Donald Trump, but her plans for Trumpian-style, MAGA gerrymandering weren't going to work. I hope that the Premier has had the chance to review the boundary commission meeting from yesterday and answer the question: why did she tell the committee to go beyond its mandate and gerrymander the maps?

The Speaker: The Premier.

Ms Smith: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to wait until November 2, when the report is fully available to every member of this Assembly so we all have the same information at the same time. I'm not going to cast aspersions on the character of the judge, Justice O'Ferrall, who is a senior court justice and very well respected, nor will I cast aspersions on the independent members of that committee. They did their work, and now it'll be presented into the Legislature. Not everybody is going to get what they want. That's sort of the nature of these things. There are differences of opinions, and we'll wait to see what the judge comes down with with his recommendation.

Mr. Nenshi: I didn't hear a withdrawal of her false and baseless accusations from yesterday, and certainly she has no problem in alleging the problems with the former independent members of the actual independent commission.

Yesterday the Premier said to put on our big-boy pants and quit complaining and start campaigning. Maybe she should have done that in Calgary-Shaw or for the referendum. To be clear, we're not scared of fair elections. We're going to win anyway. But somebody has to stand up for democracy, so does the UCP caucus want their legacy to be that they lost even after cheating? [interjections]

The Speaker: It's time only to hear from the Premier.

Ms Smith: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me tell you another tell of the member opposite. He always takes both sides of every issue. I call it the McKinsey way. I think he was trained that way. What side of the issue did he take a few months ago? His Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, his Member for Calgary-Beddington, his appointed members to the board, both of them, said repeatedly that there weren't enough seats,

that if only they had a couple more seats, they'd be able to do the work properly. Well, guess what. The judge was convinced. They asked for more seats, and that's the process we're concluding.

Mr. Nenshi: She's still so rattled that she forgets she can't talk about sitting on the fence because that's the pointy fence she sits on on Canada and separatism.

This is not a dry academic debate, Mr. Speaker. It's fundamental to democracy. It's fundamental to how government works. The Premier seems to believe that holding on to power is more important than giving urban voters, especially in Lethbridge, a voice. She takes rural voters for granted, assuming they'll always vote for her even if they're lumped in with people hundreds of kilometres away. Can the Premier explain to rural Albertans why she takes them for granted like this?

Ms Smith: Mr. Speaker, let's check the record from Justice Miller on January 12. "You'll be pleased to know that we had a government minister present this afternoon and we kind of chided him a little bit [over the fact that] we only had 89 [seats]." Why was he chiding it? It was because the Member for Calgary-Beddington, the Member for Calgary-Elbow, the Member for Edmonton-Whitemud, Greg Clark, who was the appointee from that side, Susan Samson, who was also the appointee from that side, repeatedly at numerous meetings said: if only we had more seats. Justice Miller listened to their advice, and that's the reason why we have a new report. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

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

Premier's Travel to the U.S.

Mr. Nenshi: You know, Mr. Speaker, it's taken me a while to understand the motivations of this Premier and this government, but now I understand that they are not interested in making life better for Albertans. They're just in it for themselves. This summer when Donald Trump threatened our economy yet again with tariffs, the other Premiers stood united on Team Canada. Canadians committed to buying Canadian. We stood together. The Premier thought that this was a great time to go partying in Nashville. So what was the best band she saw?

The Speaker: I'm a hundred per cent sure that wasn't on government policy, so in the future I would caution the member to ask about government policy.

Premier, go ahead.

Ms Smith: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed that the Member for Calgary-Buffalo, who's supposed to be a supporter of the arts community, is not excited about the potential for Calgary to become Nashville north. I'm very excited about that. In fact, National Music Centre boss Andrew Mosker is down there right now with our national music commissioner talking and celebrating Canadian music and figuring out ways that we can partner with Nashville to make Calgary a music city. Absolutely, this is something that we do as a government. Our arts and culture minister has done a tremendous job of making this the first time we've been able to put this focus on music, and I'm very proud of it.

The Speaker: The hon. member, on government policy.

Mr. Nenshi: Well, we're talking about government-funded trips, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, Nashville is the capital of Tennessee. The governor lives there, but the Premier didn't meet with the governor. The Premier didn't meet with the mayor. The Premier only met with – excuse me; I

have to check my notes – the Commissioner of the Tourist Development department. It should be below the Premier to charge the taxpayers for a vacation like this, where she didn't do a single public event to promote Alberta as a destination. So let's get some value out of the trip. Could she please tell this House: where is Nashville's best barbecue?

10:30

Ms Smith: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the member to withdraw that. It was a personal trip. I paid for it privately. While I was there, because I was so excited about the work that my arts and culture minister is doing, I used the opportunity to meet with members of tourism so that we could start the partnership between Calgary and Nashville. I'm pleased to see that it's already borne fruit. A short period of time later we've got the Grand Ole Opry celebrating Canadian music artists and we've got some of our top people in the music industry down there to figure out how to increase the partnership. We're going to continue doing more of that, and yeah, I'm happy to pay my own money if I can celebrate Calgary and celebrate Alberta. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

Let's hear from the Leader of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Nenshi: I invite the Premier to table all of the expenses for her staff, her security, and everyone else who made the social media posts for her while she was in Nashville.

The Premier claims that her American adventures have somehow protected Alberta, but Canadians are suffering from the impacts of the Trump administration. She jetted off to Mar-a-Lago. She went to Trump's inauguration. She claims to have met with senior Trump officials, not one of which admits to having met with her. So what is the point of all of this? She's not saving jobs. ConocoPhillips just announced huge layoffs. Our unemployment rate is massive. So could she tell us that she at least made time for Dollywood?

The Speaker: The hon. Premier.

Ms Smith: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The work that not only myself but my ministers as well as private members have made in reaching out to all levels of the U.S. administration, from governors and private members who are elected at state Legislatures to members of Congress as well as to members in the administration: the results speak for themselves; 97 per cent of Alberta goods cross into the United States tariff free. Now, we want it to be 100 per cent. We still have that 3 per cent to work on, but we are very clearly in the best position of any of the other provinces in the country.

Electoral Boundaries Committee Review (continued)

Ms Gray: The Premier stated repeatedly that they were only going to follow Justice Miller's recommendations when the UCP decided they needed to redraw the electoral maps. His first instruction was that the restoration of the two rural electoral divisions should have no impact on divisions south of Airdrie. Now we know from the committee yesterday that Lethbridge has been split into four. Republican gerrymandering techniques have been used, and the UCP will benefit from it. Will the Premier hold to her word and reject blatant attempts to gerrymander?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The NDP know full well that the report will be tabled in this Legislature on November 2. None of us have had the benefit of reviewing that. That is a task for the

Legislative Assembly of Alberta to review, to debate, and then to subsequently pass should it be acceptable to the Assembly. But as noted time and again, the Electoral Boundaries Commission and the majority of that commission believed that additional seats were required. That's why this process happened, and we're looking forward to seeing the report with the 91 distributions here shortly.

Ms Gray: It was discussed at committee yesterday. We were there. Where were your members?

Lethbridge residents in their presentations to the legitimate Electoral Boundaries Commission . . .

The Speaker: Respectfully, that was a direct question to the other side. Through the chair, please.

Ms Gray: Lethbridge residents in their presentations to the legitimate Electoral Boundaries Commission sought to preserve their city's boundaries and keep their urban ridings, two of them, by a 5 to 1 margin. You know who argued against two ridings, disrupting 55 years of status quo? Their ministers and Conservative operatives. Now we know they've cut Lethbridge into four with a technique called packing and cracking, one that makes it easier for the party who drew the boundaries to win additional seats. Will the Premier reject . . .

The Speaker: Let's all restrict our time to 35 seconds.

Go, Minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. We all know that Alberta's population is growing, and it's growing faster than anywhere else in the country. That's why the Electoral Boundaries Commission believed that they needed additional seats in order to do their job properly. That's why the initial report that was tabled in this Legislature made those recommendations, and that's why the esteemed advisory panel that included Justice O'Ferrall, two members from the NDP, two members appointed by government sat to re-evaluate everything that Justice Miller and the majority commission recommended.

Ms Gray: They were supposed to add two rural seats, and they've added three. Losing in Calgary-Shaw confirmed that this government is losing support everywhere but especially in urban areas. Their referendum questions failed in the cities, and now these new maps make urban votes worth much less than rural votes. It disregards everything the government said that they were going to do when they started this sham of a process. Is the government really going to keep going down this blatantly partisan and unconstitutional road?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is disappointing to see that member allege that the independent advisory panel and the commission that included two of their own members, two members appointed by government, and one of the most respected judges of our province engage in a debate and a conversation with Albertans to come with the report that we expect to see on November 2. I prefer to thank those members for their hard work and not to call their integrity into question and also not to call the report into question either. It is beneath that member and beneath the NDP to do so.

2026 Provincial Referendum

Member Hoyle: Mr. Speaker, just last week Albertans voted to reject this Premier's wasteful and divisive referendum. Albertans sent a message: denounce separatism, respect the Constitution, and focus on the issues that actually matter like strong public health care. Every single one of the Premier's constitutional questions was rejected by massive margins even in UCP ridings. Will the Premier

apologize to Albertans, drop the soft-separatist act, and commit to respecting Canada's Constitution?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, Albertans have spoken clearly. We're very happy that they have continued to support wanting to be in Canada. As a proud Canadian who wears the poppy along with members opposite, I accept that. The only ones refusing to drop the separatist act are members opposite, who bring American-style politics and will not accept yes for an answer. Albertans have said: yes; we love our country. We want to continue to focus on these policies that matter to Albertans. I'm allowed to look at you.

Member Hoyle: Given that 60 per cent of Albertans, 65 per cent of Calgarians, 70 per cent of Edmontonians voted against letting the Premier take Albertans out of federal programs and given that just yesterday a spokesperson for one of the four health ministries said that the UCP will continue to press ahead with plans to opt out of pharmacare and dental care, will this UCP government explain why they're rejecting the results of their own referendum? Why won't this government just listen to Albertans?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, we listened to Albertans when they voted on question 10. Happily, we campaigned with them to that end. We listened to them as well, and we respect the outcomes of all of the other nine questions, including the entire province, not just Edmonton and Calgary – the entire province's votes – when it comes to the immigration questions. Of course, we will continue with the policy that we have a mandate for since the last election, of which Albertans also voted on to create a majority Conservative government in this House so that we can pass laws to advance their interests.

Member Hoyle: Given that the UCP spent millions of taxpayer dollars on endless referendums that no one asked for, money that could have been spent on priorities like funding the south Edmonton hospital, and given that this government is ignoring the voters who told them to stop fiddling with Canada's Constitution and given that this government is desperately trying to change the channel with tired American-style cultural nonsense, when will the UCP admit that this referendum was a failure and they've lost their mandate from Albertans?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be nothing more un-Canadian, un-Albertan than the four years of NDP government when they were in power that attacked our heritage and our history, attacked our economy, attacked Albertans rural and urban in their way of life. To tell us that we are somehow unconstitutional for asking Albertans questions about how they want to govern seems so outlandish and un-Canadian that I think members opposite need to stand outside, look out, see the sky, and touch grass. The reality is that we are happy to hear from Albertans and follow their direction when it comes to elections.

10:40

The Speaker: The next set of questions belongs to the hon. Member for Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock.

Bill 34

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Buying a vehicle is one of the biggest financial commitments Alberta families make, and when someone spends tens of thousands of dollars on a vehicle with serious defects that cannot be fixed, they shouldn't be left footing the bill. Albertans deserve confidence that their hard-earned money is protected when they make major purchases. To the Minister of

Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction: how will our government protect Albertans who find themselves stuck with a defective vehicle?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans shouldn't be stuck with a bill for a vehicle that can't be fixed. We're proposing lemon law protections that would give Albertans options to seek a refund, replacement, or other remedy. These protections would apply to qualifying vehicles within their first three years or 60,000 kilometres. Albertans work hard for their money, and we're going to stand by them when they need us the most.

The Speaker: Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister for that answer. Given that Albertans should have the freedom to repair the products and equipment they own and further given that farmers can face costly delays when critical machinery breaks down during the seeding and harvest seasons, to the same minister: how will our government's right-to-repair protections give farmers and everyday Albertans more control over their property, reduce unnecessary costs, and make their lives easier?

The Speaker: The hon. the minister.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We care about property rights, and that means that we care about right-to-repair. We also care about farmers. Now, we know how the members opposite feel about farmers when they tried to unionize the family farm with their farm safety legislation. We stand with farmers. They asked for right-to-repair, and we were happy to give it to them. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order.

The hon. member.

Mr. van Dijken: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again to the minister. Given that Albertans work hard for their money and deserve fair and transparent prices when purchasing tickets to concerts and sporting events and further given that excessive resale markups and hidden fees can put attending events out of reach for families, to the same minister: how will our government's proposed legislation strengthen ticket resale protections and ensure Albertans know exactly what they're paying for? [interjection]

The Speaker: Only the hon. minister.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Albertans shouldn't be priced out of seeing their favourite artist or cheering on their favourite team. We're proposing clearer ticket pricing so Albertans know exactly what they're paying for, including fees. We're also opening the door to further protections, including potential caps on resale markups following consultation. Enjoying a concert or taking your family to a hockey game shouldn't break the bank. Albertans asked for it, and we were more than happy to deliver.

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

Investigation of Health Services Procurement

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hot on the heels of their epic referendum loss – I hate to break it to this government, but they lost the referendum – the Premier and her caucus must have been sad to see that the RCMP's probe into corrupt care is homing in on potential

fraud, breach of trust, money laundering. Ouch. The Wyant report never looked into these allegations. They did not absolve them at all. This scandal just keeps getting worse and worse for this government. When will they finally do the right thing and call a public inquiry?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice and keeper of the Great Seal.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We've already had a judicially led inquiry into the allegations that were made, and those led to 18 recommendations. I'm pleased to report that those 18 recommendations are being implemented, and we are actively pursuing each and every one of them to make sure that is happening. I want to make it clear to the member that not a single government minister, not a single staffer, not a single individual working in the public service, not a single member or private member in this Assembly was found to have been involved in any wrongdoing whatsoever by Justice Wyant or the inquiry. We're looking forward to the report coming forward by the Auditor General as well.

Mr. Eggen: Well, Mr. Speaker, given that Justice Wyant did not have all the powers of a public inquiry, which limited his investigation, given that he said right in his report, "I can only make conclusions based on the documents I was able to review and the people [that] I [was allowed to be] interviewed," which translates as unable to review countless documents, and that list of interviews did not include the Premier or her ministers, will the members opposite continue to maintain that there's nothing to see here? It sure does look like it.

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, Justice Wyant received and reviewed over a million documents and questioned countless witnesses. Every single person on this side of the aisle co-operated with the work that Justice Wyant was doing in his inquiry, including whatever he asked for by furnishing documents. Alberta Health provided countless materials, witnesses, and so on and so forth. We've implemented many of those recommendations. We're continuing to implement the rest as well, and that will improve oversight and make sure that the procurement issues are resolved.

Mr. Eggen: Well, given that Justice Wyant did not have subpoena powers and no one interviewed was required to give sworn testimony, given that of 26 people interviewed, Justice Wyant did not interview any members of the government, the political staff, including the chief of staff who was named in the original allegations, and given how incomplete this report was matters, especially as the mountains of new information from the RCMP investigations come to light, Mr. Speaker, the walls are closing in. What's this government going to do when the RCMP comes knocking on the door? [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. Order. Let's hear from the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We've said time and again that we welcome and we will co-operate with every single investigation that is happening to get to the bottom of the AHS procurement issues. We welcome the investigation from the RCMP. We certainly are looking forward to the report that is coming from the Auditor General as well, and we worked very closely with every single ministry to make sure that there was full and complete co-operation with Justice Wyant's report. As a matter of fact, not a single individual who was requested to be interviewed by Justice Wyant failed to appear.

Alberta Separatism and Government Policy

Member Gurinder Brar: Last week Albertans heard this Premier say that anyone trying to turn the UCP into a vehicle for Alberta independence should go and find another party. Even with that weak statement, prominent separatists continue to remain active and influential within the UCP, and one self-identified separatist continues to be on government benches. What, Mr. Speaker – what on earth – will it take for this Premier to remove separatists from government caucus?

The Speaker: That was clearly not a question on government policy. I expect the next one will be.

Would somebody like to answer? Go ahead, Minister.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As Albertans we believe deeply in democracy, and of course we believe deeply in our country. Albertans on this side of the House and, I think, members opposite love their country, love their province, love their home. I think that this is an opportunity for us now to say that Albertans have clearly spoken. Let's move forward and address those challenges together as a province that Albertans expect us to be addressing.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. member, on government policy, please.

Member Gurinder Brar: Given that this Premier has finally acknowledged the threat that separatism poses to Alberta and its economic future and given that Albertans have decisively rejected separatism, the question, Mr. Speaker, is no longer about what she says; it's about what she actually does. Will she tell Albertans today that she will reject this separatism as a government policy? Or should Albertans conclude that her opposition to separatism ends where her political support begins?

The Speaker: I'm just going to quickly compliment the improved second question.

Go ahead.

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you compliment the answer as well.

An Hon. Member: We'll see.

Mr. Williams: The members opposite may or may not.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has been abundantly clear. This government has been clear. Our position is clear. Albertans have spoken. This is not a province that wants to separate. Albertans do not want to. Take yes for an answer, members opposite, clearly right now from the Government House Leader's office. As well, we do have to look at what the Premier has done. What she has done is led us through, navigated an incredible deal with the federal government, with Pacific link along with billions of dollars of investment because she has been working for this province. What have members opposite done?

10:50

Mr. Nicolaides: That was a great answer.

The Speaker: The answer was also in order.

Member Gurinder Brar: Given that Albertans have made it clear that they are proud Canadians and have rejected political divisive distractions and given that while Premiers across the country were standing up for Canada in Canada, this Premier chose to spend taxpayer dollars to take a selfie with Donald Trump in Florida, will the Premier finally admit that chasing the attention of U.S. politicians

was a wrong government policy and commit to focusing on issues facing Albertans right here?

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This government and Premier will never apologize for looking out for Alberta's interests, Alberta's energy industry, and advocating for the one economy in the entire country that produced 80 per cent of the jobs in the entire country last year, five times higher job growth, and making sure that energy coming from Alberta pays for every single Canadian's infrastructure through equalization payments and paying down the debt that the disastrous Trudeau government, along with the NDP support, racked up. Even Prime Minister Carney knows that the Alberta energy industry is necessary, which is why the Premier's advocacy when it comes to energy and national-international...

The Speaker: Order. Order.

The hon. Member for Camrose has the next question.

Support for Survivors of Gender-based Violence

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Survivors of gender-based violence can face significant barriers when seeking justice. Navigating court processes, accessing legal support, and finding services in rural or in Indigenous communities can be rather challenging. Community organizations play such a vital role in helping survivors understand their options and access the support they need. To the Minister of Justice: what is Alberta's government doing to remove these barriers and ensure survivors can navigate the justice system safely and confidently?

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the hon. member for the question. Our government is and continues to be committed to ensuring that survivors of gender-based violence have the supports that they need. That's exactly why we're investing 2 and a half million dollars through the community pathways to justice grants to support 36 organizations across Alberta. These organizations will provide front-line supports, legal assistance, and system navigation to victims of gender-based violence. By supporting these organizations, we're going to see the supports go where they need to.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Camrose.

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the minister for that answer. Given that survivors of gender-based violence may feel frightened, isolated, or unsure of where to turn and given that trusted local support can make all the difference in helping someone take that first step towards safety and healing, to the Minister of Justice: can you explain why the chosen organizations are well positioned to support survivors and how their community knowledge, trusted relationships, and co-ordinated approach help connect Albertans with the services they need?

The Speaker: The minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Well, we know that these community-based organizations are always in the best position to understand the needs of the communities that they serve in, and that's why these grants support organizations that deliver direct services to survivors of gender-based violence, including providing that legal advice, the advocacy, and system navigation to victims. Our goal is to strengthen the co-ordination between legal, social, and community services so that

Albertans facing gender-based violence have the supports they need wherever they need them.

The Speaker: The hon. member.

Ms Lovely: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the minister for that answer. Given that community pathways to justice grants play such an important role in funding these programs and given the \$50,000 for these supports in my Camrose constituency, which we are very grateful for, to the Minister of Justice: can you explain how this government is committed to continuing funding for gender-based violence programs moving forward to ensure everyone facing violence can find the support they need?

The Speaker: The hon. the minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I'm incredibly honoured to be going to Camrose tomorrow to announce this grant being given to the Camrose & District FCSS. We have a remarkable MLA and advocate working in Camrose, and we recognize how important these supports are for people who are experiencing gender-based violence. That's why Alberta has a 10-year gender-based violence strategy, the most comprehensive plan in the entire country. The community pathways to justice grant is just one way of making sure that the supports get to where they're needed.

The Speaker: The next question belongs to the hon. Member for Calgary-Currie.

Investigation of Health Services Procurement (continued)

Member Eremenko: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fraud, money laundering, and hockey tickets: it sounds like a Canadian episode of *The Sopranos*.

The Speaker: Hon, member, I'm going to give you a fresh 35, but I need you to sit down for a minute, please.

Speaker's Ruling Matters Referred to the Ethics Commissioner

The Speaker: This is just for everybody's benefit, all at once. Before we proceed further, I want to make a brief comment respecting the matter of hockey tickets that was before the Ethics Commissioner. After inquiring with the commissioner about the status of the matter, I was advised the investigations had been suspended. You all had the benefit of that correspondence, which I tabled on October 27.

I have not been advised the investigations have ceased, that the Ethics Commissioner has refused to investigate, or that the matter has otherwise been disposed of under section 25(11) of the Conflicts of Interest Act. The chair is mindful that the Conflicts of Interest Act does not clearly address the effect of a suspension on the prohibition of members from inquiring into a matter under investigation.

While I'm reluctant to restrict debate or prevent members from asking questions or holding the government to account, I have to be guided by the rules in place, including section 24(6) of the Conflicts of Interest Act. As such, I would strongly encourage members to exercise restraint before raising issues related to the hockey tickets or the subject matter of the suspended but not cancelled investigations. I intend to give members the benefit of the doubt, but that does not mean anything can be said. The chair will intervene when questions or remarks stray into matters that ought not to be debated in the Assembly.

I also want to remind members that the ordinary rules and practices remain in force. Allegations of wrongdoing, personal accusations against members, or statements imputing improper or unavowed motives on the conduct will not be permitted. The chair will enforce those rules as necessary.

Subject to those considerations, the chair will assess the questions and debate as they arise. We're in slightly uncharted territory.

Go ahead with your question, please. Start over.

Member Eremenko: From the top, Mr. Speaker?

The Speaker: From the top.

Member Eremenko: Okay.

Investigation of Health Services Procurement (continued)

Member Eremenko: Fraud, money laundering, expensive gifts are behaviours that nobody would want associated with their government, but that is precisely what is happening with the UCP. It's the UCP government and an endless abuse of our health care system for their corrupt friends and insiders that have been revealed with the latest news concerning the RCMP investigation. It was revealed that the RCMP is investigating alleged fraud, breach of trust, and money laundering at Alberta Health and Alberta Health Services. Does the Premier have an explanation for this? How deep does corrupt care go?

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, it's incredibly disappointing to hear that that question tries to seek to connect the issues with Alberta health procurement with the integrity of this government. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order. You know, we heard the question clearly without interruption. Let's at least be able to hear the answer.

Mr. Amery: We've said time and again, Mr. Speaker, that we will work with and co-operate with any RCMP investigation. We continue to do that. We continue to make sure that the RCMP has everything that they need to get to the bottom of the AHS procurement issues. We know that they're doing their work, and we are giving them everything that they need to support that work.

Member Eremenko: Given that one of those investigations that the UCP uses as cover to suppose their innocence was not an independent judicial public inquiry despite the UCP's spin and given that Justice Wyant didn't even get to interview the Premier or multiple ministers of health, given that Albertans have seen enough of the corrupt tactics and endless distractions from this government, have any of the cabinet ministers opposite been contacted for the purposes of the RCMP investigation? Yes or no?

Mr. Amery: Mr. Speaker, I've said time and again, and I'll repeat for that member's benefit, that Justice Wyant interviewed everybody that he needed to interview. No cabinet minister, no private member who was asked for an interview refused. In fact, the only people that did refuse an interview with Justice Wyant were members of AHS. That's why we're eager to get to the bottom of this. That's why we're supporting the RCMP investigation, to make sure that they get to the bottom of their work to find out what happened with the procurement issues. We know from Justice Wyant's conclusions that no member of this government was involved in any wrongdoing.

Member Eremenko: Given that so many of the players in this procurement scandal, from Sam Mraiche to Jitendra Prasad to Sam Jaber, are all either friends, employees, donors, or allies of this Premier and given that this scandal gets more and more damning

with each new revelation and the buck stops with the Premier, given that the Premier's referendum distraction was a total flop, how many more millions will the Premier spend to avoid accountability?

11:00

Mr. Amery: That member didn't quite finish. "Donors to the NDP" was what I think she intended to say, Mr. Speaker. Once again, our position continues to be very clear. We will work with the RCMP. We will work with the Auditor General. We worked very closely with Justice Wyant and his judicially led inquiry to make sure that they got to the bottom of the work that they needed to do. We're looking forward to seeing what the RCMP and the Auditor General recommend because we want to get to the bottom of the procurement issues, like everyone else in this Assembly wants to.

The Speaker: The next set of questions belongs to the hon. Member for Calgary-Lougheed.

Energy Resource Revenue

Mr. Bouchard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Our province is blessed with tremendous natural resources, a strong work ethic, and entrepreneurs who help drive our economy, yet we need to ensure that more of the wealth Albertans create stays here, supports our communities, and builds our future. To the Minister of Treasury Board and Finance: what is our government doing to ensure more of Alberta's resource wealth remains in our province and benefits the Albertans who helped create it?

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that this government has been working very hard on is to be able to make sure that Albertans can have the money from our energy wealth be here for now but also for future generations. I'm very proud of the fact that this government has worked to double the size of the heritage savings trust fund in our time in government. Unfortunately, the NDP pillaged the heritage savings trust fund by 84 per cent when they were in government to try to pay for their deficits that they just had over and over and over. This government has been able to double the heritage savings trust fund since they came into power. We're well on our track, though, to getting to \$250 billion.

The Speaker: Calgary-Lougheed.

Mr. Bouchard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Given that keeping more of Alberta's wealth at home is important to all Albertans and the immense potential that even a small percentage of increased savings would provide this province and further given the opportunity we have to ensure Alberta's resource wealth can benefit all Albertans for generations to come, to the same minister: will our government consider a legislated savings rule to direct a portion of future resource revenue into long-term investments for Albertans?

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do already have some rules that will make sure that any surplus that this government sees at any time: a significant portion of it must go into the heritage savings trust fund. We would be also interested, as the heritage savings trust fund continues to grow, to have a conversation about whether or not we would even need to strengthen that legislation to continue to be able to make sure that future governments – God forbid if the NDP were ever to get on this side of the aisle – could not pillage Albertans' wealth like they did the last time that they were in power and to make sure that we can continue to save for the future. We know it's very, very important to Albertans.

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

Mr. Bouchard: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the minister. Given that retaining a greater share of Alberta's resource wealth could create new opportunities for Alberta-focused investment and given the importance of protecting those investments from the same energy sector volatility that can affect our provincial revenues, to the Minister of Treasury Board and Finance: how can our government ensure that a greater share of Alberta-focused investment does not expose public funds to the same energy sector risks that affect provincial revenue?

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, that's why it's so important, the work that we're doing with the heritage savings trust fund, because it's taking moments of high windfalls for the province because of the very unique circumstances that we have because of our energy industry and making sure that it can be used now to help pay the bills but also that we can save for future governments and future generations to be able to utilize it, to be able to benefit the province long term because of the value of what we see from oil and gas wealth inside our province. Really, at the end of the day, though, the stark difference is this. The Alberta NDP said that the Alberta advantage was done; stop investing in oil and gas. We did the opposite, and that's why you see the great benefits in the heritage savings trust fund.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I could have stopped the clock when I did offer guidance earlier. I didn't do that, but we're going to add a minute on to question period to, hopefully, not have anybody lose a question as a result.

Alberta Participation in Federal Programs

Member Campbell: Mr. Speaker, last week Albertans were asked in a referendum whether Alberta should be allowed to opt out of federal programs while still using Ottawa's money for its own. Albertans rejected that proposal in every single riding. We overwhelmingly voted against opting out of federal programs like the dental and pharmacare benefits. Despite that result, the UCP is ignoring Albertans to develop its own dental program anyway. What is the point of asking Albertans the question just to reject their answer? Does the UCP have a different definition of democracy?

The Speaker: The hon. minister of hospitals and surgical services.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to inform the members opposite that we actually had dental programs and pharmacare programs long before the federal government came to the table. In fact, our dental program provides dental coverage to the most disadvantaged in our province and seniors as well. On pharmacare we provide over 5,000 drugs to residents of Alberta. The members opposite need to understand that, also, the federal government used all of the \$1.5 billion on other provinces.

Member Campbell: Given that the UCP ignored Albertans' response in the referendum after spending a mountain of money to ask the question in the first place and given that the Premier continues to prioritize conflict with the federal government over delivering dental care benefits to Albertans, especially amid an affordability crisis, can the Premier explain why she asked Albertans for their opinion if she clearly had no intention of respecting their answer?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, this is the best relationship a Premier of Alberta has had with a Prime Minister in decades, maybe generations. The idea that we're prioritizing conflict is beyond reality. I appreciate that the member opposite wants to try and make sure that we're diligent with the dollars that we have. The reality is that the amount of money that leaves Alberta in equalization payments and transfer payments to Ottawa that members opposite

don't seem to want to claim back for policies, for services for our own residents, for our own citizens is beyond astonishment. We are about Alberta within Canada but a fair deal for Alberta. Can members opposite say the same?

The Speaker: The hon. member for . . . [interjections] Order.
Only the hon. Member for Calgary-Shaw.

Member Campbell: Given that Albertans are outraged that the government wasted all that time and millions of dollars on a referendum that appears to have changed nothing and given that this UCP continues to champion direct democracy while disregarding inconvenient results that don't line up with their agenda and given that this government's position seems to flip-flop whenever self-interest demands, why would Albertans trust a government that asks for their opinion only after it has already made up their mind?

The Speaker: The hon. . . .

Mr. Nenshi: Third time is lucky.

The Speaker: I don't think you got recognized, Leader of the Opposition, but I'm about to recognize the hon. Minister of Finance.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the relationship between the two different parties with the federal government. The NDP-Trudeau alliance, which brought in lots of things like . . . [interjection]

The Speaker: Order. Order.

Start over, Minister. I gave the member a chance and he was louder than you, so we're going to let you start over.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the NDP made an alliance with Justin Trudeau in Ottawa that brought in a job-killing carbon tax and devastation to this country and the province. Now, this government has worked very closely with the new Prime Minister and brought in things like the new west coast pipeline. But, you know, the real challenge for the NDP, all those members across from me, is because their leader in Ottawa, the leader of the NDP, will not allow them to support the west coast pipeline. Will they stop arguing in this House right now and stand up and defend the men and women of Alberta and support that pipeline?

Minimum Wage Rate

Mr. Kasawski: Right now 114,000 Albertans are earning the minimum wage. At the same time under the UCP Alberta has consistently seen high unemployment, especially amongst the youth. While the cost of groceries, utilities, and insurance continues to increase in Alberta, workers' wages have not. The UCP policy focus is giving benefits to their friends and insiders while the rest of us pay more. Why does the government think it's okay to leave minimum wage workers behind, making them work two or three jobs just to survive in our province?

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

Mr. Sigurdson: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the member for the question. I mean, honestly, when we take a look at this as a government, we're always looking at minimum wage. But the reality is that youth unemployment is already too high, and increasing the minimum wage would only make it harder for the youth to find work. Right now 95 per cent of workers in Alberta earn more than minimum wage with average weekly earnings that are the highest in the country. The majority of those earning minimum wage are young

people still living at home. Obviously, we'll still continue to look at minimum wage, and right now it is where we feel it needs to be.

11:10

Mr. Kasawski: Given that with your policy Alberta has seen the highest unemployment rates in Canada and given that this government has kicked tens of thousands of severely disabled Albertans off assured income for the severely handicapped and that I know many disabled constituents have not been able to find work despite the UCP trying to wish jobs into existence, when is this government going to stop its policy of making corrupt deals with insider friends and start making decisions to help Albertans live a life of dignity?

Mr. Sigurdson: Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. There's no Premier that's worked harder to make sure every Albertan can live with dignity than this Premier and this government. We have created jobs. Alberta has gained 305,000 jobs, which outpaces population growth and is among the fastest employment gains in the country. While Canada most recently lost 68,000 jobs, Alberta gained over 23,000. When we look at that, the best way to overcome inflation is to have the strongest economy. That's what this government is doing. One thing that . . .

The Speaker: Minister, when I stand up, that's the end of your comments.

Mr. Kasawski: Given that the Alberta NDP introduced a practical and predictable plan to increase the minimum wage without throwing off small businesses and given that our practical plan will raise the minimum wage by \$1 a year until it reaches \$18 and then have it adjusted and indexed with annual inflation and given that this will help over 114,000 Albertans working to support themselves and their families, why does the UCP continue to punish Alberta workers with a policy of poverty wages instead of fighting for them to earn a living wage?

Mr. Sigurdson: Mr. Speaker, I think we should run a record on what happened with the NDP and their policies; massive unemployment, massive insolvencies and bankruptcies. They told Albertans to go to other provinces for work. That is not how you overcome inflation. The best thing that Albertans need right now: a strong economy, jobs that they can go to work for, making sure that they have the highest incomes possible, and upward mobility. Our government is focused on that. Albertans are seeing the result of that. We're the strongest economy in the country.

The Speaker: Hon. members, in 30 seconds we will continue with the Routine.

Notices of Motions

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to give oral notice of Bill 39, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2), sponsored by the hon. Minister of Primary and Preventative Health Services.

Introduction of Bills

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Education and Childcare.

Bill 35 Education and Childcare (Securing Parental Involvement) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026

Mr. Nicolaides: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to request leave to introduce a bill being Bill 35, Education and Childcare (Securing Parental Involvement) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026.

This bill will strengthen accountability, improve transparency for parents across Alberta's education and child care systems. With that, I'm honoured to move first reading of Bill 35, the Education and Childcare (Securing Parental Involvement) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026.

[Motion carried; Bill 35 read a first time]

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Children and Family Services.

Bill 36 Children and Family Services (Supporting Alberta Families) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026

Mr. Turton: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This morning I'm delighted to rise today and move first reading of Bill 36, Children and Family Services (Supporting Alberta Families) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026.

Mr. Speaker, if passed, this bill will improve the child intervention system to better support children, youth, and families when they need help the most. I'd also like to thank the MLAs from Camrose and Calgary-Acadia for their participation on the review committee that recommended many of these amendments.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I hereby move first reading of Bill 36.

[Motion carried; Bill 36 read a first time]

The Speaker: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Bill 37 Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2026

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the Minister of Jobs, Economy, Trade and Immigration I request leave to introduce a bill being the Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2026.

[Motion carried; Bill 37 read a first time]

Bill 211 Patient Outcomes Reporting Act

Member Batten: Mr. Speaker, I rise to request leave to introduce a bill being Bill 211, the Patient Outcomes Reporting Act.

If passed, the bill would shift Alberta's health care system towards reliability measurements and publicly reporting on what matters most to Albertans. Is their care better? Is it easier to access health care? I urge all members to support transparency, accountability, and safe, reliable public health care, and I look forward to debate.

[Motion carried; Bill 211 read a first time]

Tablings to the Clerk

The Clerk: I wish to advise the Assembly that the following document was deposited with the office of the Clerk: on behalf of hon. Mr. Nally, Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction,

pursuant to An Act to End Predatory Lending, An Act to End Predatory Lending, 2025, report.

The Speaker: We're at points of order, and it turns out there are none. This is the first time we've gone to number two since I've been Speaker. Thank you to every member of the House on all sides.

Orders of the Day

Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

Bill 34

Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026

The Speaker: The hon. the Minister of Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction.

Mr. Nally: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to move second reading of Bill 34, Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026, or, as I prefer to call it, the consumer protection bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly a United Conservative team bill. It's shaped by MLAs and ministers working together to deliver for Albertans. Our government believes that when the rules aren't working for Albertans, it's our job to fix them. That's what this legislation does. It strengthens consumer protections, gives Albertans more control over what they own, stands up for landowners, and removes unnecessary barriers for business, because when Albertans spend their hard-earned money, they deserve to know that we've got their back.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Madam Speaker, let's start with vehicles. Buying a vehicle is one of the biggest investments an Albertan family can make. It's how they get to work, how they take their kids to school, and it's how they get through their day. Now imagine spending \$50,000 on a vehicle that keeps breaking down. You take it back to the dealership. They fix it. A week later you're right back where you started. That's just not right. If someone spends tens of thousands of dollars on a vehicle that can't be fixed, they shouldn't be stuck with the bill.

11:20

That's why we're proposing lemon law protections that would give Albertans options to seek a refund, replacement, or other remedy. Under our proposal, vehicles within their first three years or 60,000 kilometres could qualify if they meet certain conditions. That includes three failed attempts to fix the same problem or 12 attempts to fix different problems or 30 days without the vehicle. The point is simple. Albertans shouldn't have to fight an endless battle over a vehicle that doesn't work, and the manufacturers need to be held accountable when they can't make things right.

I want to thank the Member for Livingstone-Macleod for championing this important issue.

Madam Speaker, we're also laying the groundwork for right to repair protections. If you own something, you should have a say in who repairs it. Think about your washing machine. One part breaks, but you can't get the tools, parts, or information that you need to fix it. Instead of a simple repair, you're looking at buying a whole new machine. Well, that just doesn't make any sense.

For Alberta farmers this is a game changer. When your equipment goes down during harvest, every hour counts. You can't afford to wait for a repair or be forced to rely on a single manufacturer. Farmers deserve the freedom to fix the equipment they own and get back to doing what they do best, which is feeding Albertans and feeding the

world, Madam Speaker. That's why we're working together toward more access to the parts, tools, and information Albertans need to repair their equipment and everyday products. Now, of course safety matters, but so does giving people a fair chance about how they repair something that they've already paid for.

I want to thank the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul for his work on this and his tireless advocacy.

Madam Speaker, we're also protecting Albertans from fraud. Identity theft can turn someone's life upside down. A fraudster gets a hold of their personal information, opens accounts in their name, and leaves them to clean up the mess. That's why we're proposing credit freezes. These changes would allow Albertans to freeze their credit file to help prevent someone from opening an account in their name. They could place or lift that freeze free of charge. It's about giving Albertans more control over their financial information and helping stop fraud before it happens.

Madam Speaker, we're also taking action on ticket sales. When Albertans want to take their family to a hockey game or see their favourite artist in concert, they shouldn't be priced out by outrageous resale costs. That's why we're proposing clearer ticket pricing so Albertans know exactly what they're paying for. We're opening the door to further protections, including potential caps on resale markups following a consultation. Enjoying a concert or cheering on your favourite team shouldn't break the bank.

I want to thank the Member for Camrose for advocating for this.

Now, every time we talk about ticket sales in here, the NDP start getting all ginned up, Madam Speaker. I've got to say: the very idea that the NDP came up with an original idea is laughable. Jurisdictions have been talking about the issue with ticket resales all around the world. Jurisdictions around North America are bringing in these changes. They don't consult with Albertans, and they don't speak to industry. When they bring something to us, it's nothing more than a high school book report. So we went out and we consulted with Albertans, we listened to industry, and we're putting forward meaningful guardrails that are going to protect Albertans.

Now, we are also standing up for Alberta landowners. Our farmers and ranchers work hard, and when disputes arise over their land, they deserve a fair and timely process. We're talking about land that supports families and businesses, sometimes land that's been passed down for generations. Landowners shouldn't have to navigate a complicated system just to get their concerns heard. That's why we're re-establishing the Surface Rights Board, a dedicated place to resolve disputes with the focus and attention that these issues deserve. It's about respecting property rights and giving landowners a better path to resolution.

I want to thank the Premier for making this a priority.

Madam Speaker, we're also cutting unnecessary red tape because government shouldn't put barriers in the way of businesses without a good reason. Take lottery tickets. Albertans can buy them at gas stations, grocery stores, and convenience stores, but not liquor stores. Why not? We're proposing a pilot project allowing lottery ticket sales at up to 30 liquor stores. It's a small test. It's not a provincial-wide rollout. We're looking at the results and deciding what makes sense from there. It's about giving local businesses another opportunity and Albertans more choice while maintaining proper oversight.

Madam Speaker, some people ask me whether stronger consumer protections means more red tape, and the answer is that it doesn't. Cutting red tape doesn't mean getting rid of every rule. It means getting rid of rules that don't make sense and making sure the ones we keep actually protect Albertans. Businesses that play by the rules and treat customers fairly shouldn't be held back by unnecessary barriers, but when things go wrong, Albertans deserve protection.

That's the balance that we're striking with this legislation. Holding bad actors accountable, protecting Albertans from being ripped off, and making life easier for families and businesses: that's what red tape reduction is all about. Whether it's a family dealing with a defective vehicle, a farmer trying to repair equipment, or a landowner looking for a fair resolution, Albertans deserve a government that stands up for them. And when things go wrong, I want them to know we've got their back. That's why I'm proud to bring this legislation forward, and I encourage all members of the House to support it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there members to Bill 34? The hon. Member for Calgary-North East.

Member Gurinder Brar: Madam Speaker, I sat in the middle of a black Vespa scooter. If you google "V-E-S-P-A scooter," it will show up on Google. At the front was my dad and at the back was my mom. On a hot sunny day we were on a road with more potholes than stars in the sky. I was about five or six back then, and we were visiting a local town and doing some shopping. When we got out of the shop, we saw that the scooter didn't start. We rolled it to the nearest repair shop, got it fixed, came home late in the night.

Next morning I heard my parents talking about buying a new car. There weren't many options. In fact, there were no options except one, and that was the Maruti Suzuki 800. An Indian brand, Maruti, collaborated with the Japanese brand Suzuki to make a small family car almost the same size as a Beetle. No AC, no cassette player, no luxury.

I vividly remember the day we got our first car. It was not just a car; it was a lifestyle upgrade. The first car in our family: white exterior, grey seats, rolling handles for the windows. It was economical, cheap, absolutely amazing for fuel. Our neighbours came to congratulate us.

In spite of having no luxury in it, everyone said a million good things about it. I obviously don't remember those million things, but I do remember one good thing about that car, that one good thing that everyone mentioned. That good thing was that you could buy its parts even from a local bike shop and fix it, and it was actually true. Every other repair shop could fix that car. No original parts were needed. No special tools were required. No software codes to override. Just park it, fix it, and drive home.

Gradually the car became a very common household brand. Everyone had it, and people began fixing it themselves. Many other American and European brands tried to compete, but all failed. They failed despite having more comfort, more space, more safety features. But they were all expensive to repair. The Maruti 800 not only survived; it thrived.

11:30

Madam Speaker, I grew up seeing people fixing things. I'm sure this is true for many members in this Chamber. From fans to doorbells to tractors, we repaired it all. If anything broke, it was seen as an opportunity to have some fun. As a kid, we would open up our toys and then ignite our imaginative mind. We were little engineers in the making. It was not just about fixing things. It was about bringing them back to life. That was a feeling when you got anything fixed. Even though I am personally not great at fixing things, I loved when my dad told me to hold the tools when he was fixing things, when my brother asked me to hand him anything that was missing while he was fixing things.

Madam Speaker, fixing things is not about being cheap. It was not only about saving money, but about protecting our environment. When I came to Canada in 2011, me and my brother went out to get his car fixed at a repair shop. When my brother parked there, the guy came up to us and said he was going to take one part of the car,

throw it away, and put the new one. There was no concept of fixing it. The concept was of replacing it.

When you come to this country as a new immigrant, you're curious about almost everything, just like a new kid, a toddler, trying to put fingers in almost every open socket, that curious mind. You multiply when you go to a grocery store. You look at the prices, and you multiply it with your home currency value. You're just curious about how these tall buildings are there, who built them, almost everything.

I was also curious and asked my brother: why can't these guys fix this part instead of replacing this part? He told me that it just doesn't make business sense. It's easy to take it, throw it, replace it. It's cheaper for them. Sure, it could be cheaper, but it's not cheaper for the future generations. It's not cheaper for the planet. It's not cheaper for the customers, consumers.

When we came back home, we were sitting at a dining table. That thing was still stuck in my mind. I started discussing it with my uncle as well, and he also gave me the same answer. Nobody actually thought that it was not the right thing to do. Everyone thought about the dollar value, the money, and the business case.

Madam Speaker, this summer I was in Toronto, and I was walking through the aquarium with my 14-month-old baby in my baby carrier. We took selfies with tiny fishes, huge octopus, and sharks. But as we were exiting that aquarium, my eyes stopped, focused, and in fact rolled when I saw a screen hanging on the wall. It had slides running on it. The first slide that I saw read that as of 2021 there were at least 363,732,605 pounds of plastic pollution in the world's oceans. The next slide: over 1 million aquatic animals are killed each year due to ocean pollution. The third slide, that every minute two garbage trucks of plastic are being dumped into our oceans. There are five trillion pieces of plastic debris in our oceans. Five trillion. Imagine a standard two-by-four Lego brick. Five trillion bricks would wrap around the Earth's equator 4,000 times. It would wrap around the moon more than 14,500 times. That's how much five trillion pieces are.

Madam Speaker, today humanity faces big questions, and these questions deserve bold steps. It's not just about NDP or UCP or progressives or conservatives because when we face catastrophic natural disasters . . .

The Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, hon. member. We're about two minutes into your speech and while it's lovely and I am enjoying the journey that we are on, I fail to see how it has anything to do with the bill at hand. We are in second reading of Bill 34. Let's tangentially at least talk about this bill at hand. Please continue.

Member Gurinder Brar: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I was also enjoying it. Let's enjoy it all together, and I will come to the bill very soon in the next 30 seconds. Thank you.

My point was that it's not about partisanship; it's about the components of this bill. That's where I was headed to. It's not about the colours of our parties; it's about the issues that this bill talks about. The questions that we face today that this bill is addressing are: how do we give power back to people to repair their products? How do we block wealthy tech companies from misusing their power to take the right-to-repair away from Albertans? How do we make sure that Albertans' identities are protected? And how do we become responsible citizens so we leave this planet in better shape than what we got from our previous generations? If we are able to fix our stuff and keep it in use until it's unfixable, we can keep it out of waste.

Madam Speaker, in 2013 average U.S. households had 28 digitally driven gadgets. If we multiply it with 123 million households, it would end up to 3.5 billion pieces of e-waste.

Madam Speaker, I will say three things about this bill. The first is thank you.

Mr. Nally: Hear, hear.

Member Gurinder Brar: Thank you, not to this UCP government. [interjections] Yeah. I mean, you need to build a little bit more patience to listen.

Thank you to my colleague from Edmonton-Manning who has been advocating for the right-to-repair act on behalf of all the Alberta farmers who desperately need this bill. Second, thank you to my colleague the MLA for Edmonton-Meadows, who introduced the private member's bill to protect the credit identity of Albertans. Third, thank you to those grassroots organizations who have reached out to me personally – and I'm sure they have met with the members from the other side as well – who have been advocating for the right-to-repair.

11:40

The second thing I want to say is that these are good ideas. It's the right thing to do. We must give the power back to people. We must give the power back to small businesses in our communities who are there to fix things, who are there to open these places, make our community vibrant, hire people, and create jobs. I want to give one example of a charity called Tech Dump in Minnesota, United States. They fix things. They repair the broken stuff. Not only do they do that, they hire young people who are just out of the criminal justice system. They invest in them, they teach them, they put them back to work. They create jobs, lift people out of poverty. They sell the repaired stuff back in the community, and any money that they make out of it, they reinvest it in training. How wonderful is that? That's so good for the community, for the economy, and for the planet, Madam Speaker. That is why these are good ideas, good things in this bill that will make the future more sustainable for the generations to come.

The third thing I want to say is: too late. As I have already mentioned, my colleagues have put forward this private member's bill to protect the credit of Albertans. Unfortunately, during that time, last spring session, this government was focused on a divisive referendum instead of getting things done that really matter to Albertans. They voted that private member's bill down. Now that's the exact same thing that they are bringing forward, which we are happy to support. We are not here to play divisive politics. We are here to get things done for Albertans, to advocate the issues that matter to Albertans.

Madam Speaker, I myself am a victim of identity fraud. When I was planning to buy my new place a couple of months ago, I applied for my mortgage, and my mortgage broker told me that I have a low credit score. I went onto the website of Trans Union, and Trans Union showed that I have a credit score of about 800. I was a bit surprised. How did it happen? What is wrong? Where's the gap? I sent that screenshot, downloaded the report, and sent it to my mortgage broker. My mortgage broker told me that they do not accept Trans Union. They accept the other credit agency that monitors the credit. When I went onto their website, I logged in, and I was surprised to see that my address was wrong, my occupation was wrong. I had some missing payments on my account. I had some credit cards that were unpaid from my account, and none of those belonged to me.

I was surprised because one credit union was showing that everything was right; the other credit union was telling me that it's not correct. I had to fight. I had to file a complaint. I had to follow up. It took me more than a month to get it fixed.

Had this government passed that private member's bill brought forward by my colleague from Edmonton-Meadows, it might not have directly benefited me, but it might have benefited lots of Albertans who have gone through the same struggle that I went through after that private member's bill was voted down. But I am

glad that those ideas are back in the House, I am glad that we are discussing something real that Albertans are facing, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. Nally: Hear, hear.

Member Gurinder Brar: Yeah. We can do that. No problem.

But, Madam Speaker – once again you guys are a step ahead, so calm down – this is the only thing the UCP is doing to help Albertans save money. That's not enough. You guys can do more, and let me suggest how you can do that better.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I want to suggest that the government can go to one wonderful website and they can steal a whole bunch of ideas. The website is albertandp.ca/savemoney. We have already put forward the plan called the Alberta affordability agenda. These guys can go ahead and increase the minimum wage, which is the lowest in the country and hasn't gone up a single cent. These guys can lower the cost of groceries. These guys can make life more affordable for Albertans.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there others? The hon. Member for Calgary-Elbow.

Member Kayande: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my honour to rise to speak to Bill 34, red tape reduction number whatever it is. There are a couple of things that I do want to talk about about this bill. One is that it includes the reconstitution of the Surface Rights Board. For many Albertans it's incredibly unclear what surface rights are, why we need a board for that, and how incredibly important this is to rural landowners to protect the value of the most important investment that they have, which is the land that they sit upon.

In Alberta most of the mineral resources are owned by the people. They're owned by the people and administered by the government of Alberta. That's why we have a system in which oil and gas companies are required to pay royalties and bonus payments for the right to extract resources from mineral resources that are located by definition underground. Those extractions require some surface presence.

Now, that surface presence is much smaller than it would have been 50, 70 years ago, back in the days when oil wells were drilled vertically and had a relatively small amount of drainage. Now we have large pads that extend massive, long vertical wells of three, four, sometimes even longer kilometres, massive drainage areas, which means in aggregate that the surface presence of oil and gas facilities is definitely less than it would have been 50 years ago. However, what it does do is it concentrates the surface facilities onto a smaller number of landowners.

This is the thing. When the mineral estate is owned by somebody other than the surface owner, the law must be that the surface owner cannot prevent the mineral owner from accessing the reservoirs that they have paid good money in good faith in order to access. This leads to conflicts because the surface owner wants to use their land that they own and that they bought and that they own free and clear of all encumbrances and the mineral owner also wants to be able to access their share, the resource that they have paid to access.

11:50

How do we mediate these conflicts? It has been the legal tradition in Alberta that there is a Surface Rights Board that exists to mediate the conflicts that naturally arise from having a different set of interests between surface rights owners and mineral rights holders. The UCP government ended the Surface Rights Board, and the problem with that and the predictable consequence of that is that

surface landowners found themselves unable to hold irresponsible operators to account. Who would have thought – who would have thought – that dismantling an accountability mechanism would have made for less accountability? What a shocker.

Six short years after that fateful decision that our party voted against – six short years after that – somebody finally looked up and said: wow, we've got a problem. And this is the problem. Somebody on the government side looked up and said: "We've got a problem. We lost the Calgary-Shaw by-election." There isn't a single safe seat in Calgary anymore for the UCP. Not only that, but losing Calgary-Shaw, which the UCP won by some 40 points in 2019 – that's a 44-point swing – means there aren't a whole lot of safe seats left in the rest of the province.

And rural landowners were super irritated – super irritated – about irresponsible operators who didn't clean up their messes, who didn't make the payments that they were contractually obligated to make. Their mechanism for settling those went to a generalist body that didn't understand the nuances of how these agreements work, and boy, if you don't think that landowners understand every single comma in their surface rights agreement, you haven't talked to a lot of landowners. There are landowners who used to be regarded with fear in downtown Calgary office towers because they knew what their rights were and they knew what the mechanism of enforcing those rights was.

You know, I certainly don't want to make it seem as though this is a battle between office towers and landowners. It's not. What it is is the requirement that if you sign an agreement, you have to live up to the terms of that agreement, and if you're not, you should pay the consequences.

So I'm grateful that the Surface Rights Board is going to be reconstituted. I am also a little bit annoyed that it hasn't existed for the last six years and now this entirely new mechanism has to be rebuilt from the ground up, re woven from whole cloth to fix a problem that this government created.

It's fundamental to the nature of government, to the nature of being governed in a free and open society that government is there when you need it and out of your way when you don't. Sadly, this government has shown that it's very eager to get involved in places where people don't want it, like separation referendums, and very reluctant and extremely slow and screaming, "Oh, my God, too much red tape" when very, very real problems that government is designed to solve are not being handled properly. So nice work. Take the W.

Let's step over to another piece of this bill, the credit freeze and ticket transfer transparency. The Member for Edmonton-Meadows proposed a credit freeze bill which was derided as being unnecessary red tape. Again, government protection being derided as unnecessary red tape. Okay. Fine.

Also, ticket transfer fees. Included in the Member for Calgary-Currie's additional ticket transfer fee regulation were provisions to allow for subscription cancellation to be as easy as signing up. If you've got one click to sign up, you should have one click to leave. And boy, if I had a dollar for every time the minister said that credit freezes and ticket transfer transparency were unnecessary red tape, I'd have enough dollars to buy a beer at an Oilers game, but I wouldn't be able to get into a skybox. That's for ministers alone.

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

There is a fundamental problem in society where people genuinely feel as though they're in hock to tech monopolists who are taking their paycheques subscription fee by subscription fee every month. They feel as though, Albertans feel as though, we feel as though – I'm included in there – our paycheques are being

grabbed by billionaires one monthly subscription at a time. It's awful, and this government offers no protection in this bill from that.

The Member for Calgary-Currie actually had a better bill, and if this government had passed that bill, if they had voted for it, we would have those protections in place for six months longer than we have them now. So on the one hand, I'm thinking, "Thank you, Minister, for showing the people what an NDP government would be like," but on the other hand I'm thinking: why did it take you losing a sure by-election riding in order to do the right thing?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I'll recognize the Member for Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright.

Mr. Rowswell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today to speak in support of Bill 34, the Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. At its core this legislation is about protecting consumers, giving Albertans more control over the products they own, and ensuring people have fair and practical tools available when things go wrong. It's about updating Alberta's laws to reflect the challenges people face in the real world. Most importantly, it's about standing up for ordinary Albertans and making sure they are treated fairly in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, every Albertan is a consumer. Whether we are buying vehicles, repairing an appliance, purchasing event tickets, monitoring our credit, or operating a farm, we all expect a basic level of fairness. We expect businesses to stand behind their products, we expect access to clear information, and we expect governments to create a framework that protects consumers when problems arise. This is exactly what the bill seeks to accomplish.

One of the most significant aspects of the legislation is the creation of stronger protection for Albertans who purchase defective vehicles, often referred to as lemon law protections. Mr. Speaker, purchasing a vehicle is one of the largest financial decisions many people will ever make. Families save for years to afford a vehicle. Workers depend on their vehicles to get to their jobs. Parents rely on them to get children to school, sports, appointments, and countless activities.

When someone purchases a vehicle, they have a right to expect that they will be able to operate safely and reliably. Unfortunately, that is not always the case. While most vehicles perform as expected, some experience serious manufacturing defects that cannot be resolved despite repeated repair attempts. In those situations Albertans can find themselves trapped in a frustrating cycle of breakdowns, repairs, repair bills, and lost time. They may spend months returning to dealerships only to encounter the same problem over and over again. That's not fair.

12:00

This legislation recognizes the reality and creates a path for consumers facing significant and persistent defects. Under these proposed changes vehicle owners would be able to seek remedies through the courts when repeated repair attempts fail to correct serious manufacturing issues. Potential remedies could include refunds, replacements, buybacks, or other forms of compensation where the legal requirements are met. Mr. Speaker, these changes are about accountability. They recognize that consumers should not bear the burden when a product repeatedly fails to function as intended. They provide Albertans with stronger protections while encouraging confidence in our marketplace.

This bill also introduces the right-to-repair framework. I believe this is another extremely important step forward. Many Albertans have experienced the frustration of owning a product but feeling unable to repair it. Sometimes repair information is unavailable.

Sometimes replacement parts are difficult to obtain. In other cases consumers are limited to a single repair option even when other qualified repair providers are available. That can drive up costs and reduce consumer choice.

Mr. Speaker, when Albertans purchase something, whether it's a vehicle, a piece of farm equipment, an appliance, or an electronic device, they should have reasonable options when repairs are needed. These proposed changes would require manufacturers to make repair manuals, tools, diagnostic information, and replacement parts available in situations where they are not currently accessible. This would help consumers repair products themselves or choose an independent repair provider if they wish. This legislation is not only about affordability; it is about practicality. It can help reduce waste, it can extend the lifespan of valuable equipment, and it can support independent repair businesses that serve communities across the province.

Mr. Speaker, another important aspect of the bill addresses the issue that, unfortunately, affects far too many people today, identity theft and fraud. As technology evolves, fraudsters continue finding new ways to access personal information and open unauthorized accounts. For victims the consequences can be serious. It can take months or even years to resolve fraudulent activity. Personal finances can be disrupted, credit ratings can be affected, stress and uncertainty can follow. That is why these amendments would allow Albertans to freeze or restrict access to their credit reports. By adding this tool, consumers would have greater control over their personal credit information and stronger protection against unauthorized credit applications. This is a common-sense measure that puts more power directly into the hands of consumers.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation also seeks to improve transparency in the ticket resale market. Many Albertans have likely experienced the disappointment of finding tickets advertised at one price only to discover significant markups, fees, and service charges before completing a purchase. Consumers deserve transparency. They deserve clear information when making purchasing decisions. These changes would improve disclosure requirements and provide authority to regulate resale pricing, fees, service charges, and record-keeping requirements. That means greater transparency and fairer experience for consumers.

Mr. Speaker, while consumer protections represent a major focus of this legislation, there are additional changes that deserve recognition. This bill would re-establish the Surface Rights Board as a dedicated forum for handling surface rights disputes involving private land and resource development. Property rights matter. Albertans deserve a system that is accessible, specialized, and focused on resolving disputes efficiently and fairly. These amendments would help ensure landowners have access to a dedicated body capable of addressing compensation, damages, right-of-entry matters, and unpaid compensation concerns. This is particularly important for rural Albertans, farmers, ranchers, and landowners who often face complex issues involving energy development and infrastructure on private lands.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also includes provisions that would allow Alberta Gaming, Liquor and Cannabis to conduct a pilot project for the sale of lottery tickets in select liquor stores. The purpose of the pilot is to assess customer demand and evaluate whether broader implementation may be appropriate in the future. Existing lottery retailers would continue to operate while the pilot gathers information and data.

Taken together, these measures demonstrate a practical and balanced approach to improving services, reducing barriers, and strengthening consumer protection. Mr. Speaker, what I appreciate most about this legislation is that it focuses on issues that directly affect everyday Albertans. These are not abstract concepts. These are challenges people encounter in their daily lives. A family

purchasing a defective vehicle, a farmer trying to repair equipment, a senior concerned about fraud, a consumer purchasing event tickets, a landowner seeking fair treatment: these are real situations affecting real people. This bill recognizes those challenges and responds with practical solutions designed to improve fairness, transparency, choice, and accountability.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this legislation represents a meaningful step forward for consumer protection in Alberta. It strengthens rights, expands choice, promotes accountability, and provides Albertans with additional tools to protect themselves and their families. The measures contained in Bill 34 reflect a commitment to fairness and common sense. They put consumers first, support property rights, and modernize the protection Albertans expect in today's economy.

I encourage all members of the Assembly to support this important legislation and vote in favour of Bill 34. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Are there others? The Member for Calgary-Falconridge.

Member Boparai: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak to Bill 34 and to explain why Alberta's NDP will be supporting this legislation. We support Bill 34 because it contains measures that will improve consumer protections for Albertans. It introduces protections relating to defective vehicles, the right to repair, credit report security, and transparency in ticket resales. These are important steps that can help Albertans save money and protect themselves from unfair practices.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is something important that must be acknowledged. Many of the best ideas in Bill 34 are ideas first proposed by Alberta's NDP. So today I will give credit where credit is due. I want to thank the government for finally recognizing that these ideas have merit. I want to thank them for implementing policies that Alberta's NDP have been advocating for for many, many years.

The problem is not that they're adopting our ideas. The problem is that they rejected the same ideas when Alberta's NDP proposed them. Had the government acted sooner, Albertans would already be benefiting from stronger protections. Had they listened when my colleague the Member for Edmonton-Meadows introduced protections against credit fraud, Albertans could have had access to credit freezes months earlier. Had they listened when my colleague the Member for Calgary-Currie introduced transparent ticket pricing legislation, consumers could have been protected from hidden fees and price surprises much sooner. Instead, Albertans had to wait while the government voted these proposals down only to bring many of them back later under a different bill. Mr. Speaker, if these policies are worth passing today, they were worth passing when they were first introduced.

One of the most significant changes in this legislation is the introduction of lemon law protections. For many Albertans purchasing a vehicle is one of the largest financial investments they will ever make. People should not be trapped with a vehicle that repeatedly breaks down despite multiple repair attempts. Families need reliable transportation to get to work, take children to school, attend medical appointments, and participate in their communities.

12:10

I support the principle behind these protections. However, I'm concerned that consumers may still have to rely on court proceedings to obtain remedies. Many ordinary Albertans do not have the time or resources to engage in lengthy legal battles. A truly effective lemon law should provide consumers with a fast, practical, and accessible path to replacement or compensation. Alberta families deserve a system that works for them, not one that creates additional barriers.

Mr. Speaker, another area where this bill makes progress is the right to repair. For years farmers, small-business owners, and consumers have been asking government to address this issue. When a farmer owns a combine, when a business owner owns equipment, or when a family buys an appliance, they should have the freedom to decide where and how it gets repaired. Too often manufacturers restrict access to parts, tools, and repair information. The result is higher costs, reduced competition, and unnecessary delays. A farmer during harvest should not have to wait days for an authorized technician when a repair could be completed immediately.

Mr. Speaker, right-to-repair policies support competition, lower costs, and greater consumer choice. This is something Alberta's NDP has advocated for because we believe ownership should actually mean ownership. If you bought it, you should be able to fix it. I hope the regulations that follow preserve the spirit of these reforms and do not create loopholes that weaken consumer protections.

Mr. Speaker, fraud is another growing concern. Every year Canadians lose hundreds of millions of dollars to fraud schemes and identity theft. Bill 34 will allow Albertans to place restrictions on access to their credit reports. This is a good policy, but it is also worth remembering that Alberta's NDP introduced these same protections through Bill 210. At that time the same government voted no. Today they are effectively saying yes. Again, I welcome the change of heart, but Albertans should never have to wait this long. The best time to protect consumers was when these ideas were first proposed. The second best time is now.

The same story applies to ticket resale protections. Consumers deserve transparency. When a ticket is advertised at one price and a much higher amount appears during checkout because of hidden fees and charges, consumers rightly feel frustrated. Albertans deserve honesty and transparency from ticket sellers. We support stronger disclosure requirements and clear pricing information. However, Mr. Speaker, these protections could already be helping families today if the government had supported Alberta NDP proposals when they were originally brought forward.

Mr. Speaker, while we support Bill 34, we must also recognize its limitations. Consumer protection matters, but Alberta families are facing a much broader affordability crisis. People in Calgary-Falconridge and all over Alberta tell me every day that they are worried about rising costs. They are worried about fiscal mismanagement by this government. They're worried about wasting millions and millions of dollars on an unnecessary referendum. They're worried about paying their utility bills. They're worried about insurance rates. They're worried about housing. They're worried about the rising cost of everyday necessities. This legislation provides some positive tools for consumers, but it does not go nearly far enough to address the affordability pressures facing families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill re-establishes the Surface Rights Board. This government eliminated that board just a few years ago and is now bringing it back. If the government believes specialized expertise improves dispute resolution, then perhaps it is recognizing that eliminating the board in the first place was a mistake. And they must admit it and apologize to all Albertans. Regardless, Alberta's NDP will always support practical measures that improve services and provide fairness for Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, Bill 34 contains important consumer protections. We support these protections. We support Albertans' right to repair what they own. We support stronger protection from fraud. We support transparent ticket pricing, and we support protections for consumers dealing with defective vehicles. But we will continue advocating for stronger enforcement, meaningful implementation, and real affordability measures for Alberta families. Most importantly, we will continue reminding this government that good ideas should be judged on their merits, not on who proposes them.

Because when Alberta's NDP brings forward solutions that help Albertans, the government should pass them the first time, not years later after families have already paid the price.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: I recognize the Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Member Ceci: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Of course I'm on the topic of Bill 34, Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. I won't be repetitive of some of the things that my colleagues have said. I will amplify a few of those points that they made very well before us, and those points include that what we're dealing with in Bill 34 is several watered-down implementations of Alberta NDP proposals. Those are on ticketing protections, credit card fraud protections, and establishing the right-to-repair policies. There are a few other things in here, and I heard the minister speak to those earlier today, and some of my colleagues have touched on those things today, too.

I want to touch on a couple of those, particularly the one called, well, lemon laws. It's talked about the right-to-repair lemon laws. In Europe they don't call them lemon laws, but they have the same sorts of things. They call them – just let me see here – consumer sales directives. Essentially they're the same thing. Lemon laws exist in 50 states and in one jurisdiction in Canada, one provincial jurisdiction. And, you know, it's too bad that we didn't have the same sorts of things in this province several months ago as a result of the proposals by colleagues on my side. That's unfortunate that the partisan nature of this Chamber has it that you just can't take a suggestion from the opposite side and put it into a bill, work it, get the regulations going to protect Albertans as soon as a good idea comes up.

12:20

Unfortunately, that's not what the members on the other side do. They wait, they delay, they take good ideas and bring them back and say that they're their own, which I know they're not because I heard them proposed in bills by my colleagues months and months and months ago.

My colleague from Calgary-North East was talking a lot about the ability to fix things, and he used an example from the United States. I think he talked about Michigan or Minnesota, one of those places where there was a rather unique kind of charity that helped people fix things that broke down and resold them and kind of helped those who were leaving incarceration to get meaningful work. I want to . . .

Mr. Dach: Repurpose therapy.

Member Ceci: Yeah. Repurpose them.

I want to say that there's a much closer example to us all, and it's in Calgary. It's a small-appliance repair rodeo or organization. The organization that does that is the Arusha Centre, and they have been doing small-appliance repair, helping Calgarians and others fix things that break down in their homes. Instead of throwing them out, they bring people together, have other kinds of experienced people at the same tables, and they can show them how to fix these things. The Arusha Centre in my riding has been doing this kind of thing for many, many years. It just shows you what ingenuity happens and takes place when, you know, a lot of folks don't have a lot of money to go out and buy and replace their items that break down.

So the right to repair that's in this bill is a great thing that's coming, and it'll help Albertans out. I certainly support legislation that expands consumer protections as much as possible, and we'll see what the regulations do in that regard.

The other part of this I wanted to just address briefly is the whole idea that there'll be a pilot program around buying lottery tickets in

liquor stores. You know, I'm not sure that's the best place for all of this. I think keeping liquor stores somewhat focused on what their primary business is is a good thing, and a pilot program with 30 potential licensees being able to sell lottery tickets across the province in all parts of the province: we'll see what it does, but I'm not sold at this point in time.

I think there are other places in the country that de facto do these sorts of things already. Why can't we learn from those experiences, say in Ontario in particular, in Quebec perhaps? There is alcohol sold in corner stores as a result of the Premier in that province opening that up. Why do we have to have a pilot program here? Why can't we just get the information from other places, find out how it's going, and then come back to this place with that information, or through committee, and find out the results of all of that?

Those are some of my comments with regard to this. I appreciate my colleague in Edmonton-Meadows for bringing forward the ideas about credit card protection before it was even a gleam in the eye of the people on the other side, my colleague from Edmonton-Manning doing the same sorts of things and standing up for the rights of farmers to look at equipment that they have and say: you know, why can't we find a better way to repair this on the farm or through registered people who have the skills and abilities to do that? I appreciate those ideas coming forward in the context of this place months ago and just wish that the other side would take good ideas, put them into effect right away, and not delay the protections and the abilities of Albertans to have good legislation before them as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker: Are there others?

The Member for Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Dach: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A pleasure to rise for the first time this fall session to speak to Bill 34, Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026. I'll focus my comments primarily on a couple of aspects of this bill. I did want to start off by saying that it focuses on changes which fall into rather broad categories: consumer protection, the lottery ticket pilot project, then re-establishment of the surface rights tribunal. They do address some significant concerns – defective vehicles and right to repair, credit protections, ticket reselling – however, there are some major concerns that I have, and I think Albertans may be asking themselves, about the pieces of legislation when you actually think on it and go right through the process.

For example, many of us in this Legislature, including here on the opposition benches, have a significant proximity to farming families, and in fact we were maybe one generation or not even a generation removed from being on the farm. I'm no different. My father and grandfather had farms and, of course, when equipment broke down, there was no question about having the manufacturer telling them they couldn't fix their own cultivator or get the tractor going again. They got together, and you cobbled it, whatever you had to do. You fixed that piece of equipment to get it going so that you could finish your harvest or your seeding or whatever you happened to be doing on the farm.

Now fast-forward to this generation of farmers where a combine costs you over a million bucks, and you're being told in the middle of a harvest season that you can't fix your own equipment. It has been frustrating many, many people in the agricultural sector for a long time, so it's important to address this prohibition on the rights of agricultural producers to repair their own equipment; however, the fact remains that there's a huge lobby from the equipment manufacturers to prevent this type of legislation. That's one of the

reasons, I believe, that we haven't seen it come forward in previous years, because the lobby has been so effective.

The details of the enforcement of this type of legislation, particularly when it comes to large equipment like combines and farm equipment, tractors, other major vehicles, is that the resistance from the manufacturers will not relent just because this legislation has been passed. So I'm concerned that the ability of the government to enforce this legislation has not been fully addressed. It remains an unknown piece of territory, to see how effective this legislation will be when it comes to a situation where an agricultural producer actually goes ahead and repairs his or her own equipment and then faces some type of a stall or delay, some type of tactic or strategy on the part of the manufacturer to accomplish what they have been doing in the past by way of simply denying the right to self-repair, but doing it by delay or by stealth or other means. How, in fact, will that type of noncompliance be addressed? That doesn't seem to be something that's contemplated in this piece of legislation.

I'm sure every farmer who owns a combine and who's just finished their harvest is thinking: "Okay. What actually happens? How is this actually going to work when it comes to a breakdown in the field? Am I going to face delay, or if I am facing a delay or noncompliance by the manufacturer to get some stick in the spokes of my repair work, where I'm getting denied parts or I'm getting denied service technicians, there's a delay in actual communications." There are any number of ways that a major corporation can decide by policy that they're not going to comply.

I'm wondering what teeth, what measures are in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that would actually have the ability to force a manufacturer to be compliant. You know, the intention is great, but I think that when it comes to actual, in-the-field work and enforcement, I don't know if this piece of legislation has been well thought through on this front. It's a massive undertaking. When we're talking about anything from toasters to tractors, that's a pretty wide array of items that we're basically guaranteeing to the consumer that they'll have the right to repair on their own, yet there doesn't seem to be an effective measure to actually enforce compliance, particularly with the big-ticket items. That's a significant concern that I have, and I'd certainly like to hear, perhaps in later debate, the government address how they plan to enforce the consumer protection items in the right-to-repair legislation piece of this bill.

12:30

I also wanted to say that it's laudable that we're seeing this surface rights tribunal be re-established, but my goodness, we've had six years where the lineups for the appeals and the requests for arbitration have gone through the roof. I think the minister mentioned 4,000, and of course he says that's too many. Well, goodness. Why are we at that level? Because six years ago the surface rights tribunal was dissolved, and it was a mistake. A minister by his own admission telling this House that the number of appeals and the number of applications for resolution of disputes between landowners and particularly energy companies has soared in the ensuing six years since that legislation was passed to eliminate the surface rights tribunal: I mean, it's admission of a glaring error that should have been foreseen but was not by this government.

So we're focusing on things that the government is trying to do to protect consumers, yet the most glaring thing that consumers are feeling the crunch over right now is going to the grocery store and buying enough food for their family to eat, Mr. Speaker. I see nothing in this consumer protection legislation that addresses the number one concern of Albertans and that is food cost, the price of finding food for your family.

Like, I was at a local grocery store recently, about three or four days ago, and there's a gentleman ahead of me at a checkout. He had four big jugs of homo milk, the four-litre jugs of homo milk, and carried them out. He just happened to be parked in front of my vehicle. As he was packing the homo milk, the four big jugs of milk into his car, I could hear his babies in the back of the minivan, and I remarked to him. I said, "Man, it must cost a fortune to keep those kids in milk these days, the price of milk being what it is." He said, with a really sad and despondent face, to me: "It's the best I can do. I can't afford the formula." I thought: my God, what a horrible predicament to be in as a family man, as a father of children, young babies, where you've got to make a decision about buying homo milk in lieu of baby formula to sustain your kids.

That's the number one consumer protection that I'd like to see, Mr. Speaker, as far as legislation to make life better for Albertans and make groceries more affordable. That's the number one concern that people have in this province, never mind milk versus formula. It's, I mean, not even hamburger versus steak. It costs 10 bucks just to look at a steak, Mr. Speaker, so I see the efforts of the government here to try to focus on protecting consumers. But the major thing that they miss is what is most high on the priority list of Albertans, and that is the cost of food to survive and sustain their families.

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

Those are the two items that I wanted to speak about. Of course, buying a vehicle and then finding out that you have problems with it and have repeated attempts to get it fixed with no success and then getting denied further help from your dealer or the motor vehicle branch where you bought the vehicle from is more than frustrating. It's time consuming and it's super expensive, and it can be completely financially ruinous to a family who has undertaken the second-largest expense that they will ever undertake, and that's to buy a vehicle to transport their family. That effort, the effort to make sure that people who have suffered repeated denials to rectify a problem with a vehicle that they bought, is something that we hope actually works. Once again, we hope it actually has some teeth because, like the consumer protection proposed under this piece of legislation with respect to right-to-repair, there seems to be a definite lack of teeth on the enforcement side, Madam Speaker.

I don't know if the government has really gone to that extent to determine the so-called lemon laws. If indeed noncompliance happens, what effective measures are there to enforce compliance, what penalties are there, and will they be enough to overcome the long-term lobby that we've seen in this province and globally, actually, from manufacturers of large equipment vehicles and farm equipment and so forth? We'll see that that lobby continues to be effective and that the teeth that this legislation does not have does not enable government to enforce compliance.

I don't buy a lot of tickets, Madam Speaker, but I know that the prices for things have gone through the roof. Most Albertans are not seriously contemplating buying too many tickets, especially to hockey games, because it costs – I don't know – half a car payment to buy a ticket these days. I don't know that they're worried about buying tickets for the most part. They're worried about buying milk for their babies.

With that, Madam Speaker, I'll allow others to comment on this piece of legislation and take my seat, but I hope the government really considers what enforcement requirements this bill lacks and perhaps seeks to ensure that they are strengthened so that we can actually have this bill be meaningful and useful.

The Deputy Speaker: Are there others that wish to join this debate? The hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview.

Ms Sigurdson: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker, and it's my pleasure to join debate on Bill 34. Of course, the Alberta NDP are focused on supporting Albertans. We're all in an affordability crisis, and Albertans deserve a government that advocates for them. Sadly, this is not what the UCP are doing currently. There are so many issues, many articulated by my colleague from Edmonton-McClung just now.

But this bill, Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 – you know, actually, the contents of much of this bill could have passed in the spring session of this year. However, instead, Albertans were left to languish for months. Let's just review the history a little bit about previous legislation that was tabled in this House that did not pass because of the UCP government. Certainly, we know my colleague the MLA for Calgary-North East has been a strong advocate in terms of consumer protections, making sure Albertans have the supports they need as the shadow minister for service Alberta. Also, the MLA for Calgary-Currie, the NDP MLA, put forward a private member's bill, Bill 209, consumer protection for credit card fraud, in spring of 2026. Also, the NDP MLA for Edmonton-Meadows put forward a private member's bill in the spring session, Bill 210, fraud prevention measures.

These two pieces of legislation, actually, the UCP has used to create this new bill today, but sadly there have been months where that legislation could have been passed. Albertans would have been supported to have consumer protection, but unfortunately the government chose not to vote for that bill, and it really is kind of a waste of time, money, resources, and, of course, leaving Albertans languishing, as I say.

What I want to remind the government of is that, actually, both sides of the House can work together, and we have worked together many times. I'm dismayed that the government felt they had to bring forward this legislation, their own government bill, instead of supporting the NDP private member's bill in the spring.

12:40

This is just a little bit of history that's not even that long ago, you know, the silver alert bill. When I was the minister of seniors and housing, I worked very closely with the UCP MLA for Drayton Valley-Devon. He brought forward that legislation into the House because he was concerned about seniors who may go missing, wander. Like the Amber Alert that we have for young people, he brought forward a silver alert, and I worked with him. At that time we had the office of the Seniors Advocate. She worked extensively with him to do research for that bill. We worked collaboratively and – guess what – that bill passed unanimously.

I'm just wanting to bring this forward to the current government because it can happen. Certainly, when we were government, that was passed unanimously. It could have been passed in the fall, and we wouldn't be wasting time now talking about these things. Another bill that came forward when we were opposition, and it was my private member's bill, was about addressing senior supports. Again, actually, the UCP was government then, and they voted in favour of that.

I just want to make sure that all members of the House, you know, especially the UCP, realize that they can support private members' bills that aren't their own. They can be the NDP's bills, and that actually makes for good government. I just would encourage the members because what we're looking at today is legislation that was already introduced in the House in the spring session by the NDP. Instead, the UCP are using our ideas, which are great, of course, but needing to put them under their own label, and that's unfortunate because, as I said, Albertans have been waiting a long time for this legislation and we could have been past this already.

Bill 34 does address three things. One is the consumer protections, the second is the lottery ticket pilot project, and the third is the re-

establishment of the surface rights tribunal, and I'd like to focus mostly in my remarks on credit protections.

We know that in 2025 in Canada \$700 million was lost in fraud scams for seniors. Of course, I was the minister of seniors in the Notley government, but now I'm the shadow minister for that, so of course that's an area that's very important to me. As a senior myself I want to make sure that, you know, I don't fall prey to any of these things. Certainly, the seniors in this province fall prey to scams or frauds. Seniors are vulnerable to many scams and frauds that come out, and some of the examples – perhaps some of you have heard of these, but it's important for seniors to be educated about them, their loved ones to know about this so they can be on alert to help protect seniors.

Grandparenting scams. They'll get a text that'll say: "Hey, grandma. I have to pay this bill. Will you help me out?" That's known as a grandparenting scam. Government or bank impersonations are another way that seniors are often vulnerable. Someone steals their credit information, their identity information, and that can make them lose thousands of dollars. Investment scams, promises of unrealistic high returns: seniors can fall prey to that. And, unfortunately, romance and friendship scams. Seniors are often isolated and maybe wanting attention, and people who have malintent are taking advantage of that and preying on them. The seniors are vulnerable, and they give them their banking information, and then there are significant issues with that.

This is actually called elder abuse. You know, it's the most common form of elder abuse, financial abuse, so this legislation does bring forward some credit protections that will help seniors. Knowing the different kinds of scams and frauds that hurt seniors, it's very important for us to help seniors and support them so that they don't fall prey to this.

This is personal for me because my own mother lost \$50,000. She fell prey to a scam a few years back, and she gave away a whole bunch of information regarding her financial information. She just went on and on about how this person was her friend and all of this stuff, but it was obviously misguided. We did fortunately get some of that money back, but it was still a pretty significant loss financially for her, and I know, certainly, that my mom isn't alone.

We know that this legislation does bring forward a credit freeze, and it can prevent identity thieves from opening fraudulent credit cards and loans or accounts in a senior's name. It does give stronger identity verification, and this is an additional safeguard. I'm glad the government is using some of the suggestions we put forward in the spring to bring into legislation because these are important protections, so of course this is something that I will support, but we really need to think a lot about different ways of prevention for this type of thing.

The powers of attorney oversight are very important. Too often these powers are misused and often underreported. Sadly, a lot of times people in seniors' families are the ones who are taking advantage of them, and that is dismaying but true. It's important for everybody to watch for warning signs, unexplained withdrawals or transfers, missing valuables, sudden changes to wills or legal documents, a new friend – this is kind of the thing that my mother fell prey to – becoming overly involved in financial matters. Seniors need to be connected as social isolation increases vulnerability to abuse.

This legislation: I'm standing in support of it, but as I said earlier, it's too bad it couldn't have been passed in the spring. We had two private members' bills from the NDP caucus that covered much of this territory.

With that, I'll take my seat, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. Williams: Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's been a productive debate so far on Bill 34, and I'm looking forward to more constructive conversation on it; however, I move to adjourn debate on Bill 34.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Ms Pitt in the chair]

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

Bill 33 Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2)

The Chair: Is there anyone that wishes to join the debate at this stage? The hon. Member for Calgary . . .

An Hon. Member: Klein.

The Chair: Klein. Thank you.

Member Tejada: I know. We've had all summer and fall.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I am honoured to rise to speak to Bill 33, Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2). I will say at the outset that Bill 33 really highlights a growing problem with the way this government approaches legislation. Rather than bringing forward focused, transparent bills that allow members to carefully debate individual policy changes, the government has bundled together a wide range of unrelated measures into a single omnibus bill.

We know from our conversations – I'm sure the members opposite can attest to this as well – that Albertans are struggling with the cost of living. They're struggling with access to health care. They are struggling with an education system that's in crisis. And the UCP's first piece of legislation was to meddle in the affairs of agencies in terms of their hiring and not addressing those issues that Albertans care about most.

This legislation amends eight separate statutes covering everything from intimate image protections and human rights legislation to court procedures, municipal hiring practices, King's Counsel appointments, public-sector compensation, transparency, and you can see even just from the list that I've given here that none of these issues are connected by any meaningful policy objective, and they deserve independent examination and debate.

12:50

So while we support several provisions that are included in this bill, including strengthening protections for nonconsensual distribution of intimate images, including AI-generated intimate content – these measures address the real harms that are facing Albertans that could have garnered broad support on their own, but what this government has chosen to do is to package those widely supported protections alongside far more other controversial and, I would say, often politicized issues related to inclusive hiring and the topic of diversity, equity, and inclusion. The approach creates an unfair and unnecessary dilemma for legislators.

Members of this Assembly shouldn't be forced into an all-or-nothing vote on a bill that combines multiple unrelated subjects. Good legislation requires thoughtful scrutiny, and Albertans expect that their representatives will be able to support measures they agree with and oppose measures that they might disagree with. By combining so many disparate initiatives into a single bill, the government limits the Legislature's ability to provide that level of

accountability. So while there's a clear concern that this bill represents political wedging in terms of attaching broadly popular protections for victims of intimate image abuse to other types of legislation, the government seems to be providing a shield for itself for provisions that should have a lot more scrutiny.

The debate on one section of the bill shouldn't be used to deflect criticism of another part of this bill. That's why we recommended yesterday that the bill be referred to committee for further review. A committee study would have allowed stakeholders, experts, municipalities, legal professionals, and affected communities to provide feedback on the bill's many components. It also would have created an opportunity to properly examine each proposal on its own merits rather than rushing through a sweeping omnibus package.

I will say that I'm always amazed at the government's propensity to create councils that they say advise them. We've seen so many of those. I would say, with this bill in particular, that I would love to know if they did any consultation with those councils, thinking about, like, the Premier's own council on antiracism and multiculturalism, the Black Advisory Council, if she did consultation at all with Indigenous nations. I know that that's not par for the course with this government. But I would say that if the Premier thinks that they have enough merit to be providing the government with advice, perhaps consultation with any of those groups would have been welcomed. Albertans deserve legislation that's transparent, that's focused and accountable, and the best way to achieve that would have been through that careful committee review.

I'll just talk a little bit about the nonconsensual distribution of intimate images and content. Bill 33 contains one section that, of course, we wholeheartedly support, the modernization and strengthening of Alberta's protections against nonconsensual distribution of intimate images and content. Those reforms respond to real harms that have evolved rapidly with technology and social media, and they provide important new tools to protect victims, particularly women, children, and other vulnerable individuals. A significant improvement here is the expansion of the legislation to cover AI-generated and -manipulated intimate content. The rise of deepfakes and other forms of artificially generated imagery has created entirely new avenues for harassment, exploitation, and abuse. We know now that individuals will be able to have protections against having intimate images fabricated and distributed without their knowledge and consent, and updating the laws to address this and these emergent technologies is necessary and overdue.

In terms of protections against extortion and coercion, increasingly perpetrators use threats to distribute intimate content, to manipulate victims, force compliance, or extract money, and this can be devastating to the victim of that sort of abuse. So recognizing and addressing those threats is definitely an important step forward.

I will say that while we support the provisions around recognizing that consent can be revoked, I see that there are a lot of elements of this bill that the government would do well to address in other areas and other types of legislation. So a person who once consented to the sharing of intimate content should retain the right to withdraw that consent. That's pretty basic. This legislation appropriately acknowledges that consent is not permanent. And I would just say, in general, especially when it comes to that section around consent and intimate images: wholehearted support there. I do feel a lot of disappointment in the fact that something that is this important has been rolled into an omnibus and that instead of just being accountable and giving us the ability to debate thoughtfully, they would roll the protections of victims in with inclusive hiring practices.

A further note on consultation: when I think about the groups that they could have consulted with, I'm also thinking about how this government is already making headlines, constantly making

headlines for the wrong reasons, and the national outcry that we have seen specifically around this bill, around those wedge issues. I know that the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has already spoken out. I've seen several organizations speaking out. It's a shame that we did not move this to committee for more scrutiny and thoughtful debate.

In closing, I would say that our caucus will be supporting this bill, especially around the provisions around intimate content and protecting victims in that way. It's disappointing that this got rolled into an omnibus, and I would encourage the government to do better and to be more accountable when it comes to legislation instead of politicizing this sort of thing where they could be doing some really good work.

Thank you so much.

The Chair: Are there others? The hon. Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mrs. Johnson: Well, thank you, Madam Chair. It's a pleasure to rise today and speak in support of Bill 33, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2). As we've heard, this bill addresses a number of important issues within Alberta's justice system, but I'd like to focus my remarks on two areas that I believe are particularly important to the people I represent in Lacombe-Ponoka. The first is the proposed changes to hiring practices within public institutions, and the second is the strengthening of protections for victims of the nonconsensual distribution of intimate images. At first glance these may seem like different subjects, but actually both are rooted in the same principle, fairness: fairness in how people are hired and promoted, fairness in how Albertans are protected from harm, and fairness in ensuring that government institutions serve all Albertans equally and effectively.

Madam Chair, I regularly speak with constituents who believe that opportunities should be earned through hard work, qualifications, experience, and ability. In communities like Lacombe, Ponoka, Blackfalds, Clive, and the many rural areas throughout my constituency people place tremendous value on personal responsibility and merit. Parents encourage their children to study hard, to develop skills and pursue careers based on their talents and their interests. Small-business owners hire the person who can best do the job because their success depends on having the right people in the right positions. Farmers, tradespeople, health care professionals, and entrepreneurs alike understand that outcomes are best when selection is based on competence and capability. That's why I believe the amendments proposed in Bill 33 are so important. Public-sector hiring decisions should be based on merit. Albertans deserve confidence that positions funded by taxpayers are awarded to the most qualified candidates. They should know that promotions are earned through performance and ability and not influenced by factors unrelated to a person's capacity to perform the work.

1:00

Bill 33 would amend the Alberta Human Rights Act to ensure that public institutions make hiring and promotion decisions based on qualifications while continuing to respect existing human rights protections. It would restrict hiring decisions based on personal characteristics except where a specific characteristic is genuinely necessary to perform the job, like, for example, the ability to lift a certain amount of weight.

I think most Albertans would view that as common sense. The goal is not to exclude anyone or to create barriers. It's to ensure that everyone is judged by the same standard. Every applicant should have confidence that when they submit a resumé, attend an interview, or compete for a promotion, they're going to be evaluated on their skills,

experience, education, character, and ability to do the work. That principle benefits everyone.

Madam Chair, many have expressed concerns about diversity, equity, and inclusion policies that move beyond encouraging respectful workplaces and instead influence hiring decisions. They worry that personal characteristics can at times be prioritized over merit. Whether those concerns are expressed by a recent university graduate seeking their first job or a public servant hoping for promotion, the message is often the same. People want opportunities to be based on qualifications and performance. Bill 33 responds to these concerns by reaffirming neutrality in public-sector hiring.

It also ensures that mandatory training remains directly connected to an employee's role and responsibilities. Albertans expect public institutions to focus on delivering services efficiently and effectively. Whether that's a school board educating students, a municipality maintaining infrastructure, or a government agency serving the public, their primary focus should be carrying out their responsibilities and obtaining the best possible result for Albertans.

Madam Chair, fairness and accountability should never be controversial. They're foundational principles of a strong public service. By ensuring that hiring decisions are merit based and neutral, this legislation helps strengthen public confidence in our institutions.

The second area I would like to discuss is the bill's amendments to the Protecting Victims of Non-consensual Distribution of Intimate Images Act. This portion of the legislation addresses a challenge that is becoming increasingly serious as technology continues to evolve. Today a single image, video, or audio recording can be distributed across the Internet in a matter of seconds and viewed by thousands, sometimes millions of people. Once that happens, the damage can be difficult and even impossible to completely undo.

The rise of artificial intelligence has created even greater concerns. Today technology can generate realistic images, videos, and recordings that appear authentic despite being entirely fabricated. These technologies can be used responsibly, but they can also be weaponized to harass, intimidate, humiliate, and exploit innocent people.

As members of this Assembly we know that Alberta's rural communities are close-knit places. In communities throughout Lacombe-Ponoka people know their neighbours. Students attend school together often from kindergarten all the way through graduation. Families volunteer together. They attend local events. They support each other through difficult times.

Imagine, Madam Chair, a young person in one of our communities discovering that an altered image depicting them has been shared online without their consent. Perhaps it was created using AI. Perhaps it was shared as a joke. It's not a joke. Perhaps it was done maliciously. Regardless of the motivation, the impact on that individual can be devastating. The victim may experience embarrassment, reputational harm, anxiety, and emotional distress. Their family suffers alongside them. In a small community where people see one another every day, that harm can feel even more close and immediate and personal.

The law must keep pace with these evolving realities, and Bill 33 does exactly that. This legislation expands protections to include digitally altered and AI-generated intimate images, videos, and audio. It creates a new provincial offence for the nonconsensual distribution of both altered and unaltered intimate images. Significant penalties may apply, including fines of up to \$10,000 or imprisonment for up to two years or both.

Important to know, the legislation also recognizes that harm often begins before content is even shared. Victims would gain the ability to pursue civil legal action not only when intimate content has been distributed but also when someone threatens to distribute it. Threats alone can be used as a form of coercion, control, and intimidation. Victims should not have to wait until damage has already occurred

before seeking protection. The legislation would also allow Albertans to withdraw consent to the distribution of intimate content and would create accountability for negligent behaviour that results in content being distributed without consent.

Madam Chair, these changes send a clear message. Technology may change, but the fundamental expectation of privacy and personal dignity does not. Albertans have a right to control intimate images depicting themselves, and those who violate that right should face meaningful consequences. What I particularly appreciate about this legislation is that it is proactive rather than reactive. It recognizes where technology is heading and puts protections in place now rather than waiting until the problem becomes even more widespread. As legislators we have a responsibility to ensure that our laws remain relevant in a rapidly changing world. We cannot rely on legal frameworks developed for a different technological era to address modern challenges. Bill 33 rises to that challenge.

Madam Chair, whether we're discussing merit-based hiring or protections against the nonconsensual distribution of intimate images, the underlying objective remains the same: ensuring fairness, accountability, and confidence in our public institutions. This bill helps ensure that public-sector opportunities are awarded based on qualifications and merit, it also helps ensure that Albertans are protected from emerging forms of digital exploitation and harm, and it demonstrates our commitment to maintaining laws that reflect both the values and realities of modern Alberta. For those reasons, I'm pleased to support Bill 33, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026, and I encourage all members of this Assembly to do the same.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Are there others? The hon. Member for Calgary-Edmonton.

Ms Hayter: Thank you, Madam Chair. I rise to speak to Bill 33, the Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2), which could also be called another attempt for this government to create division in Alberta. It's kind of a UCP government's political wedge bill.

Why was the choice made to put two very different topics into one bill? These should be two different bills. Albertans should have — they've just finished a summer of division during a cost-of-living crisis, and the very first piece of legislation from this UCP was to ban provincial bodies from having inclusive hiring practices and training for employees. The UCP has thrown this into an omnibus bill that includes better legal protections for victims of sexual abuse.

Strengthening protections for women and children who are victims of intimate image distribution a hundred per cent needs to be addressed. This has impacted people I know, which is probably what makes this political wedge bill even more infuriating and disappointing. Does the UCP not value each of these topics and want to give respect to each piece of legislation, that each deserves diligent debate? The impacts on Albertans are immense. Last session we saw bills passed that had UCP political overreach into schools, libraries, and municipal councillors. Just last month we saw more political overreach into city councils, and remember that mayors and city councillors are duly elected by their constituents.

Now we have Bill 33 in front of us. The RMA president has said that they were not consulted, that not once had these practices been brought up or having issues with any of our members, but there is a worry about operational meddling by the government that Bill 33 can cause. With the current record of the UCP I'd be worried, too. I know my constituents are worried about what the UCP government will do next.

Why is this the government's priority? The UCP are more focused on divisive politics than they are focused on protecting Albertans. The government obsession with importing MAGA

talking points does nothing to help Albertans while protecting victims of sexual abuse absolutely does.

1:10

Bill 33 would make Alberta a province with the most comprehensive protections around intimate image distribution. I support that. I know some people who would have appreciated these protections. They would want them for others now. I want to tell you two overlapping stories. First, Emily. She was 30 years old, had a good job, good friends, a good life, and was in a relationship with a colleague that she cared about and she trusted. Emily looks at his laptop. Something pops up on his AI program. It's on a screen, and she sees something she could never have imagined, a pornographic image of herself. Emily never took these images. She's horrified. Imagine finding out that someone you love and you trusted had secretly created fake sexual images of yourself.

Recently a friend of mine had to go through an experience that no parent would want to either, an experience none of us are probably prepared to endure. Her teen's image, her teen's naked image, was being shared around social media to all of their classmates. It wasn't AI fake; it was a deepfake. It was generated. The child didn't take those photographs, didn't participate in creating those images, and they were there for social media, for all of their friends to see. Imagine both of these victims wondering why people around them are acting so strange. Have they seen the pictures? Do they think that they're real? Are people avoiding conversations with them? That's the part that makes this so awful, having to wonder whether people you see every day have been looking at them.

Neither person ever consented to any of this, yet they're the ones dealing with the fear, the uncertainty, the anxiety, the depression. The implication is that these images – they're painful and they're embarrassing to anyone. How would any of us feel in that moment? As a teen it would have crushed me. As a mom it crushes me. For a teen, it wasn't an adult, though. It was another teen that made that deepfake. We need preventative education that teaches our young people to understand consent, to recognize harmful behaviour, to build healthy relationships. Our students deserve, you know, to be taught boundaries, respect, responsibility. These lessons apply online just as much as they do in person.

It is important to have laws to protect people when things go wrong. We should be looking at what we can do to stop the harm before it happens, though, in the first place. Yet the UCP government still persists with their opt-in approach to sexual health education in schools, creating barriers for that conversation that can help our kids recognize exploitation, understand consent, and know when to ask for help.

We do need more understanding and education about AI-generated images. The harm is very real, technology we can use to violate somebody's privacy and dignity, and it can happen to anyone: women, men, and people of any gender. It can happen between partners, co-workers, classmates, and complete strangers. And even when an image is never shared, creating sexual content of someone without their consent can also be a profound violation. We need to make sure our laws keep pace with the way technology is being used to exploit people. Everyone deserves control over their own image, their own body, and their own dignity.

Bill 33 does also address sextortion. This is when someone threatens to distribute intimate videos, images, and other content and then blackmails them. Something that is happening to people across this province, especially young people, is sextortion, and it's happening far too often. According to the Canadian Centre for Child Protection in 2025 alone the organization received more than 280 reports of sextortion. We know the shame and the embarrassment and the fear can prevent people from coming forward, and behind every

single one of those reports is someone who may be frightened, overwhelmed, and unsure of what to do.

Daniel's story was brought to my attention. He's 18 years old, and he just started his first year of university, a quiet guy who keeps to himself and has never had a very large friend group. He is also an incredibly bright student; he earned a scholarship to university. One evening he receives a message from a stranger, a young friendly woman on Instagram around his age. She likes his lake photos. They exchange messages. Eventually their conversation becomes more personal. She sends him an intimate photo and asks him to send one back, and he does. Then all of a sudden the friendly messages stop. Suddenly the person on the other end is demanding money. They've saved his pictures. They know where he goes to school, where he works, who his friends are. Somehow they know where his mom works, too. They're threatening to send these pictures to everyone he knows unless he pays them.

Daniel panics and sends them what's left in his last paycheck, hoping it'll stop, and it doesn't. Demand for more, and he has nothing left to give. You have a young 18-year-old man who's worked so hard. He's beginning his future. Now he's sitting in a bathroom, you know, terrified that one photograph could destroy everything he's worked for. He's ashamed, he's frightened, and he doesn't know who to turn to.

Those pictures don't even have to be shared. The threat alone is enough to turn anyone's life upside down. Victims shouldn't have to wait until these images have been shared before they can seek legal protection. I've talked about the importance of protecting people when intimate images are shared or threatened to be shared. I've talked about AI, you know, creating new opportunities for abuse. These are serious issues that do need to be discussed. Sharing an intimate picture with someone doesn't give them permission to share it. Threatening someone with an intimate image is abuse, and creating sexual images of someone without their consent is a serious violation.

This is, again, what our concern is. This bill is why we believe it should be divided into two. As Bill 33 is, it's just another political set-up, and it's a very offensive political move. It is highly inappropriate for the UCP government to choose to lump together essential protections for victims of sexual abuse with their MAGA-inspired grandstanding. It is extremely important to introduce protections for victims of intimate content distribution and abuse.

Looking around the Chamber, I have to ask: how was everybody's summer break? How many Albertans did you listen to this summer? I know my colleagues and I were at community events, at the doors. We were hearing from our constituents. My team and I went to every community in Calgary-Edgemont. We heard what the priorities are: access to public health care, public education shouldn't be in crisis, Albertans are struggling with the cost of living.

Calgary-Edgemont constituents want an ethical government that will listen and serve Albertans. They are tired of a government that spreads division at every single step. If the UCP are going to divide anything, maybe they should divide this bill. Call an election, as Alberta deserves a better government than this.

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

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much. I'm excited to have an opportunity to rise and speak. This is the first bill that has been brought forward by the current government in this fall sitting. When I think about priorities, top priorities, I think a lot about the conversations that I've had over the last several months. There was very large overwhelming feedback that Albertans, not just in my riding but in the vast majority of Alberta, are overwhelmingly pro-Canada.

One of the great things about having an Edmonton-based riding is that I get to still do constituency events most nights while we're sitting. This week I was at two AGMs for different community leagues in my riding. It was clear at both of them that the key priorities for the families that I represent are around affordability, health care, good schools and public education, and good jobs.

But here we are, and the first bill that is being brought forward by the current government is focused on division and is an omnibus bill as well. Instead of having really clear communication about what the bill does and focusing on very specific areas, the government has chosen to combine several pieces of legislation and propose amendments to many of them.

I'm going to touch on two of those areas today in debate. The first one I'm going to talk about is the Legal Profession Act amendments. This is basically a bill to undo some of the problems that the Justice minister created himself 18 months ago. The piece that I particularly am relieved that the minister is reversing is around the piece that relates to the Law Foundation.

When Bill 39 was passed, the Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, again, another omnibus bill, it took significant power away from an independent arm's-length organization governed by – well, not totally independent – appointed members, by both the government and by the Law Society themselves, so a governing body to take the money that lawyers hold in trust and make interest off and to enable the Law Foundation to determine where that money should best be invested. It's not the minister's money. It's not taxpayer money. It's the interest that lawyers hold in trust on behalf of their clients, and the intention is for them to use it to fund areas that are currently gaps.

1:20

One of the areas that are gaps and that have been funded for long periods of time is the space between legal aid and market rate for legal representation, so funding things like student legal clinics, and the Law Foundation has given grants to these for as long as I've been alive, I believe. The minister instead decided that it would be up to the minister to determine whether or not lawyers themselves could choose to fund student legal clinics. I think that was clearly determined to be wrongheaded.

One of the biggest responses here is that every single employee of the Law Foundation resigned their position. Every single employee. Some had been there their entire careers, and it left a significant gap in services. I think it was a reflection on how disrespected the folks who had committed their careers to serving Albertans and serving the lawyers who were using this money that was held in trust in a way that could benefit the entire community and perhaps . . . [interjection] Is the minister seeking an opportunity to – I would welcome responses to this.

They also funded things like Indigenous justice programs; programs for survivors of violence, domestic violence and otherwise; and programs to support newcomers who weren't able to access legal supports.

This is one of the things that's being changed in this piece of legislation. The interference on grants \$250,000 and above is being eliminated from this legislation. I think that is a good repeal. It's just too bad that the government brought an omnibus bill forward 18 months ago that enacted this change, because it definitely devastated, I think, a lot of the legal community as a consequence. Repealing it is definitely a step in the right direction.

I also want to touch base on another section in here in the same area where it talks about quorum for special meetings being moved from 50 to 2.5 per cent of the current number of members, which would mean about 250 people today, approximately, as opposed to 50. I think that's a good change. There is a repealing, though, in the following area, 29(2), where right now a two-thirds vote in favour

is required for resolution if the benchers haven't implemented a recommendation by the special meeting or by the majority of members at a regular AGM. I think it would be useful for us to know, "Why the repeal of two-thirds majority?" when the minister does respond. I think that's a fair question because it implies that now it'll be a simple majority. So is that indeed correct, and if so, why?

The other area I want to touch on following some of the comments from my colleagues earlier is around this piece around pornographic images and particularly the creation of them using artificial intelligence and the threat to distribute them or distribute them without consent, period. I think that this is definitely a move in the right direction, again. I want to look at section – it's on page 21 and it's (b). I'm not clear about which section it is actually, but it is on page 21 of the hard copy of the bill. It talks about being able to share images without the consent of the person represented in them, for the context, if the distribution is for the purposes of one of the areas they refer to as "victim support groups or organizations." I still don't understand why we wouldn't need the consent of the person who is depicted in the images if it's about going to a victim support group or organization, so I'd love to understand why the minister has determined that as an opt-out that doesn't require consent.

Then the other one is educational providers. Again, if images, particularly of minors, have been created, why is it important for a teacher or a principal to see those without the consent of the minor who is depicted in those images? I understand why legal counsel and health care providers would possibly need to see those, and they, of course, have legal requirements around protecting the confidentiality of their patients or clients, but I do have some questions around why it is that we think we don't need consent for them to be shared with victim support groups or organizations or educational providers.

Then then clause (e) refers to "parents or trusted family members." And while in theory I agree with this, I wonder how the government is defining "trusted family members." Who is it that is supposed to be trusting this family member? Again, why are they allowed to see those things without consent? I think that that concept of trust is something that we deserve more clarity on. So that's in (e). And then why does it specifically say "parents or trusted family members" but not refer to guardians? Of course, there are lots of situations where children, for example, might be in foster care. So if we determine that a trusted family member, a legal family member from the nuclear family has a right to see it, why not the guardian? Again, I do wonder why we don't require consent for some of these pieces. I would love to know the minister's justification for (b)(vi), (c), (d), and (e) on page 21.

Like many in this Chamber, I know young people who have had deepfakes created of themselves and had those threatened to be shared, and it is incredibly damaging. Having recourse on how to be able to respond to those situations, I think, is very important as is making sure that nothing goes further without their consent unless there is a very clear reason why it needs to. So, again, understanding the minister's justification on page 21 for (b)(vi), (c), (d), and (e) and what the interjurisdictional comparison would be for those three areas. Again, I understand this is an omnibus bill. It touches on many different ministers, and I'm speaking specifically to the Minister of Justice.

Those are the points I want to raise at this point in debate and hope that the minister will be able to give some clarity so we can understand the rationale in those areas.

Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Are there others? The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to share a few remarks on Bill 33. I was interested listening to the debate. Again, we've been very clear. We support the elements of this bill that are dealing with many of the other issues. Our concern is with this government's choice to forefront in so many ways its obsession with this MAGA conspiracy around inclusive hiring.

I was interested to hear the Member for Lacombe-Ponoka talking about how her constituents believe in hard work, experience, and personal responsibility, hiring based on competence and capability, that positions funded by the taxpayers should go to the most qualified candidate based on an assessment of their ability to do the work. Indeed, I would agree with those things, Madam Chair, but it's so often that this government does not actually seem to believe in that itself.

I think, Madam Chair, about the situation we had with the purchase of children's medication, Turkish Tylenol. In that situation we had a company, MHCare, which does not seem to have any qualification whatsoever, completely fails on any question of merit. The company had no experience with obtaining that medication. There was no credible reason that they should be able to do so, and there was no competitive process to look for that. Instead this government seemed to simply choose to select a single provider, a single contract. No look at merit, no look at quality, no look at experience, but certainly an individual that we have seen this government has chosen for a number of concerning contracts, indeed, that we find at the heart of the corrupt care scandal.

What we know is that that company did not have any significant experience, but under this government, who instructed Alberta Health Services to move forward with their contract, they were given directives. This was not outside the government. This was a government decision, Madam Speaker, speaking of a government that is crusading on choosing people by merit. This is a government that directed them to choose this particular company that had no experience, had that go forward, bypassing almost every standard institutional measure of credibility and oversight. No standard commercial legal review, no competitive bidding, no price disclosure guidelines. Forensic accountants that looked into it from RSM Canada noted that indeed the contract itself defied standard public-sector practices. It had AHS pay tens of millions of dollars in upfront fees to MHCare before anything had actually been delivered. The fact is that we know a significant amount of that never was delivered, and indeed we're still out \$49 million for that contract. That is the record of this government when it comes to making decisions based on merit.

1:30

Now it wants to go forward and instruct other public bodies on how they should do their hiring and their practices. RMA president Kara Westerlund, who was in the gallery today, noted that the government did not consult them on this. She said that they did not ask for this. They did not ask for this interference from the government. Indeed, that's what she noted, that this is a government that seems to consistently be interfering with and trying to control municipalities. I would agree with her that this is a government that has the wrong priorities. This was not top of mind for Ms Westerlund or the folks at the RMA. It's not top of mind for Albertans.

The fact is, again, that we support the other pieces in this bill. Hey, we were the government that welcomed the private member's bill

from the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul when he brought forward Bill 202, the Protecting Victims of Non-consensual Distribution of Intimate Images Act. We supported that to move under our government, and we support the provisions to expand on that as we have seen the expansion of the technology involved. We will happily vote for that, Madam Chair, but we will be looking for an opportunity to perhaps be able to vote on that separately from this government's grandstanding on these MAGA conspiracy theories about inclusive hiring. Albertans, I think, deserve that respect, that we are not trying to combine political wedge issues and cheap grandstanding with important legislation and things that are genuinely of concern to Albertans. We'll be looking for those opportunities as we continue debate and as we move forward on this bill.

I think there are some other important provisions in here, too, some of the changes that the Minister of Justice wishes to make to some of the former changes he had made, amending some amendments regarding the Alberta Law Foundation. Certainly, we recognize the important work they do. We recognize the importance of maintaining the independence of public bodies. Those should be free from government interference. They should be free to determine how they spend their funds that are collected from their members in their positions in which they are elected to represent their members. Certainly, we welcome those changes from the minister, and we're happy to vote to support those as well.

We'll have the opportunity, I know, for future debate, further debate, but I will end my remarks there for today.

If I could add one more comment, Madam Chair, at this point I'll take the moment, then, to adjourn debate or make a motion to do so.

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

The Chair: The hon. Deputy Government House Leader.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Madam Chair. I move that the committee rise and report progress on Bill 33.

[Motion carried]

[The Deputy Speaker in the chair]

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mrs. Johnson: Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports progress on the following bill: Bill 33.

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

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Deputy Speaker: Any opposed, please say no. So carried.
The hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and thank you to all members of this Assembly for a good first week back in the fall session. I move that the Assembly be adjourned until Monday, November 6, 2026, at 1:30 p.m.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 1:35 p.m.]

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

Activity to Thursday, October 29, 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 Sitzings.

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) (\$) (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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026 cS-0.3]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026 c6]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026 cA-37.7]

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*), 1833-39 (*May 11, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1874-80 (*May 12, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 1901-07 (*May 12, 2026 eve., adjourned*), 1925-26 (*May 13, 2026 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation, with exceptions; SA 2026 c13]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026 cI-0.3]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2026 c8]

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*), 1839-46 (*May 11, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1880-86 (*May 12, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1893-95 (*May 12, 2026 eve., passed on division*), 1887 (*May 12, 2026 eve., adjourned*)

Third Reading — 1928-36 (*May 13, 2026 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2026 c10]

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

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

Second Reading — 1651-57 (*Apr. 23, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1716-23 (*May 5, 2026 aft., adjourned*), 1867-74 (*May 12, 2026 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1887-93 (*May 12, 2026 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1936-43 (*May 13, 2026 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force May 14, 2026, with exceptions; SA 2026 c9]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2026 cE-12.8]

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*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force May 14, 2026, with exceptions; SA 2026 c12]

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*), 1846-53 (*May 11, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1895-1901 (*May 12, 2026 eve., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 1907-12 (*May 12, 2026 eve., adjourned*), 1926-28 (*May 13, 2026 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 14, 2026 morn.*) [Comes into force on May 14, 2026; SA 2026 c7]

Bill 33 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2) (Amery)

First Reading — 1973 (*Oct. 27, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1990-97 (*Oct. 28, 2026 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2018-23 (*Oct. 29, 2026 morn., adjourned*)

Bill 34 — Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Nally)

First Reading — 1990 (*Oct. 28, 2026 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2010-18 (*Oct. 29, 2026 morn., adjourned*)

Bill 35 — Education and Childcare (Securing Parental Involvement) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Nicolaides)

First Reading — 2009 (*Oct. 29, 2026 morn., passed*)

Bill 36 — Children and Family Services (Supporting Alberta Families) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Turton)

First Reading — 2009 (*Oct. 29, 2026 morn., passed*)

Bill 37 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (Schow)

First Reading — 2009 (*Oct. 29, 2026 morn., passed*)

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)

Royal Assent — (May 14, 2026 morn.) [Comes into force on January 1, 2027; SA 2026 c11]

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), 1820-22 (May 11, 2026 aft., defeated on division)

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

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

Second Reading — 1822-28 (May 11, 2026 aft., defeated on division)

Bill 211 — Patient Outcomes Reporting Act (Batten)

First Reading — 2009 (Oct. 29, 2026 morn., passed)

Bill 212 — Pharmacy Statutes (Rewards Points) Amendment Act, 2026 (Pitt)

First Reading — 1923 (May 13, 2026 aft., passed)

Bill 213 — Alberta Personal Income Tax (Emergency Services Volunteer Tax Credits) Amendment Act, 2026 (Lunty)

First Reading — 1923 (May 13, 2026 aft., 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)

Third Reading — 1867 (May 12, 2026 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (May 14, 2026 morn.) [Comes into force May 14, 2026]

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)

Third Reading — 1867 (May 12, 2026 aft., passed)

Royal Assent — (May 14, 2026 morn.) [Comes into force May 14, 2026]

Table of Contents

Prayers	1999
Introduction of Guests	1999
Members' Statements	
Health Care System Capacity	1999
Government Achievements	2000
Premier's Travel to the U.S.	2000
Lacombe Research and Development Centre	2000
Indigenous and Métis Relations.....	2000
Calgary-Shaw By-election.....	2001
Oral Question Period	
Citizen-initiated Petition Requirements	2001
Electoral Boundaries Committee Review	2002, 2003
Premier's Travel to the U.S.	2002
2026 Provincial Referendum	2003
Bill 34	2004
Investigation of Health Services Procurement.....	2004, 2006, 2007
Alberta Separatism and Government Policy.....	2005
Support for Survivors of Gender-based Violence.....	2006
Energy Resource Revenue.....	2007
Alberta Participation in Federal Programs.....	2008
Minimum Wage Rate	2008
Notices of Motions	2009
Introduction of Bills	
Bill 35 Education and Childcare (Securing Parental Involvement) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	2009
Bill 36 Children and Family Services (Supporting Alberta Families) Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	2009
Bill 37 Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	2009
Bill 211 Patient Outcomes Reporting Act	2009
Tablings to the Clerk	2009
Orders of the Day	2010
Government Bills and Orders	
Second Reading	
Bill 34 Service Alberta and Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2026	2010
Committee of the Whole	
Bill 33 Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2026 (No. 2).....	2018

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