



Province of Alberta

The 31st Legislature
First Session

Alberta Hansard

Wednesday evening, May 14, 2025

Day 112

The Honourable Ric McIver, Speaker

Legislative Assembly of Alberta The 31st Legislature

First 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, Andrew, Drayton Valley-Devon (UC)
Boparai, Parmeet Singh, Calgary-Falconridge (NDP)
Bouchard, Eric, Calgary-Lougheed (UC)
Brar, Gurinder, Calgary-North East (NDP)
Calahoo Stonehouse, Jodi, Edmonton-Rutherford (NDP)
Ceci, Hon. Joe, ECA, Calgary-Buffalo (NDP)
Chapman, Amanda, Calgary-Beddington (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy Assistant Whip
Cooper, Nathan M., Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UC)
Cyr, Scott J., Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul (UC)
Dach, Lorne, Edmonton-McClung (NDP)
de Jonge, Chantelle, Chestermere-Strathmore (UC)
Deol, Jasvir, Edmonton-Meadows (NDP)
Dreeshen, Hon. Devin, ECA, Innisfail-Sylvan Lake (UC)
Dyck, Nolan B., Grande Prairie (UC)
Eggen, Hon. David, ECA, Edmonton-North West (NDP)
Ellingson, Court, Calgary-Foothills (NDP)
Ellis, Hon. Mike, ECA, Calgary-West (UC),
Deputy Premier
Elmeligi, Sarah, Banff-Kananaskis (NDP)
Eremenko, Janet, Calgary-Currie (NDP)
Fir, Hon. Tanya, ECA, Calgary-Peigan (UC)
Ganley, Hon. Kathleen T., ECA, Calgary-Mountain View (NDP),
Official Opposition Whip
Getson, Shane C., Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland (UC),
Government Whip
Glubish, Hon. Nate, ECA, Strathcona-Sherwood Park (UC)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gray, Hon. Christina, ECA, Edmonton-Mill Woods (NDP),
Leader of the Official Opposition,
Official Opposition House Leader
Guthrie, Hon. Peter F., ECA, Airdrie-Cochrane (Ind)
Haji, Sharif, Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Hayter, Julia K.U., Calgary-Edgemont (NDP)
Hoffman, Hon. Sarah, ECA, Edmonton-Glenora (NDP)
Horner, Hon. Nate S., ECA, Drumheller-Stettler (UC)
Hoyle, Rhiannon, Edmonton-South (NDP)
Hunter, Hon. Grant R., ECA, Taber-Warner (UC)
Ip, Nathan, Edmonton-South West (NDP)
Irwin, Janis, Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood (NDP),
Official Opposition Assistant Whip
Jean, Hon. Brian Michael, ECA, KC, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche
(UC)
Johnson, Jennifer, Lacombe-Ponoka (UC)
Jones, Hon. Matt, ECA, Calgary-South East (UC)
Kasawski, Kyle, Sherwood Park (NDP)

Kayande, Samir, Calgary-Elbow (NDP)
LaGrange, Hon. Adriana, ECA, Red Deer-North (UC)
Loewen, Hon. Todd, ECA, Central Peace-Notley (UC)
Long, Hon. Martin M., ECA, West Yellowhead (UC)
Lovely, Jacqueline, Camrose (UC)
Lunty, Brandon G., Leduc-Beaumont (UC)
McDougall, Myles, Calgary-Fish Creek (UC)
Metz, Luanne, Calgary-Varsity (NDP)
Miyashiro, Rob, Lethbridge-West (NDP)
Nally, Hon. Dale, ECA, Morinville-St. Albert (UC)
Neudorf, Hon. Nathan T., ECA, Lethbridge-East (UC)
Nicolaidis, Hon. Demetrios, ECA, Calgary-Bow (UC)
Nixon, Hon. Jason, ECA, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre
(UC)
Pancholi, Rakhi, Edmonton-Whitemud (NDP)
Petrovic, Chelsae, Livingstone-Macleod (UC)
Renaud, Marie F., St. Albert (NDP)
Rowswell, Garth, Vermilion-Lloydminster-Wainwright (UC)
Sabir, Hon. Irfan, ECA, Calgary-Bhullar-McCall (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sawhney, Hon. Rajan, ECA, Calgary-North West (UC)
Schmidt, Hon. Marlin, ECA, Edmonton-Gold Bar (NDP)
Schow, Hon. Joseph R., ECA, Cardston-Siksika (UC),
Government House Leader
Schulz, Hon. Rebecca, ECA, Calgary-Shaw (UC)
Shepherd, David, Edmonton-City Centre (NDP),
Official Opposition Deputy House Leader
Sigurdson, Hon. Lori, ECA, Edmonton-Riverview (NDP)
Sigurdson, Hon. R.J., ECA, Highwood (UC)
Sinclair, Scott, Lesser Slave Lake (Ind)
Singh, Peter, Calgary-East (UC)
Smith, Hon. Danielle, ECA, Brooks-Medicine Hat (UC),
Premier
Stephan, Jason, Red Deer-South (UC)
Sweet, Heather, Edmonton-Manning (NDP)
Tejada, Lizette, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Turton, Hon. Searle, ECA, Spruce Grove-Stony Plain (UC)
Wiebe, Ron, Grande Prairie-Wapiti (UC)
Williams, Hon. Dan D.A., ECA, Peace River (UC),
Deputy Government House Leader
Wilson, Hon. Rick D., ECA, Maskwacis-Wetaskiwin (UC)
Wright, Justin, Cypress-Medicine Hat (UC)
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, Edmonton-Ellerslie
Vacant, Edmonton-Strathcona

Party standings:

United Conservative: 47

New Democrat: 36

Independent: 2

Vacant: 2

Officers and Officials of the Legislative Assembly

Shannon Dean, KC, Clerk
Trafton Koenig, Law Clerk

Philip Massolin, Clerk Assistant and
Executive Director of Parliamentary
Services

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

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

Executive Council

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

Parliamentary Secretaries

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

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund

Chair: Mr. Yao

Deputy Chair: Mr. Rowswell

Boitchenko
Brar
Kasawski
Kayande
Stephan
Wiebe
Wright, J.

Standing Committee on Alberta's Economic Future

Chair: Mr. Getson

Deputy Chair: Vacant

Boparai
Cyr
de Jonge
Elmeligi
Hoyle
Stephan
van Dijken
Wright, J.

Select Special Conflicts of Interest Act Review Committee

Chair: Mr. Getson

Deputy Chair: Mr. Long

Arcand-Paul
Ellingson
Hunter
Ip
Lovely
Rowswell
Sabir
Wright, J.

Standing Committee on Families and Communities

Chair: Ms Lovely

Deputy Chair: Ms Goehring

Batten
Haji
Johnson
Lunty
McDougall
Petrovic
Singh
Tejada

Standing Committee on Legislative Offices

Chair: Mr. Getson

Deputy Chair: Mr. van Dijken

Chapman
Cyr
Dyck
Eremenko
Lovely
Miyashiro
Petrovic
Shepherd

Special Standing Committee on Members' Services

Chair: Mr. McIver

Deputy Chair: Mr. Getson

Eggen
Gray
Hunter
Metz
Petrovic
Sabir
Singh
Yao

Standing Committee on Private Bills

Chair: Ms Pitt

Deputy Chair: Mr. Cyr

Bouchard
Ceci
Deol
Dyck
Hayter
Johnson
Sigurdson, L.
Wright, J.

Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing

Chair: Ms Armstrong-Homeniuk

Deputy Chair: Mr. Wiebe

Arcand-Paul
Bouchard
Ceci
Cyr
Dach
Gray
Sinclair
Stephan

Standing Committee on Public Accounts

Chair: Mr. Sabir

Deputy Chair: Mr. Rowswell

Armstrong-Homeniuk
de Jonge
Ellingson
Johnson
Lunty
McDougall
Renaud
Schmidt

Standing Committee on Resource Stewardship

Chair: Mr. Rowswell

Deputy Chair: Ms Sweet

Al-Guneid
Armstrong-Homeniuk
Boitchenko
Calahoo Stonehouse
Dyck
Eggen
Hunter
Yao

Legislative Assembly of Alberta

7:30 p.m.

Wednesday, May 14, 2025

Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

The Deputy Chair: I'd like to call the committee to order.
The Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that the committee rise and report progress on Bill 55.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

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

Mr. McDougall: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports progress on the following bill: Bill 55. I wish to table copies of all amendments considered by Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

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

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Acting Speaker: Any opposed, please say no. That is carried.
Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request unanimous consent of the Assembly to move to one-minute bells for the remainder of the evening sitting, including the first bell of Committee of the Whole.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Government Bills and Orders Committee of the Whole (continued)

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

Bill 54 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, pursuant to Government Motion 71, agreed to earlier this afternoon, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, in Committee of the Whole. Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered? The Member for Edmonton-City Centre.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill 54, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025. As we've discussed and as I've had the chance already to put on record, I have many concerns about this bill. I think fundamentally it poses, I don't think it's hyperbolic to say, a threat to democracy in Alberta. It is quite the opposite of what the Minister of Justice and other members of the government contend.

This is going to create more problems. It's going to create more issues. It is going to hurt transparency and accountability, and one of

the ways it is going to do that is by dumping hundreds, thousands, millions more dollars into our elections. In particular, in Bill 54 the government is moving to significantly increase third-party advertising limits. Now, those were initially established to help prevent outsized influence of wealthy special interests. I think these were reasonable limits that were put in place to help maintain a level playing field in our democracy.

The current spending limit is \$150,000. I think that's pretty reasonable to allow a third party to communicate any messages they might want to share in the context of an election while preventing, I think, any single group from dominating that discussion. A lot of Albertans have concerns about the growing influence of money in their politics, but with Bill 54 the UCP government is looking to triple the amount that can be spent by a third-party advertiser from \$150,000 to \$500,000 and increase electoral division spending limits from \$3,000 to \$10,000. This is a dramatic increase, Mr. Chair, one that would allow wealthy special interests to flood the zone, flood the political landscape with advertising.

Of particular concern, Mr. Chair, is that we know this legislation is being brought forward and many aspects of this legislation are aimed specifically at one thing, and that's aiding and abetting and supporting a vote on Alberta separating from Canada. The Premier has made it clear she wants to lower this threshold because she's concerned about what's going to happen with her own political party if she doesn't. She feels she needs to hold this vote to hold her party together. So because of the Premier's interests we are going to see this foisted on Albertans. The government is lowering the threshold, and I would suggest it is one of the reasons why they are increasing this threshold, because third parties can also advertise on a referendum. So what we have this Premier deciding, this government deciding with this bill, what they are presenting: they want to give groups that want to tear Alberta out of Canada three times the money to bombard the public with advertising about it.

Now, Mr. Chair, you might say: "Well, what's the issue here? We're just having a conversation. We're just asking the question. Albertans are smart. They're capable. They can make their own decision." Well, you know, earlier today I mentioned an article by the columnist Jen Gerson, and it is talking about specifically this and the reckless lack of leadership from this Premier and government in aiding and abetting the bringing forward of this referendum question. What she says is that

one of the major failings of modern conservatism . . . is that it consistently declines to accept this minimum duty of care to its own constituents. It puts its faith in the notion that we live in a marketplace of ideas. That all things can and should be debated because – of course – good ideas will win out in the long run and bad ideas will be out-debated.

That's mostly correct, but not fully. Because good ideas don't always win – or, rather, they don't always win quickly enough to prevent the irreparable damage that bad ideas can do to societies and the people who live in them. Humans are creatures of emotion and tribal affiliation, not rationality and restraint. Mobs will rule, if they are permitted. And the compulsion to do monstrous things, to intellectually justify evil emotions, is encoded into our deepest natures.

An ideology built around a Pollyannaish fantasy about the marketplace of ideas therefore contains a bone-deep flaw. One that can only be guarded against with the aid of strong institutions, taboos, moral norms, and, yes, authority. Leadership, if you will.

Conservatives used to understand this better than most. [They] used to be the champions of institutions and incrementalism on this very understanding.

There is a point at which "just asking questions" ceases to be a healthy and robust intellectual exercise and instead starts to become an abdication of moral responsibility.

She talks about the concept of the tyranny of the minority, also known in an essay by Nassim Nicholas Taleb, Dictatorship of the Small Minority, of which she says, “Briefly, this concept points out that a small, committed minority can hold entire institutions hostage if the leaders of those institutions lose their moral bearings and fail to assert norms and guardrails.” What we had here, Mr. Chair, was a guardrail in our democracy to contain the amount of spending that a third party could spend on election advertising or, in this case, on a referendum.

7:40

Out of their political interests this government is tearing that away and they are tripling the threshold. This is not something that’s going to benefit Albertans. This is not something that’s going to help Albertans. This is something that, in the words of Ms Gerson, could do irreparable harm. For that reason, I’m bringing forward this amendment.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, this will be referred to as amendment A4.

The hon. Member for Edmonton-City Centre may proceed and read it into the record.

Mr. Shepherd: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Moved by my colleague from Calgary-Bhullar-McCall that Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, be amended in section 7(57) by striking out clauses (a) and (b), essentially returning us, backing us off from that \$500,000, that tripling of the threshold for third-party advertisers, bringing it back to \$150,000 so that, as this government rockets us towards this referendum on Alberta separating from Canada, we don’t have triple the amount of money for folks to flood the zone with advertising, propelling us to the sort of Brexit-type situation that we saw, the incredible damage that that has done for the folks in Great Britain.

I think \$150,000 is quite reasonable for everyone to have their ideas, their views expressed. It worked just fine for the folks that were third-party advertisers on the previous referendum, which this government held on equalization. I think, in this case, \$150,000 is adequate here. I hope our colleagues on the government’s side agree.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: Any others wishing to provide comment to amendment A4? The Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the submissions from my colleague in Edmonton-City Centre, certainly passionate about Bill 54 and the amendments put forward. There’s a glaring problem with the amendment put forward by the Member for Edmonton-City Centre on behalf of the Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall. While they spend a great deal of time speaking about their discontent with Bill 54, they certainly should and must respect the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada.

In it, Mr. Chair, this exact issue was decided just a few months ago. In March 2025 the Supreme Court of Canada held that limits on third-party advertising were inappropriate, that third-party advertisers play an important role in our elections, play an important role in informing the public of important issues, and the amendments put forward in Bill 54 address exactly that. I would ask all members of this Assembly not only to respect the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada but also to vote against this amendment, which would go in direct contravention of that recent decision.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wishing to provide comment?

I am prepared to call the question on amendment A4 as proposed by the Member for Edmonton-City Centre on behalf of the hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 7:44 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

For the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Gray	Renaud
Brar	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoyle	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Ip	Sweet
Deol	Irwin	Tejada
Eggen	Kasawski	Wright, P.
Ellingson		

Against the motion:

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

Totals:	For – 31	Against – 41
---------	----------	--------------

[Motion on amendment A4 lost]

The Deputy Chair: We are back on the main bill, Bill 54. Are there any more? Edmonton-North West has risen.

Mr. Eggen: Well, thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I just have so many thoughts about Bill 54, but I’ll try to just be as succinct as possible. You know, I find this to be one of the most cynical political moves that I’ve ever seen in this Legislature. Clearly, the government had a plan to invoke this sovereignty referendum scheme – right? – the minute that the federal election results came in.

7:50

For us to be risking not just our place in Canada as a province but, you know, the nation of Canada as well – to be clear, there is a sovereignty movement, and it is the United States wanting to move in on us, quite frankly. It’s not to create an independent state. I mean, for 5 million people it’s just not viable, but certainly the United States of America has made it abundantly clear that they are interested in a secession from Canada by any province, really – Alberta maybe is a good start – and to absorb them into the United States of America. The vast majority of Albertans would have

nothing to do with this. Myself I will have nothing to do with this either, and we will ensure that this is defeated every step of the way and that we remain as part of the Confederation of Canada here in the province of Alberta.

Playing with fire is an understatement as a metaphor for this, and we see so many examples of this backfiring around the world. People talk about Brexit. David Cameron said: “Okay. Well, I’ll run this Brexit thing as a referendum. It’ll go away, and that will be it.” Oh, no. Right? In the heat of the moment that referendum passed, and the United Kingdom’s economy has suffered catastrophically as a result. Europe has been weakened as a result. In the midst of a war in Europe we have all of these things, and it’s like dominoes falling down.

A referendum is very volatile and very unstable and very uncertain, and certainly Bill 54, by allowing so many more donations in from third parties, from corporate donations, from increasing personal limits – the people that have a vested interest in executing a sovereignty yes vote will have so many more tools as a result of Bill 54. Lowering the threshold by half to get a referendum on a ballot, increasing corporate donations – right? – by people who would choose to break up Canada and choose to have Alberta secede from Confederation, giving them all the tools that they need: Mr. Chair, this is absolutely unconscionable.

We see that this UCP government from the beginning has been planning this all along, right? Taking us out of the Canada pension plan, removing the national RCMP as a police force: you know, the list goes on and on, the different pieces that they’re moving into position. And, by golly, there they are. Here we are at the brink of being able to start the process of having a sovereignty referendum, very well funded by the people who would like to see a yes vote, happening here in the next few months in Alberta.

Well, I can tell you, Mr. Chair, that we stand as the Alberta New Democrats to make sure that this doesn’t happen here in the province of Alberta. Anybody who wants to get in the way of that – it’s a democratic process; yes, it is – we will make sure that you will lose. For sure. As a result, I think the only fair thing to do after losing is for all of the perpetrators of this plot to resign. That’s a perfectly reasonable thing for them to do.

We know that when we had our first bill, when we formed government a number of years ago, Bill 1 was to remove corporate and union donations from the political process. You know, it was voted unanimously. In fact, the Wildrose of the time – there are some institutional memories back there I’m sure, confused as they might be sometimes. The Progressive Conservatives, the Wildrose: it was a unanimous vote for this thing to clean up donations, to make sure that democracy could not be bought here in the province of Alberta.

Here we are now 10 years later, and, by golly, there it is. Yes, democracy can be bought by this UCP government changing this very law. It’s very dangerous. As was mentioned before, it allows for single-issue sort of donations. People that want to break up the country, for example: this is a great place to invest because this is just an opportunity of a lifetime, right? This government is giving us it by changing the election statutes here with Bill 54.

I mean, I don’t think I can make it any more clear. We do not support this bill, the vast majority of Albertans. It’s coming in at the eleventh hour, right? They just slip this thing in, and people are just starting to figure out just how damaging it can be. Even that, by the very process of doing that, undermining democracy, undermining the process of democracy, putting big money back into our democratic process here in Alberta, is nothing but negative results, as we can obviously see. So I encourage everyone to vote against Bill 54 here this evening. I mean, it’s the eleventh hour, but that’s

when this bill was brought in in the first place. We can stop it here tonight at the eleventh hour as well.

The Deputy Chair: Any others to provide comment? I will recognize the Official Opposition Leader.

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I’d simply rise to object to Bill 54 at Committee of the Whole for the reasons so many of my colleagues have outlined. Specifically, I’m very concerned about the potential referendum. I’m also concerned about the creation of the new fundraising mechanisms through the candidate fundraising accounts, which, unfortunately, given the time allocation, we’ve not had enough time to discuss. Bringing back in union and corporate donations is shameful at this point.

With these very brief comments, I rise to object to Bill 54 continuing.

The Deputy Chair: I recognize the Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I have an enormous amount to say about this bill. Very unfortunately, there isn’t a lot of time to say it in, so I will attempt to be as brief as possible. I just want to begin by talking about the fact that the Chief Electoral Officer has significant problems with this bill. It’s a bill that makes it harder for people to vote. It’s a bill that adopts Trump-style politics here in Canada. It’s about letting big money in and keeping the little man out of the electoral process.

It’s designed specifically to allow those who have deep pockets, who have lots of money, to have a greater influence on our elections and to force out those who are at the bottom, those who are less likely to be able to vote anyway. Essentially, it’s a bill to shift away from the system we have always enjoyed, which is to say one person, one vote. Now, instead, we will have more and more and more influence for people with more and more and more money and less and less and less influence for those who don’t. And what that creates is a system that perpetuates, where more and more money is shifted to the wealthy and they have more and more influence in our democracy. Mr. Chair, I just don’t like it.

Another thing that I will say that I deeply despise about this bill is the separatist referendum. I am Canadian. Most Albertans are Canadian. All of us in this room are Canadian. We don’t want to be the 51st state. Albertans don’t want to be the 51st state. Even at a fundraiser in an area that has massive support for the UCP, the Premier still couldn’t get cheers on trying to separate from Canada and become the 51st state. Mr. Chair, I think it is incredibly clear that Albertans do not want to become Americans. We are Canadians. We would like to stay Canadians, and we object strongly to these attempts on the part of the UCP to make us the 51st state.

Now, obviously, I can’t fix in this moment everything that is wrong with this bill though I deeply, deeply wish that I could because I think that the people of this province deserve democracy. But one thing I can fix is to get some of the big money out of politics.

8:00

Mr. Chair, it’s actually kind of funny that I should be the person moving this amendment because 10 years ago I moved Bill 1 on behalf of the NDP government, which banned corporate and union donations. This is an amendment which will put back the donation limits as they were previously and which will ban corporate and union donations. I would urge all members of this House to support it.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, this amendment will be referred to as amendment A5.

I don't believe we're going to read the whole amendment into the record, but the member can proceed.

Ms Ganley: I appreciate that deeply, Mr. Chair. Yes, I appreciate not having to read it into the record. It is a very long amendment, but the substance of it is to ensure that donation limits are back in place and that corporate and union donations are banned.

Mr. Chair, I believe very strongly that democracy should belong to the people. I believe very strongly that each person should have equal influence in our elections, regardless of the wealth they were or were not born to. This is an amendment that tries to bring that back in our democracy a little bit.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wishing to speak to amendment A5? I'll recognize the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for recognizing me. Thank you to the member for introducing this amendment and for the submissions. When the NDP brought forward their Bill 1 banning corporate and union donations, they opened the door to PACs. The problem with that is that there was no financial oversight whatsoever in what these PACs were receiving, who they were receiving the money from, or what they were doing with it. Bill 54 puts an end to that. It requires appropriate accountability. It requires corporate and union donations and those receiving them to provide full oversight and transparency so that people can see who is donating to whichever particular candidate is receiving those funds and a breakdown of where that money is coming from. This closes the NDP dark money door, and it allows for financial oversight.

I would submit that it would be appropriate for all members of this Assembly to vote down this amendment.

The Deputy Chair: Any other members wishing to provide comment on amendment A5?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question on amendment A5 as proposed by the hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View on behalf of the hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

[Motion on amendment A5 lost]

The Deputy Chair: The Minister of Justice has risen.

Mr. Amery: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I want to start by saying that I have truly appreciated all of the debate that we've had on the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, so far.

Mr. Chair, Bill 54 is about protecting our democracy. The amendments in this bill would protect the integrity of our elections and bolster confidence in the methods and results of elections here in this province. Bill 54 would also help ensure that our election results are delivered on time, that candidates and Albertans alike can see the results of their elections in a timely manner. Albertans will have more options to cast a ballot and prove their place of residence.

Amendments with respect to Senate elections and referendums will improve access to voting for First Nations and Métis settlements and allow voting to be discontinued and recommenced on another day should we ever find ourselves in an emergency. Other amendments would ensure that important citizen initiatives and recall votes for MLAs are conducted in a standard, accessible, and transparent manner that will create a fairer process for members of the public.

As I mentioned previously, elections are an important cornerstone of our democracy and maintaining public confidence is absolutely paramount. Since I tabled Bill 54, we've heard from partners, we've heard from stakeholders, and we've heard from Albertans. In response to the input we've received, I too would like to introduce some amendments to Bill 54.

The Deputy Chair: Hon. members, the amendment will be referred to as amendment A6. I will ask the minister to proceed.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Chair. The Member for Sherwood Park seems overly interested in these amendments so I'd be happy to explain it to him and all members of the Assembly.

I propose to amend the new section 8.11 of the Referendum Act to add a new subsection (3) that would read as follows:

Nothing in a referendum held under this Act is to be construed as abrogating or derogating from the existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada that are recognized and affirmed by section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

The proposed House amendment is in addition to the current, already existing requirement in 2(4) of the Citizen Initiative Act that states that,

An initiative petition proposal must not contravene sections 1 to 35.1 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

Alberta's government has heard concerns from First Nations regarding how a referendum question may impact existing treaties between First Nations and the Crown. We are listening and we recognize the importance of protecting treaty rights, which is why we're proposing this amendment.

I also, in the amendment put forward to you, propose to amend sections 11(5) and (7) of Bill 54 to remove the ability to use mail-in ballots in a constitutional referendum. Subsections (8) and (14) would also be changed to be consistent with that amendment. Currently in the unamended Referendum Act mail-in ballots are allowed for nonconstitutional referendums but not constitutional referendums. When we introduced the bill it included an amendment to allow for mail-in ballots for constitutional referendums. Today's proposed amendment would reverse the original amendments and preserve the status quo.

Finally, Mr. Chair, the amendment input we've received from the Chief Electoral Officer regarding investigations is currently being addressed as well. The amendment would strike section 153.2(1) and amend 153.2 of the Elections Act so it reads in part:

A letter of reprimand or a notice of administrative penalty may not be served more than

- (a) one year after the date on which the Election Commissioner received a complaint in accordance with section 153.09(1)(a), or
- (b) 2 years after the date on which the Election Commissioner knew or ought to have known of a matter that permits the Election Commissioner to conduct an investigation under section 153.09(1)(b) or (c),

whichever is earlier.

(1.1) If the Election Commissioner receives more than one complaint respecting substantially the same . . . matter, the date referred to in subsection (1)(a) must be calculated with respect to the first of those complaints received by the Elections Commissioner.

Similarly, the EFCDA would strike sections 51.02(1) and amend 51.02 of the act so it reads similarly.

Chair, all of the bill's proposals are meant to protect our democracy, deliver free and fair elections, and restore confidence in every vote cast by Albertans. The amendments put forward seek to find a balance from the input we've received while also ensuring

that transparency, accountability, and confidence in our election system remains paramount.

Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: I will recognize the Member for Edmonton-West Henday.

Member Arcand-Paul: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm incredibly concerned that it took this long for the UCP to realize that it made this mistake and propose this amendment, which I do not support. I'd urge everyone in this Chamber to vote against.

8:10

I echo the concerns raised by the chiefs who are entirely against the possibility of separation. This includes from the grand chief of Treaty 6, who just today responded to an entirely condescending letter from the Premier to the Confederacy of Treaty Six First Nations, Treaty 8 First Nations, Grand Chief Mercredi, the Blackfoot Confederacy chiefs, and the Treaty 7 First Nations Chiefs' Association. To quote Grand Chief Desjarlais: The confederacy believes that this interpretative provision does not and could not limit an initiative petition proposal, which would have the effect of derogating from Aboriginal and treaty rights protected by the Constitution.

And just now this government received a second cease and desist letter from the Sturgeon Lake Cree Nation, which states: Bill 54 is harmful to our treaty relationship by giving individuals the ability to direct what happens on treaty land, a treaty that the Alberta government is not party to; this act alone is a breach of treaty and is not the government of Alberta's jurisdiction.

The way that this derogation or abrogation clause is drafted does nothing other than pay lip service to Indigenous peoples in this province, Mr. Chair. This is common language that non-Indigenous decision-makers put into their agreements or legislation when they've got nothing else. It is not something that hastily needs to be done after the UCP got in hot water because it looks disingenuous and because it is.

I've spoken to this issue multiple times in this House, and my position is unchanged by this amendment. The UCP cannot on one hand say that they will honour treaty and Indigenous rights in this province while at the same time threatening the very existence of the treaties. I have heard from proud Canadians in Alberta and those that want to separate both on this topic. The problem that I find with the latter is that they believe First Nations and treaty rights holders will be given a better go at things in Alberta as a country. This is fallacious. If the UCP truly wanted to work with Indigenous peoples, it would not have to put forward this bill to set the standard for separation and thereby threaten the very existence of treaties in this province.

Mr. Chair, this amendment does nothing but acknowledge the responsibilities that government have under Confederation. But then what happens after that? The chiefs and other Indigenous leaders are not fooled by this. What happens when separation is moved forward in 2026, as this government has alluded to in the Premier's address? Acknowledging the treaties does not mean much when you are threatening its very existence.

Well, Mr. Chair, this amendment does not give any assurance to me nor the chiefs, so I would urge this Chamber to vote against this amendment and to also defeat this bill because it is incredibly bad for so many reasons. Stating, "ensuring that any citizen-initiated referendum, if passed, must uphold and honour treaties 6, 7, and 8," does nothing. You cannot do that. You just cannot. This amendment does not even confirm this. It acknowledges that it does not abrogate nor derogate, which is revoke or reduce in plain language

respectively. The province cannot do that. This government is doing nothing but lip service to the chiefs. I know the law. I know these clauses. I've been working with them throughout my professional career, and the attempt to provide this assurance to chiefs and Indigenous leadership does nothing more than commit this province to something it is already obligated to do. Nothing more. Not protecting treaty.

Finally, while the Premier states that this government strongly believes and wants to facilitate First Nations prosperity and self-determination while concurrently threatening the federal government to remove the more robust consultation requirements under the Impact Assessment Act is concerning. Yes, I know this government absolutely abhors listening to Indigenous voices when it comes to their own land and how it is hurting them. Bill C-69 has provided a new framework for Indigenous nations to be adequately consulted. I have raised my concerns with this province's absolute failure to consult with Indigenous nations when it comes to the land, when it comes to the water, and when it comes to our shared futures. Part of recognizing Indigenous prosperity and self-determination includes actually listening to First Nations and Métis peoples in this province.

This amendment, as late as it is in this process, while the government is ramming legislation down to a few minutes of debate, is unconscionable. To also demand in bad faith to the federal government to repeal Bill C-69 would further remove the voices of Indigenous peoples via consultation. It is reprehensible, Mr. Chair, because this government fails abhorrently when it comes to consultation.

It is for these reasons I urge this House to not support this amendment. I look forward to the legal challenges that come.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. [interjections]

The Deputy Chair: Order.

Are there any others wishing to provide comment on amendment A6?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question.

[Motion on amendment A6 carried]

The Deputy Chair: We are back on the main bill. I will recognize the Member for Calgary-Buffalo.

Member Ceci: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Back on the main bill that has been amended now. Like my colleague from Edmonton-West Henday has just said, I don't think chiefs are going to be mollified or helped by this new paragraph. Nothing in a referendum held under this act construed is abrogating their rights and responsibilities. I think it's too little too late. The horse is definitely out of the barn.

This legislation is not about democratic renewal. It's about many things in Bill 54, but democracy is not one of them. It's about dark corporate money coming back into politics, something that was taken out by – imagine in 2015, as my colleague was saying, 10 years ago, the PCs, the Wildrose, and Rachel Notley's NDP all agreeing unanimously to take out dark money from politics. That was a very important decision and a good day and put us in line with many other provinces. We were behind the times, but it put us in line with those.

Now, the UCP, the far right-wing splinter from the previous PCs and the Wildrose 2.0, are opening up the floodgates again for donations from corporations. I say corporations because very few unions, as I see it, as I understand union structure, will have the structure to be able to pony up \$5,000 to – and it's not because they're weak. It's because political involvement is not part of their main reason for being. Corporations don't have that same limitation

on them, and they'll be contributing to the people they want to contribute to, the politicians they want to contribute to, the campaigns they want to contribute to. I think that this is being done because the UCP, in a very cynical way, is hoping that those corporations will line up behind them. It's wrong, and it takes us backwards to the days when wealthy interests did and will again drown out the voices of everyday Albertans.

I think, in summary to the bill, the key changes are to several acts, Mr. Chair. We know that the Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act has changed as a result of Bill 54. The Citizen Initiative Act is changed as a result of Bill 54. The Recall Act, the Election Act, and the Referendum Act are all changed. This omnibus legislation is aiming to reduce several of the positive NDP electoral reforms and also restructuring aspects of Alberta's electoral and referendum system ahead of the next provincial election. It's a cynical piece of legislation that First Nation chiefs have not seen and will not see as a positive improvement to their nations and lives.

We know that there are issues that have been reported on by people involved, you know – professors of political science, pundits, people who watch politics – and they see the voter identification and suppression aspects of this bill as representing the most significant voter access restriction in Alberta's modern electoral history. It takes us back, Mr. Chair, to a time when people who had difficulties expressing themselves in terms of their free ability to vote are now going to be even more hampered as a result of that.

8:20

Who has the greatest difficulty around all of that? The people who need vouching especially are the ones who will be prevented from casting their votes. The number of people who vouched in the last election were .7 per cent of the voters, Mr. Chair. You know, what is the UCP afraid of? You have to ask. Those people who need vouching are people who don't bring their ID who come with a family member; who are perhaps living in care facilities, show up at their voting station without their ID, and instead of having them have to go back, if they have someone who knows them. That's what vouching is all about: to facilitate democratic involvement in our elections. That was a good thing.

What we see before us is not a good thing, and I, like my colleagues, will continue to not support Bill 54 and work against it. When the time comes, Mr. Chair – hopefully, that time will be at the next general election – and the NDP are back in charge, if it's a fall election or a spring election or a summer election or a winter election, there will be recall. Not recall. There will be – yeah. That's what Mr. Kenney called it when he was here. He called it the summer of recall for the legislation that was brought in by us. We're going to do the same thing to bad bills like this one and every other one that's before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: Thank you.

Any other members wishing to speak? The Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview.

Ms Wright: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm happy to stand and talk to my opposition to Bill 54, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025. This is a bill that is nothing, in my view, short of antidemocratic. It manufactures a sovereignty crisis just days after a federal election. It appears to be designed to distract from all the not so great things Albertans are experiencing as a result of the incompetence of this UCP government. It creates this din kind of that just sort of swirls around us constantly and consistently, and

through that din Albertans' voices, like a few of my constituents, are begging to be heard except this government isn't hearing them.

One of my constituents, Travis, has some real concerns with this bill, Mr. Chair. One of the things that he says in an e-mail that he sent just a week ago says that

it appears that our Premier has once again chosen to sow seeds of discontent rather than build bridges. My newest main concern is the proposed new referendum voting changes. This is a concern to see tabled the day after losing a federal election, and no matter what the Premier says about whether these would have been released in a Conservative victory, this comes across as nothing more than a temper tantrum.

Milan, who's a young constituent of mine, writes, and what he says is that the separatist base, one which, unfortunately, has elements that have shown to disregard treaty rights and have spewed extremist, hateful rhetoric on social media, is gaining momentum. We can't let that happen, Mr. Chair.

Rebecca states that

the Premier suggested that a desire to leave Alberta is one held by many if not a majority of Albertans. I want to make it clear that this is not the case. With the tariffs and hostile policy coming from the United States, Canada must stand united, and giving a platform to radical separatist groups is dangerous and presents the entire province in a poor light.

She goes on to say, Mr. Chair, that

Albertans do not need to be worried about threats of separation when the average Albertan is struggling to pay rent, daycare, utilities, and groceries.

Mr. Chair, Bill 54, as I said, is sowing the seeds for barriers to voting. It makes it more difficult for people to vote rather than making it easier for folks to vote, and quite frankly the total lack of attention to treaty rights and our responsibility of treaty people is absolutely abhorrent to me. What this government could and should have done, what they should have had very first on their agenda before they decided to present this bill to this Legislature: they might have chosen to enter into conversations in circle in the right way with the folks of treaties 6, 7, and 8, with those people. They might have chosen to listen and then to respond appropriately rather than place this bill before us and then try and backpedal with this amendment that we just saw.

However, they didn't do any of that. They chose to lay it before us in its present form. We've got rushed amendments, a bill that sets the stage for disenfranchisement of voters through the elimination of things which, quite frankly, help many members of my own constituency vote, vote anywhere and vouching. Vote anywhere and vouching, Mr. Chair, add to the opportunity that all Albertans have to vote. This is a right that everyone needs to have the opportunity to do. It is incumbent upon this government and is certainly incumbent upon the offices like Elections Alberta to make that work for people.

The other thing that I believe this bill does is that it simply copies willy-nilly from what's going on in the United States, and that is not a road that this province should be going down on. We know what's happening in the United States right now. We know that there are active voter suppression measures going on, and this is voter suppression perhaps in a slightly nicer form but nonetheless voter suppression. The elimination of vouching along with the vote-anywhere procedures creates real barriers for Albertans. It solves a problem that, quite frankly, we don't need to solve.

During our last provincial election, two years ago, I sat in a meeting with Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview's returning officer. All the candidates were there, and we heard from one of the candidates at that time, Mr. Chair, that they had heard that there were going to be some buses of homeless people. They were just going to round up all the homeless people, they were going to bring them all into

the voting booth, and they were going to vouch for them. That was not at all the truth. It was a lie. Nonetheless, it had its root in this sort of thing that we see before us today. The idea was to make it harder for people to vote, and by making contentions like that, making statements like that, which were unfounded, which I believe the folks who made those statements knew were totally unfounded – they knew they were just rumours, but they said them anyway – it was an attempt to suppress voting. But not only that; it was also an attempt to vilify an entire group of people.

Every single person over the age of 18 in Alberta has the right to vote. It is not just a privilege; it is a right. As I said, this government's responsibility is to make sure that right is available.

One of the issues that I have with this bill, Mr. Chair, is the fact that people will no longer be able to vouch for others, and I speak from some personal experience here. Right now I know that folks can either show only their current driver's license or an identification card, but that sometimes can get trickier, for instance, if the voter has moved recently, as they'll need to show a second piece of identification with their current physical address. For those without, for instance, a driver's license or identity card, they need to show two approved pieces of identification.

Now, the problem, Mr. Chair, is one that my own mother faced as she went into her 80s and, you know, decided really not to do necessarily all the things she was supposed to do, that the government told her to do because she figured she was in her 80s and she could just kind of do things the way she wanted to. Nonetheless, it became a problem when she no longer had a current identification card. And it's very true, again, that there are lots of approved ID to choose from if you don't have those primary pieces of identification. You can use a birth certificate, a passport, a First Nations membership card, a marriage certificate, even a library card, an Alberta health card.

But if you're like my mother and, as I say, if you're in your 80s and you haven't kept up on those identification requirements because you haven't and because you're in your 80s, you have no idea where that marriage certificate from 50 or 60 years ago is. You think you might have your birth certificate, but you can't find it, and right now you do not have the dollars to replace it, Mr. Chair. You might have a decades-old passport, but it's decades old, so that one is not going to count. You don't have a library card that's in your own name because it's usually your husband who goes to the Sherwood Park library and takes books out, including those you tell him that you want to read and that he has to get for you. Even though your name is on that life lease, you just don't have that second piece of identification. You might be able to find one thing, but you cannot find two. That means you cannot vote, Mr. Chair.

Now, we've heard from the members opposite just recently, the last couple of days that all you have to do is go to the navigation centre, but I'm here to tell you that if you're in your mid-80s – there isn't a navigation centre in Sherwood Park, Mr. Chair. There are two navigation centres in all of Alberta, one in Edmonton and one in Calgary, and it's really hard to take a cab to Calgary last time I checked. If you have issues with mobility and you can't stand in lines for a long time because of health issues and then if your husband who would be accompanying you also has health issues, too – and he's six months away, quite frankly, from being in the same no-identification land that you might be in at that moment. Right now, again, you don't have the money to go to the registry office and pay for not just one but two new birth certificates. You don't have the money to take an expensive cab ride downtown. That means you're not going to have the identification that you need in order to vote. But you're a person who has voted since the moment you turned 18 because you understood how important that was. You understood that there was a time when your mother did not have the

ability to vote because the country told her that she wasn't a person. You know how very important it is to vote.

8:30

Mr. Chair, this is a situation that many seniors in this province are now going to be facing upon passage of this bill. These are folks who have voted their entire lives. These are folks who fought for the right for others to be able to vote, and quite frankly these are folks who deserve better. Seniors in care facilities will face the same difficulty. Folks who happen to be in hospital could easily find themselves in a similar situation.

Instead of creating additional barriers to Albertans, Mr. Chair, what this government could have chosen to do is to assure Albertans that they know their job, that their job is to make sure as many folks who are able to should in fact be able to vote in each of our elections in our province. That means retaining and leaving the vote anywhere provisions, and that also means retaining vouching.

Dr. Jared Wesley talked about this and about moves like this although, mind you, he was talking about Bill 20 at the time, but it applies to Bill 54. What he said was that these bills are concerning from a democratic inclusiveness standpoint because people who don't have voter identification are usually the most marginalized in our community. Provisions like those we see in Bill 54, Mr. Chair, will absolutely restrict the people who can cast ballots.

This is voter suppression. This is harm. A government should not be actively doing harm to the people it was elected to represent and the people it was elected to serve. We see that harm happen all the time now in the United States. I just want to take you on a wee bit of a geographical and political tour down in the United States, Mr. Chair.

An Hon. Member: Take us there.

Ms Wright: Thank you very much.

When we take a look at our neighbours to the south, we learn that overly burdensome photo identification requirements end up blocking millions of eligible Americans from voting. They know, just like we do here, that it is absolutely possible to ensure a secure election without compromising the individual citizen's right to vote. But in the U.S. right now it's estimated that about 11 per cent of eligible voters don't have the kind of identification that states in particular, many of which are instituting tougher voter ID laws, are now requiring. They also know, just like we do here, too, that that percentage ends up being higher amongst seniors, minorities, people with disabilities, low-income voters, and students.

In particular, Mr. Chair, the Brennan Center in 2022 noted that Native American voters living on rural reservations often use ballot collection services due to limited access to home mail services and polling places. Yet [in the 2021 election], Montana – home to 12... nations – enacted a law that makes it illegal to pay organizers who collect... absentee ballots from voters.

The law [has become] part of a nationwide surge in voter suppression legislation instigated by state legislators... [and] in 2021, states around the country enacted dozens...

Dozens.

... of restrictive voting laws, making vote by mail and early voting more difficult, imposing harsher voter [identification] requirements, and making faulty voter purges more likely.

Mr. Chair, this is the road we're going down, and we shouldn't be. There is no reason why we should be following in the footsteps of a system that – quite frankly, if you want to call it a broken system, the system down in the States is absolutely broken. Native Americans in the U.S. are facing threats of disenfranchisement for a whole host of reasons. Many Native American communities...

The Deputy Chair: I hesitate to interrupt the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview, but pursuant to Government Motion 71, agreed to earlier this evening, which states that after one hour of debate all questions must be decided to conclude debate on Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, I must now put the following questions to conclude debate.

[The voice vote indicated that the remaining clauses of Bill 54 were agreed to]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 8:34 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

For:

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

Against:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 42 Against – 35

[The remaining clauses of Bill 54 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Hon. members, I will remind members that it is inappropriate to take photographs inside the Chamber. Just so everybody is aware, it would be good to proceed in that manner.

8:40

Bill 55 Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025

The Deputy Chair: Are there any comments, questions?

Ms Ganley: Mr. Chair, this bill introduces American-style health care, and to put it succinctly, American-style health care sucks.

The Deputy Chair: Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Member Irwin: Thank you. It's going to be hard to follow that speech, but I'll do my best. I was cut off just before finishing my remarks prior with very limited debate due to this UCP government's use of time allocation, taking away our opportunity to speak to bills of such consequence and truly a complete disservice to the people we were elected here to represent.

I want to get my final, brief thoughts on the record on this absolutely atrocious omnibus Bill 55, that allows for further privatization of our health care system. It's absolutely shameful that the UCP will not listen to those most impacted by this horrendous bill. Friends of Medicare, the Alberta Federation of Labour, Canadian Union of Public Employees, Alberta Union of Provincial Employees, Health Sciences Association of Alberta, the United Nurses of Alberta: these are just some of the many organizations speaking out, and they are saying that private corporations must never be allowed to run and profit from public hospitals.

Albertans have been clear, too. They want health care protected. They want to access health care with their Alberta health care card, not their credit card. They want more doctors. They want less time waiting in emergency rooms. They want timely access to surgeries, to MRIs. They want publicly funded and publicly delivered health care that meets the needs of their families. They do not want Trump-style, American health care. They do not want privately operated hospitals that cost more and provide less health care, and it's time the UCP start listening. Start supporting public health care. Stop Bill 55 once and for all.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: The Member for Calgary-Acadia.

Member Batten: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I rise to join the debate in opposition to Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025. I first want to just take the opportunity to wish all of my fellow nurses a happy Nursing Week. We love you. Thank you so much. [applause] It's always nice when the House can be united. That was lovely.

Okay. Just to build on, you know, some fantastic debate we've already heard on this evening, I want to go back to the whole Trumpian-style health care sucks piece. I did spend some time living in the United States, so I've experienced the private health care myself. When I think about the difference between the publicly funded versus privately funded, there's a huge difference in the type of care you receive. When we're looking at this bill, regardless of what this government wants to say, this is privatization. This is taking public resources, hospitals, and adding in private entities. That is putting profit before people, and that is not what our health care system should look like. It's just not. Nobody wants that.

I do want to share some experiences that I personally had with the private health care just to give an idea of what we're asking for here, guys. I lived in the United States at kind of the end of Bush's second term. That was before Obama, before Obama-care, before the United States actually thought about how they might support their neighbours through what eventually was called Obama-care. Over those times, about 20 years ago now or so, I had a couple of surgeries – you know, your 20s are a little bit nuts – one of which was . . . [interjection] Yeah, right? It gets a little crazy.

One of them was in a private hospital. It was a workman's comp thing. I had my own private room, private nurse, private surgeon. It was over the top. Absolutely the best service I've ever had. Would I have wanted that service meaning that someone else won't have service? Of course not. It was over the top. It was unnecessary.

The second surgery I had was a lot like what we're talking about with the chartered surgical spaces. It's an assembly line, Mr. Chair.

This was a knee surgery. I went in. You were put in a line with other patients: IV, IV, IV – right? – under, under, under; cut, cut, cut; out, out, out. I was young at the time, and it was a simple surgery, so it wasn't really that – I guess I was not particularly negatively impacted by it.

But what I think about, Mr. Chair, is: what if that was my parent, my grandparent? The difference in care is that in one you were treated like, well, a farm animal? I'm not sure. You're moved from one station to the other. There is little personalization. There is little of all of the things that I hold dear as a nurse. All of that individual care that makes the difference did not exist inside that assembly line. That is not what I want to see here in Alberta and certainly not what I want to see in Canada. I want everyone to have access to the care they need when they need it.

As this government continues to privatize health care – they can call it whatever they want; this is what they're doing – they are removing access from everyday Albertans to the care they need. Either it's ripping up contracts with doctors and then later claiming to have hired a whole bunch more. Yeah, you fired them first. Same thing with nurses. I could probably go on. There's probably a whole list of health care professionals who are not very happy with this government, many of which I call my friends. They've told me about the impact of splitting up AHS, a 15-year, world-renowned system. Was it perfect? No, of course not. But, borrowing an expression from my colleague from Edmonton-Riverview, you don't throw the baby out with the bathwater. You just don't. You address what is wrong. You do not scrap the whole thing.

Albertans do not want privatized health care. They do not want a private police force. They do not want a pension that is not with Canada. I do not understand, Mr. Chair, why we are talking about massive changes to our health care system right now.

The Deputy Chair: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. Member for Calgary-Acadia, but pursuant to Government Motion 72, agreed to earlier this afternoon, which states that after one hour of debate all questions must be decided to conclude debate on Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, I must now put the following questions to conclude debate.

[The voice vote indicated that the remaining clauses of Bill 55 were agreed to]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 8:48 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the committee divided]

[Mr. van Dijken in the chair]

For:

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

Against:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 44 Against – 35

[The remaining clauses of Bill 55 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Private Bills

Committee of the Whole

Bill Pr. 5

Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act

The Deputy Chair: Any members wishing to provide comment or question? I will call on the Member for Lethbridge-West.

Any other members wishing to provide comment?

Hon. Members: Question.

The Deputy Chair: I am prepared to call the question on Bill Pr. 5, Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act.

[The clauses of Bill Pr. 5 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Bill Pr. 6

Burman University Amendment Act, 2025

The Deputy Chair: Any members wishing to provide comment, questions, or amendments? The Member for Lacombe-Ponoka.

Mrs. Johnson: Yes, Mr. Chair. I do have an amendment to bring, a brief amendment. It is just for a very small clerical error. That is section 9.3(1)(a)(iii) to be . . .

The Deputy Chair: If you can just hand the amendment to the page, and when it gets to the table, then you can proceed.

This amendment will be referred to as amendment A1.

The Member for Lacombe-Ponoka can proceed.

Mrs. Johnson: It is just a simple typo. It was section 9.3(1)(a)(iii). It will be substituting to section 9.3(1)(b)(iii).

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Deputy Chair: You can proceed. Oh, you're finished. Okay.

Are there any other members wishing to provide comments or questions with regard to amendment A1?

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question.

[Motion on amendment A1 carried]

The Deputy Chair: Back on the main bill. Any further comments, questions, or amendments? Bill Pr. 6.

Seeing none, I am prepared to call the question on Bill Pr. 6, Burman University Amendment Act, 2025.

[The remaining clauses of Bill Pr. 6 agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

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

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: Any opposed? That is carried.

Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move that the committee rise and report Bill 54 with amendments, Bill 55 with amendments, Bill Pr. 6 with amendments, and Bill Pr. 5.

[Motion carried]

[The Speaker in the chair]

The Speaker: The hon. member for the outstanding constituency of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

9:00

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, first-time caller, long-time listener. The Committee of the Whole has had under consideration certain bills. The committee reports the following bill: Bill Pr. 5. The committee reports the following bills with some amendments: Bill 54, Bill 55, Bill Pr. 6. I wish to table copies of all the amendments considered by the Committee of the Whole on this date for the official record of the Assembly.

The Speaker: Hon. members, do you agree?

Hon. Members: Agree.

The Speaker: Are there any opposed? That is carried.

Government Bills and Orders Third Reading

Bill 54 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Amery: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise and move third reading of Bill 54, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025.

The amendments proposed in this act as amended currently would help strengthen public trust in our democratic systems by ensuring elections across the province are conducted in a free and transparent manner. Mr. Speaker, we've had a robust debate on this bill in the House, and I want to thank each and every member for

their participation and their contributions. As MLAs we've been hearing from our constituents as this bill has moved through the legislative process, and I'm proud that our government has listened and adjusted course with a number of amendments introduced through Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight some important aspects of this bill. Through Bill 54 we balance accessibility with protecting the integrity and efficiency of our elections. This includes eliminating the use of vouching, expanding the use of special ballots and the types of identification that can be used to prove residence. We're ensuring timely and accurate results, and in response to concerns we've heard from First Nations regarding existing treaties, we're also amending the Referendum Act to state that

nothing in a referendum held under this Act is to be construed as abrogating or derogating from the existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of the Aboriginal peoples of Canada that are [currently] recognized and affirmed by section 35 of the Constitution Act.

This is very important. With respect to all treaty rights enshrined in the Constitution, this will not change.

Similar to elections, direct democracy processes like petitions to recall an MLA and citizen initiatives give Albertans a chance to express their views. Amendments would ensure that citizen initiatives and recall votes for MLAs are conducted in a standard, accessible, and transparent manner that will create a fairer process for the public. I'd like to be clear, Mr. Speaker, that any citizen in Alberta can start a petition on a policy, a legislative, or a constitutional matter for the Chief Electoral Officer to consider.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is a very comprehensive bill. It is one that our team has been working on since the Premier gave me my mandate letter. A lot of work has gone into this legislation, and I'm grateful for all the feedback we've received on it from all across Alberta. There is nothing more important than ensuring democracy is upheld, and I'm honoured to have played a part in that for our province with the introduction of Bill 54.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage everyone to support Bill 54.

The Speaker: Are there any other members that wish to speak? The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the minister. This is a very good bill that does lots of very good things.

Now, I would like to beg the patience of the House, the Speaker. Perhaps you might provide me a wide latitude, and in exchange for that I will commit that these will be my very last words spoken in the Assembly.

Hon. members, on Wednesday last week I provided my farewell remarks as the Speaker of the Assembly, and I'd like to just provide a few brief remarks that will be my last as the member for the outstanding constituency of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. Thank you doesn't come close to conveying the gratitude that I have that has been the opportunity to serve as the 885th Member of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta.

Politics is a team sport, and often members of the team pay the price for a politician to be on that team. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this place, the Assembly, my children were ages eight, six, and two, and they have paid a significant price for public service. But it's not all bad. We've had many wonderful experiences that we would not have otherwise had. Each of my children feel differently about politics, but each feels strongly in their own way. Porter, my son, who turns 18 tomorrow, isn't a big fan of his dad being in politics; Paxton, my 16-year-old, is sometimes embarrassed by the public nature of her dad's job; and Payton, who's 12, is very proud that her dad is in politics.

In fact, she recently announced to me that she, too, would like to be a politician. I was beaming with pride and asked her: why, sweetheart, do you want to be a politician? She proudly looked at me and announced: well, dad, it seems to me that's the only real job you can get without going to university. You know, parenting and politics: there are no prerequisites, but they should each keep you humble. I love each of my three children dearly. Thank you for putting up with a dad who's been away on too many occasions. To my parents and siblings: thank you so much for your love and support over the many, many years.

The great thing about politics is that you make so many lifelong friends. Some of those friends come in and out of your life for a period of time, and some of them have been with you through all of the times. Politics can be tough-and-tumble at times, and having the support of friends makes great days even better and hard days bearable: Shawn, Scott, and Steve, my stand-in-the-gap guys, always willing to give me a dose of reality or a good tire pump; Andrew, who together we've been through so many of life's challenges, yet here we stand together; and Ethan, who's been a loyal friend and supporter. To my many, many, many former staff and colleagues as well as my friends: thank you for your support. Megan Griffith, who has been through many ups and downs, I've often appreciated your support, advice, and occasional speech. You are very good with words. Thank you so much.

To all of those who have supported me politically: you are more than just supporters and volunteers; you are true friends of which we have all been just trying to walk each other home. A huge thank you to the former presidents of the UCP and Wildrose constituency associations Tim Arnold, Carl Macdonald, and Alex Pratt and to the hundreds of people who have served on boards with me over the years.

Lastly, perhaps most importantly, thank you to the constituents of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. As much as was possible, this was never about me. It, in fact, was always about you. You make our region and communities what they are. You build community. You make Alberta the place that it is, the best place in the entire world. The best governments recognize just that, that Albertans are in charge of this government, and I believe that each day this government has done what it can to try to put Albertans first. To the moms and dads, the grandmas and grandpas, to the workers, to the managers, and everywhere in between: thank you for the incredible way that you make our province everything that it is. May God bless you, and may God bless Alberta. [Standing ovation]

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: I move to adjourn debate.

Mr. Cooper: Oh, I forgot.

The Speaker: I think we've heard the last words. We had a promise.
[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

9:10

Bill 55 Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025

The Speaker: The hon. minister.

Member LaGrange: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pleased to rise today and move third reading of Bill 55, the Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025.

Over the past several months our government has achieved major milestones in our efforts to refocus and strengthen

Alberta's health care system. This work has been shaped by the voices of Albertans through their experiences, their feedback, and their insight. We had countless – countless – engagements across this province. They have been instrumental in guiding us toward a system that works better for everyone. Every day we move closer to realizing our vision of a health care system that provides timely, high-quality care to all Albertans no matter where they live. Mr. Speaker, Bill 55 is a significant step forward in making that vision a reality.

To summarize, Bill 55 accomplishes the following. First, it amends the Public Health Act to transfer several public health functions currently housed within Alberta Health Services to Primary Care Alberta and Alberta Health. Primary Care Alberta will assume responsibility for front-line public health services, including communicable disease control, immunizations, newborn screening, and health promotion. Key functions such as policy development, public health inspection, surveillance, and the medical officers of health will transition to Alberta Health, specifically within the office of the chief medical officer of health. These changes are being made because Albertans and health care professionals have emphasized the need for a more co-ordinated and strategic public health system, something the current structure does not adequately support. This shift will also allow Alberta Health Services to focus exclusively on its core mandate, delivering acute care.

Second, Bill 55 repeals outdated sections of the Hospitals Act. Certain provisions will be incorporated within the Provincial Health Agencies Act, ensuring that hospital governance is modernized and aligned under one statute. The current Hospitals Act does not reflect the governance structures or ministerial responsibilities of today's health care system.

Third, the bill introduces further amendments to the Provincial Health Agencies Act to strengthen the role of health foundations. Oversight of these foundations will be transferred to the new health shared services entity, which, like the foundations, operates across all health sectors. This change will help streamline governance and foster stronger connections between foundations and the communities they serve.

Fourth, amendments to the Protection for Persons in Care Act will expand the capacity to investigate allegations of abuse in publicly funded care settings. This reflects our government's ongoing commitment to protecting vulnerable adults and ensuring timely investigations and accountability.

And fifth, Mr. Speaker, Bill 55 includes amendments to the Health Information Act to allow the Ministry of Seniors, Community and Social Services to collect, use, and disclose health information. This is essential to support the minister in their role as the sector head for the continuing care area in Alberta and to help ensure high-quality care for seniors and others in need of long-term support.

Mr. Speaker, we've had a lot of debate on this bill. Bill 55 reflects our government's commitment to a stronger, more modern, and better co-ordinated public health care system, one that serves the people of this province with the care, respect, and responsiveness that they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With that, I encourage all members to pass Bill 55, and I move to adjourn debate.

[The voice vote indicated that the motion to adjourn debate carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:14 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

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

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 45 Against – 35

[Motion to adjourn debate carried]

Government Motions Time Allocation on Bill 54

77. Mr. Schow moved:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, is resumed, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of the bill in third reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, I would be brief, but this bill is about restoring the balance of free and fair elections and public trust in our electoral system. The members opposite have taken the opportunity through debate to paint a picture of the kind of person that our party and our government is trying to cater to. We believe in catering to all Albertans. But the members opposite think it's some kind of person that is some kind of diamond ring wearing, Rolex-wearing, you know, kiss-stealing, wheelin' dealin' type individual, some limousine-riding or jet-flying guy, walking around with Gators on their feet. That's just not the kind of person that we are catering to. We are catering to all Albertans, and I applaud the minister for all of his work on Bill 54.

With that, I move Government Motion 77.

9:20

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

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To borrow a phrase, although to use it accurately in this case, as it is so rarely used in this House: nothing could be further from the truth. This bill is precisely designed to allow big money back into politics. This is a bill that removes limits, that increases limits, allows people to donate more. It allows corporations to donate. It allows unions to donate.

Mr. Speaker, I remember a number of members in this House who were at the time members of the PC or Wildrose Party voting in favour of the banning of corporate and union donations, who now sit here before us today and appear to have changed their opinions somewhat. I think that that's highly problematic, and I'd be very curious what has caused them to reverse themselves in that way.

Mr. Speaker, the government is moving closure on this bill. There are five bills before this House that the government is using closure on. This bill has had less than 10 hours of debate in this place. It is a bill which allows a referendum for separation. It is a bill which brings big money back into politics. It is a bill that makes it more difficult to vote. It is a bill that the Chief Electoral Officer has taken the time to write to every MLA in this Chamber to oppose, and the government is ramming it through with less than 10 hours of debate, with no time for the public to weigh in.

The reason they're doing that, Mr. Speaker, is because they know the public doesn't like it. They can read the polls the same as we can. They know that we don't want a separatist referendum here in Alberta, and they presumably saw what happened in Quebec, just like we did. In Quebec property values fell, jobs fled, the economy was massively damaged by this move. Merely talk of a referendum can drive away investment, and that's not just my opinion. It's not a left-wing opinion. Our former Premier, the very first leader of the Alberta United Conservative Party, said just today that this was kryptonite for our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the UCP is limiting the ability of the people of the province to have time to weigh in, to have time to consider this bill that will have impacts that resonate throughout our province. Even considering separatism drives investment to flee the province. People will lose their jobs. People will lose their retirement savings. Their property values will drop. This is not a good thing for our province, and the UCP rushing this through without giving all of us, who are elected by constituents, who are sent here in representative democracy to share the concerns of our constituents, which are significant with this bill, is wrong. It's just the wrong thing to do. It undercuts democracy. It suggests that the function of this place is something that the government feels they can do without. It suggests that the support of the people is something that the government feels they can do without.

That might be the case, Mr. Speaker, for a couple of years, but it won't be the case forever because all governments face elections. And I believe that this is a moment that the people of this province will remember, that they will remember that this is a government that drove through a bill to enable a separatist referendum in a matter of weeks with a matter of a handful of hours of debate. I hope and expect that the people of this province will hold them accountable for their decisions.

Thank you.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the hon. Government House Leader has moved Government Motion 77.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 77 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:25 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

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

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 45 Against – 35

[Government Motion 77 carried]

9:30 Time Allocation on Bill 55

78. Mr. Schow moved:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, is resumed, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of the bill in third reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

The Speaker: Hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [interjections] And thank you to the Member for Red Deer-South for that voice of confidence. I appreciate that.

With that, I move that motion.

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

Ms Sweet: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see the government members so excited to hear what I have to say about this. If only they were this collaborative when it came to actually debating the bills.

Mr. Speaker, I'm really curious when this government is going to finally decide to grow up and govern, because at this point time allocation is not governing. Time allocation is running away from your responsibilities and your accountability to the very people that elected you to be in this place. That is what time allocation does.

What we see repeatedly and have seen since this government has been elected is an increased use of time allocation. It's not governance. Why I can say that I know that it's not governance is that 71 times since 2019, time allocation has been implemented by this government. Seventy-one times. Pretty much almost all of their legislation. Do you know how many times we did it when we were in government, Mr. Speaker?

An Hon. Member: How many?

Ms Sweet: Four. I could probably name the bills for the hon. member across the way because we remember where we didn't want to actually hold ourselves accountable to the very people and when we ran away from having to be held accountable. This government runs so far and so fast, they don't even know what bill they're running from at this point.

What doesn't make sense to me – the government members opposite are heckling me because they know what I'm saying is true. The reality of time allocation and the reason that governments implement them into the House is because they don't actually want to hear any type of accountability or criticism for any of the work that they've put forward. They don't want to acknowledge the fact that they don't actually consult, that they don't actually talk to their constituents, that they don't speak to their stakeholders. If they did, then the amendments that the opposition brings forward, that identify the deficits in their legislation, the government would be willing to listen to, would be willing to debate openly and transparently and, heaven forbid, maybe accept every once in a while.

But this government doesn't want to do that. They want to say, "our bills are perfect except when they're not," which is a lot of the time because the government will bring in amendments like we saw today. Here's how awesome this government is on accountability and transparency. Five minutes before we have to adjourn the House this afternoon, the government brings in an amendment to a health bill that's going to privatize health care, and they dump it on us and are just like: "Now you have to pass it. You've got 10 minutes left of debate." You don't even give us time to read it. That's awesome governing. Awesome. I'm sure Albertans love to hear that the government can't even do a proper grammar check and has to bring in a five-page amendment to fix the grammatical errors in their legislation. Slow down, do the work, consult with Albertans, and maybe you wouldn't have to check your grammar or whether or not the bill is constitutional.

Needless to say, this is a poor motion. I think I've made that pretty clear. Time allocation is weak governance, absolute weak governance. What is true powerful leadership, which this government likes to say they do, is working with the opposition, is working with Albertans, is talking about the issues that matter to them and not creating legislation that is divisive, that goes against the will of the people, and only speaks to a small minority of individuals that raise the power of the government and not the power of the people of this province.

I will encourage all members in this House to have a moment of clarity and recognize that this is not democracy and stand against this motion and spend time evaluating a bill that is going to have significant impacts on the future of our health care and defeat this motion and just spend some time talking to Albertans and doing what's right.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the hon. Government House Leader has moved Government Motion 78.

[The voice vote indicated that Government Motion 78 carried]

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 9:36 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

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

9:40

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 45 Against – 35

[Government Motion 78 carried]

Government Bills and Orders

Third Reading

Bill 54

Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025

(continued)

The Speaker: Hon. members, pursuant to Government Motion 77, agreed to earlier this evening, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, in third reading.

The hon. Member for Calgary-Bhullar-McCall.

Mr. Sabir: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak briefly to Bill 54. Essentially, what the government is doing in the wee hours is ramming through certain changes that will damage our electoral system here, that will damage democracy in this province. This is the most antidemocratic bill that I have seen in the 10 years of being a member of this Legislature. There are a number of things that are opposed by Albertans across this province, that are opposed by academia, that are opposed by First Nations, who call this bill garbage and also sent a number of letters to this government to essentially pull this bill.

The reason that this bill is back and the reason that I'm saying that it's antidemocratic: this bill contains provisions that are commonly known as vote suppression, that are mostly used in the United States. What they're doing here is getting rid of the vote anywhere provision. The evidence we have is that by having vote anywhere in the last two elections, we have seen the participation in elections go up. That, certainly, the United Conservative Party sees as a threat, so they are getting rid of that. The evidence is that it increases participation.

The second thing they are getting rid of, that they are eliminating, is vouching as a form of identification. Who does that impact? Indigenous communities, those who are unhoused, those who don't have any identification for one reason or another, and that will lead to disenfranchisement of voters. Again, the participation in the democratic process will be curtailed by this provision.

They are also tinkering with the issuing and receiving of special ballots, and they are making it difficult for people to get the special ballots. Again, they are making sure that they can do everything they can to limit the participation in the democratic process, and that is called vote suppression. That's the reason the Chief Electoral Officer of Alberta, an independent officer of this Legislature, has sent a letter to all 87 MLAs, urging them to reconsider these changes, and still the government wants to ram through all these changes.

The other thing they are doing is that they are also changing the timelines, changing the procedure for investigation by the Election Commissioner. They are reducing the time period to one year from the date of the conduct. Not only that, but they are also changing the threshold for investigation to pretty much the criminal standard of reasonable grounds for the Election Commissioner to initiate any investigation.

Put simply, they do not want these election laws to apply. They do not want to be investigated. In the last five, six years if we look at the UCP record, there are a number of people who have been investigated for the infraction of election laws. With these self-serving changes they are just protecting themselves from future investigations.

One more thing they are doing is that they are also banning vote tabulators. There is no evidence whatsoever anywhere in North America that vote tabulators were used somehow to rig elections. Again, these tabulators are not networked. They are not connected to the Internet. They can't be hacked, and the actual votes are always there as a record if any close race needs to go to a recount. They are only bringing in that change because some extreme elements in their base want that change from this Premier.

A couple of more things that I will briefly touch on. The first order of Rachel Notley's government in 2015 was to ban corporate and union donations, a bill brought forward by my colleague from Calgary-Mountain View. Now what they are doing: they are bringing dark money back into politics. That also will hurt the institution of democracy. If we look at the history of democracy, democracy was built on ideas, and ideas built a nation. Look at any movement for justice, equality, for the right to vote. Those moments were not sparked by wealth and those who have the wealth but by those who have hopes and ideas for a better society, for a better future for everyone. What they are doing with these changes: they are bringing back big dark money into politics so that they can rig the process in their favour.

It also raises financial limits for PACs, political action committees, third-party advertising, to half a million dollars, raising it from \$185,000 before and during the writ period. Again, that undue influence of money will hurt the institution of democracy in this province, will influence our elections in a way that it should not be. This UCP will be remembered as the only government that passed such provisions, such legislation that are so antidemocratic.

I urge all members of this House to read this bill, read this provision, talk to your constituents about that. Stand up for more voter participation, not vote suppression. Stand up for better ideas, not just influence of dark money in politics. And listen to the First Nations, who have been calling this bill garbage because it will lower the threshold for citizen initiatives and referendums from 20 per cent to 10 per cent.

They are doing it just for their own political purposes, to stoke separatism. That is not in the interest of any Albertan, not in the interest of their institution of democracy, not in the interest of, I guess, the unity that we need now, and not in the interest of business certainty. Everyone is calling that out, yet this government is hell bent on pushing through these changes and this attack on our democracy.

I urge all members of this House to vote against this bill.

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

Ms Chapman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to offer comments on Bill 54. I'd like to really thank my colleagues who have spoken before me on this bill, who've done a really good job, I think, of speaking to the issues around the thresholds on referendums and, of course, also the issues around the changes in vote provisions. The worry is that we're actually going to be suppressing the vote. I don't ever think that I actually heard the government offer an explanation for removing the vote-anywhere provision. That was a bit of a disappointment because that one just doesn't make any sense to me.

9:50

What I wanted to spend my few minutes talking about here was on the finance part of this piece. Now, of course, I wasn't around in the 2015 caucus so, you know, I wasn't as familiar with the process when the NDP government was bringing in Bill 1 to remove corporate and union donations. I went back into the *Hansard* just to read a little bit of the debate that happened at that time. I just wanted to share a few bits in there that I thought were pretty relevant when it comes to this discussion on Bill 54, where we're bringing back those corporate and union donations.

The Member for Airdrie-East at the time in 2015 said:

Wildrose believes in putting democracy in the hands of everyday Albertans. We believe that banning corporate and union donations is a critical step towards doing that. Pay-to-play politics is the way that politics have been done here in Alberta for quite awhile, and we want to put the power of democracy back into the hands of Albertans regardless of their financial backing or their ability to donate.

That was an interesting one.

The Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo. This is what this member had to say: "Wildrose believes in putting democracy back in the hands of Albertans. We . . ." Oh, okay. He must have been so inspired by what the Member for Airdrie-East said, he just rehashed the exact same thing. Just the one set of speaking notes, I guess.

Member Irwin: Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo?

Ms Chapman: Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo, yeah. No original thoughts there. He just went with the same thoughts that the Member for Airdrie-East had.

Now, the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul had some original thoughts on the matter of removing corporate and union donations, which was to say:

Bill 1 will ban corporate and union donations to political parties . . . This would mean that only Albertan residents could make private contributions to parties, candidates, constituency associations . . . The intent here is to bring an end to the enormous

influence organized entities can have when they choose to invest large sums of money into the political process. More specifically, this will bring an end to the ability of corporations and unions to steamroll the will of individual Albertans, who are the real voters.

Super interesting for me to learn that the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul now believes in steamrolling the will of individual Albertans, the real voters. That's exactly what this bill is doing, right? You know, people change, they age, they grow. They do a complete about-face on their values about access to democracy, about voting, apparently, I guess. I don't think that I've ever done quite that big an about-face on my own values, Mr. Speaker, but certainly the *Hansard* record shows that the Member for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul has had a complete change of mind, no longer has any issues with corporate and union donations the way he did 10 years ago.

The Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre had this to say.

Wildrose has been abundantly clear. We are in support of eliminating corporate and union donations and getting big money and big labour out of politics. We believe that the power of democracy is best served when it's in the hands of individual voters. Wildrose has stated for a very long time that there needs to be an end to big business and organized labour bearing undue influence on politics and having an unfair advantage when it comes to funding elections.

Now, the Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre at the time, of course, would have known that donations to the Progressive Conservative Party, about 65, 70 per cent of large donors to the PC Party at that time, came from corporations, energy firms being the largest contributor, but the Wildrose at the time only received around 40 per cent of their donations from corporate or union sources. I guess it's just one of those cases where, you know, when it works against his favour, the Member for Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre has one set of values, and when it works in his favour, he can just do a complete flip-flop on that.

In the end, it was the members for Bonnyville-Cold Lake-St. Paul, Calgary-West, Taber-Warner, Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche, Central Peace-Notley, Calgary-Hays, Airdrie-East, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre, Athabasca-Barrhead-Westlock, Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo. These are all members that sit in this Chamber today. These were all members that voted in support of removing union and corporate donations.

I'm running up to my time here, but what I want to say is: come on, Mr. Speaker. Do we have values or not? Do we stick to them? Do we care about democracy, or are we only interested in ourselves? Well, when I look at the members on the other side of the aisle, I know exactly what the answer to that question is. It's change the rules to serve their own interests and to heck with Albertans and the interests of voters. Let's just go ahead and steamroll over the will of voters by bringing big money back into politics. That's exactly what this bill is doing. Shame on them.

The Speaker: I didn't want to interrupt that speech. I'll just make a gentle reminder to the hon. member that no one in the House is to bring the Speaker into debate.

The hon. Member for Fort McMurray-Wood Buffalo.

Mr. Yao: I'll be quick, Mr. Speaker. I just want to congratulate His Majesty's Loyal Opposition for studying a really good opposition, that was the 2015-2019 Wildrose Party. We did a phenomenal job in those seats across the way. We kept the government to account,

we held them to that account, and, ultimately, they lost the next election thanks to the great work by not only that Wildrose opposition but the PC opposition. I just want to say thank you for that, but keep studying. You will learn many things if you study how that Wildrose opposition did things.

The Speaker: Hon. Member, please send your remarks through the chair.

Mr. Yao: Through the chair.
Thank you.

The Speaker: The hon. member from Edmonton-McClung.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I actually am the hon. Member for Edmonton-McClung even though I am from Edmonton-McClung, and I thank you for your introduction.

Tonight, this afternoon, today, earlier this week we were asking fundamental questions. Primarily what we were asking is this question: what is Alberta? That's the question we were asking, Mr. Speaker. To Alberta separatists: what is Alberta? Or to the UCP government they're married to: what is Alberta? To an Alberta separatist or the UCP government they're married to: is Alberta a nation? To an Alberta separatist or the UCP government they're married to: is Alberta a homeland? Is Alberta a country to an Alberta separatist or a UCP government who is married to that ideology?

At its core, I argue, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is neither of those three, is neither a nation, neither a homeland, neither a country to the Alberta separatists and the UCP government they're married to ideologically. No. Alberta is simply a transaction. That's it. It's a transaction. Send money to Ottawa, they say, and you get less back. Therefore, we've got a trade deficit with the rest of the country. We're lacking. The deal is tarnished, so we're going to take our oil and go where? Go where, Mr. Speaker? What indeed are these separatists talking about? In my world, in this world we view from the opposition bench, in the world of the vast majority of Albertans, this country, this Alberta, this Canada is way more, much more, so much more than a simple transaction.

Mr. Speaker, you'll remember and I'll remember the 1964-65 flag debate. It was a debate that was heartily – heartily – rendered in the House of Commons.

10:00

The Speaker: We're among the few old enough to remember.

Mr. Dach: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for reminding me of my age.

I tell you what. I do remember that because I was in about grade 2. We had Union Jacks, Mr. Speaker, before that famous Canadian flag was adopted after a very rancorous debate in the House of Commons. On February 15, 1965, that proud flag was officially unfurled.

We now stand behind that flag and proudly – proudly – see what it represents. It represents a nation. It represents a nation who came into its own in a couple of years shortly after that, in 1967, when we celebrated our centennial year of Confederation. I was in grade 3, 4 in that year, Mr. Speaker. We did things to celebrate that. We sent letters to every famous person around the world we could think of. I wrote, actually, to Mr. George Ignatieff, who was a consular diplomat, a Canadian diplomat, and he wrote back, sent his signature to us in grade 3, 4. All of those dozens and dozens of signatures from people around the world we collected, and they actually now sit in the archives of Alberta. We celebrated 100 years of Confederation. We celebrated Canada and to be part of this proud nation.

Now, every July 1 for the first 20 years of my life, from 1958 to '78, I attended the Thorhild rodeo. It was a big event for us kids, six of us in my family. There was a parade. There was a midway. There was a big rodeo. You get five bucks from your parents and then you get five bucks more from your grandparents, and man, you're away to the races. You could do a lot with five bucks in 1965, let me tell you. There were lots of flags at those rodeos, lots of anthems. Everybody stood and rose to proudly sing our anthem the same way we do at hockey games now and in this Legislature as well.

However, Mr. Speaker, they on the other side of this House seem to want that music to stop. That silence is a silence of a government that knows not what it's doing. The vast majority of Albertans still relish in the joy of this country, the thoughts back to Expo 67 in Montreal and the 1976 Olympics that followed, 100 years of Confederation, a celebration of Canada emerging as a thriving democracy and a world economy.

We've survived great challenges together in this country, Mr. Speaker: in 1970 the FLQ crisis, the abduction and murder of labour minister Pierre Laporte, the abduction and release of James Cross, British diplomat; the Quiet Revolution which followed the '60s with the Jean Lesage government, the Liberal Quebec government, where the Quebec Catholic church was shoved off the stage of ruling that province and the province was secularized. You ended up with a massive teachers' strike, and ultimately the shackles of the Catholic church were thrown off that society and Quebecers came into their own and ruled themselves as a distinct society.

Those movements turned into what happened to become the Parti Québécois, represented by René Lévesque in 1976. In the 1980s shortly thereafter that movement turned into a Quebec referendum on sovereignty, Mr. Speaker. Sixty per cent of the population of Quebec, including the majority of French Canadians, voted no: we want to stay within Canada; we see the value in Canada. However, there was another referendum debate that took place after the first night, when René Lévesque said to the Quebec people: si je vous entend, vous êtes en train de me dire: à la prochaine. That's going to be what happens regularly if indeed we keep visiting this nonsense of a referendum debate and sovereignty association and this government determines that it wants to continue down this road.

I have lots and lots to say, Mr. Speaker, about this, but – tell you what – I'll keep it short. My country is Canada. My nation is Canada. My heart and soul is embedded in this country. I hitchhiked across this country three times before I was 20 years old in three different seasons, once in the wintertime, and I'll be damned if anybody is going to take it away from me.

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

Mr. Ip: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to speak in the strongest possible terms against Bill 54, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025. I think my colleagues have made the case very well. Bill 54 is about one thing. It's about concentrating political power in the hands of a Premier who is willing to gamble with Alberta's place in Canada to achieve her own political ends. This bill is nothing short of an attempt to engineer chaos for purely political purposes, a threat to democracy, so much so, in fact, that the Chief Electoral Officer took an extraordinary step to issue a letter warning of the dangers of this bill.

Let's call it for what it is. It lays the groundwork for separatism. We've all heard the Premier's rhetoric. She frames this legislation as a defence mechanism, quote, to protect Alberta against hostile acts from Ottawa. But the bill is deliberately structured to manufacture a sovereignty crisis. It slashes referendum thresholds, it paves the way for citizen-led constitutional brinkmanship, and it

invites groups like the Alberta Prosperity Project to stir up separatist sentiment under a newly lowered bar. Mind you, this comes just days after a federal election where Pierre Poilievre lost his own seat, and now we see this government scrambling to recalibrate its base not by focusing on health care or affordability but by opening the door to a divisive referendum that threatens Alberta's place in Confederation.

You've got to hand it to the Premier because she knows how to distract from her government's own incompetence. But, Mr. Speaker, Albertans see through it. I don't know about members on the other side of the House, but on this side of the House we are proud Canadians, and I believe most Albertans are proud Canadians. Albertans want fairness, yes. Albertans want respect from Ottawa, absolutely. But they also want stability. They want solutions. They don't want to be dragged into another sovereignty showdown driven by political desperation.

The Premier's separatist overtures are already having an impact on Alberta's economy. In fact, just tonight the ATCO CEO at the AGM has been quoted to say that investors are very concerned, and the Alberta separation conversation is scaring potential investors. I just want to read into the record an excerpt from CTV News on this on this very concern.

CEO Nancy Southern says the biggest challenge lies in the threat of Alberta sovereignty.

"This discussion of separation should have no oxygen," she told reporters.

"It's impacting investments now as we look to having partners for our large projects that are from offshore. Our Japanese partners or our South Korean partners want to invest in a multi-billion-dollar plant in the heart of Alberta and say, 'Well, what are the rules going to be? What's the currency going to be? Is there security around this? Who's going to trade with this? How do we get to tidewater? How do we get our product to our country?'"

This is having a real effect on Alberta's economy. Frankly, this could be Alberta's Brexit, and we know that that was a disaster.

Bill 54 doesn't stop at separatism. It resurrects the influence of big money in Alberta politics. Several of my colleagues have already made reference to this, but in 2015 Alberta made history with unanimous support, including from the Progressive Conservatives and the Wildrose parties. The Alberta NDP when in government banned corporate and union donations. We said at the time that democracy should not be auctioneered to the highest bidder. We stood together to ensure that elections are fought and won based on ideas, not bank accounts.

10:10

Now, what does Bill 54 do? It reintroduces corporate and union money. It sets a uniform \$5,000 annual limit per donor, individual or corporate, and it creates a new category called prospective candidate associations, which essentially allows candidates to fund raise without limit before they officially enter the race. This makes it much easier for dark money, tainted money, whatever you want to call it, to enter politics, just like in the U.S.

Before 2015 65 to 70 per cent of the large donations to the Progressive Conservatives came from corporations, many of them energy firms. This bill: what it effectively does is that it restores the pipeline of influence. It gives wealthy donors a much louder voice than the people that we are supposed to serve. We've seen that. We've seen what happens when corporate money dominates politics. If you look just south of the border, public interest takes a back seat to private gain. It costs tens and hundreds of billions of dollars, at times cumulatively, to run a campaign in the United States. With that kind of trajectory the everyday Albertan gets shut

out of the conversation entirely. Mr. Speaker, democracy should not be pay-to-play.

Equally troubling are the barriers this bill erects for voters, particularly the most vulnerable. It eliminates vouching, a critical process that allows someone to verify a voter's identity, and that will impact and affect some of the most vulnerable Albertans, Indigenous Albertans living on-reserve who may lack traditional ID. It affects seniors in care who may not have ready access to government documents.

Mr. Speaker, this is truly foundational to our democracy. It will do great harm. I encourage all members to vote against this bill. Thank you.

Mr. Kasawski: Mr. Speaker, I've been thinking about what rhymes when I come to these bills. Bill 55 rhymes with bloated government contracts. Bill 54 rhymes with kleptocracy. Yeah.

There's a great number in hockey, 99. On page 99 of the bill it's a bad number because it says that third-party advertisers and political parties can now spend \$5 million per year on election campaigning. The current system allows for about \$3.4 million. It's a factor of the number of voters in this province. Even if we round up to the future growth where we have 3 million voters in this province, probably by the next election, that's \$3.48 million that would be fit rather than \$20 million per election cycle, which this bill is going to allow.

We have before us legislation that threatens to undermine Alberta's democratic foundation by opening the gates to big money in politics. Let me begin with a cautionary tale that we've all probably heard about in the news of our neighbours to the south. In 2022 in the U.S. mid-term elections Elon Musk, the world's richest man, not only purchased one of the most influential communication platforms but also invested tens of millions of dollars to influence public discourse and political outcomes. And that was just the warm-up. Fast-forward to 2024, last year, and Musk's involvement escalated dramatically. He has reported spending \$290 million during the U.S. presidential election funding candidates, organizations, platforms, and messaging efforts aligned with his interests and those of his business empire. He even launched a \$1 million contest to reward influencers who produced pro-MAGA content supporting former President, now current President Donald Trump.

That was not simply campaign support; it was a full-scale attempt to engineer public sentiment through social media, financial incentives, and algorithmic manipulation. Elon Musk didn't just vote. He didn't just contribute personally to the democratic process. He invested in the outcome of the election strategically and aggressively to gain access, shape policy, and secure influence at the very top of the U.S. government.

How is this made possible? The U.S. floodgates were opened when they failed to provide appropriate spending limits on elections. Corporations and unions can spend unlimited money on election advertising in the U.S. Billionaires, special interest groups, and megacorporations now routinely pour hundreds of millions of dollars into elections, effectively buying louder voices and often a better result for themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're being asked to take Alberta down the same road, reversing the guardrails of our democracy that were put in place by the Alberta New Democrats and unanimously supported in this House 10 years ago, in 2015. Bill 54 lifts the restrictions on corporate and union donations, creating a Wild West of campaign financing, where those with the deepest pockets will hold the greatest power. We are not trending towards democracy. We are trending towards kleptocracy, where systems that are meant to serve the public can be hijacked by private interests.

Let's just review that. Kleptocracy: thief-ocracy, a government whose kleptocrats use political power to expropriate wealth of the people and land they govern, misappropriating government funds at the expense of the wider population, no public announcements explaining or apologizing for misappropriation of funds or punishments levied. Does that sound familiar?

Some Hon. Members: Yeah.

Mr. Kasawski: Yeah. We are seeing that in real time here in Alberta. That's what Bill 44 is inviting to happen more often in Alberta. Under this bill elections will be less about ideas and more about advertising budgets, less about local voices and more about strategic investments from corporate headquarters and union war rooms. Some will argue that more funding simply means more participation, but let's be honest. This isn't about more voices; it's about louder voices. When citizens begin to feel their voices no longer matter, they turn away from their democracy.

Referendums are vulnerable to the same forces as elections: money, manipulation, and misinformation. The examples have been brought up about California's Proposition 22 in 2020. The gig economy giants like Uber and Lyft spent more than \$200 million, the most expensive ballot measure in U.S. history, to overturn worker protections. It passed not because it was good policy but because corporations flooded the airwaves with fear and false promises.

We must defend our system of representative democracy, a system where elected officials are accountable to people, not corporate donors, a system where decisions are made not in ad campaigns but in debate chambers like this one, a system where democracy is not auctioned off to the highest bidder. Albertans do not want a democracy that's for sale. They want one that reflects their values, their struggles, and their hopes. If we pass Bill 54, we turn our backs on that promise. We say to Alberta families that their voices can be drowned out by multinational corporations or well-funded unions. We say that influence is no longer earned; it is bought.

Let us not follow the path of the U.S. Let us not follow Elon Musk down the rabbit hole of billionaire democracy. Let us stand up right now for the people over profit, accountability over influence, and democracy over dollars. I urge this House to reject Bill 54 and defend the integrity of our elections before it's too late.

The Speaker: The hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood.

Member Irwin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm getting a lot of messages, and I know a lot of folks are just about to tune in right now just in time for my speech because we are going into overtime. So perfect timing. Thank you, Oilers, for having the break right now so I can get a lot of views.

All right. Serious business at hand, though. I want to talk about Bill 54, the Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025. This is another giant omnibus bill. There's just so much here, and I have to say that I did laugh when I saw the news release this government sent out because they included a laughable headline of Strengthening Democracy. [interjections] Laughter from our side of the House, which I will accept because this bill does the exact opposite. It degrades and it undermines democracy.

10:20

Like I said, there's so much to unpack in this bill, but we, of course, have very limited time due to this UCP government using time allocation, which, for those at home who may not know what that means, is basically limiting debate on these crucial bills,

limiting debate on a bill that is fundamentally about democracy. The irony. People are watching. I know Albertans are watching at home. There's so much here that I can talk about.

Many of my colleagues have talked a lot about the concerns around referendums – I should say, I guess, referenda if I want to use proper plural – and the concerns about how this is very much just pandering to separatists. I know my colleagues, including the incredible MLA for Edmonton-West Henday, have talked a lot about the implications for various Indigenous communities across this province. I'm just so proud of all of those nations who are standing up, who are speaking out, and who will even be rallying at the Legislature tomorrow to say enough is enough to this UCP government. Start listening to Indigenous communities. Start respecting their treaties.

There's just a whole lot in here that is seemingly trying to fix problems that don't actually exist. I want to talk about one specific piece that's really important to me, the removal of vouching. Like I said, my colleagues have talked about a lot of the other pieces very well, but I want to talk about the changes to voting.

The removal of vouching is actually something that I've spoken on the record here in this House in the past. In fact, it was last year with Bill 20 that this government brought in the removal of vouching for municipal elections. I talked then, and so did many of my fantastic colleagues, about the fact that removal of vouching disproportionately impacts certain communities, including unhoused community members, seniors in care, racialized Albertans, Indigenous people on and off reserves, Albertans displaced by disasters. I heard from the fantastic MLA for St. Albert disabled Albertans as well. Thank you for always, always centring the voices of disabled Albertans. I'm just going to bang on my desk for her. Listen, democracy works best when everyone has a seat at the table, and Bill 54 directly suppresses the voices of people, certain communities, and it's unconscionable.

I want to talk about our unhoused neighbours. I have the honour, as many of you have heard in this House, of representing Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood, which is just, you know, a riding made up of so many incredible communities, including a number of communities where folks do struggle. We do get to meet every day a lot of visibly unhoused folks. This has led me to reflect on the fact that in every election that I've run in, which is now three, I make sure to talk to folks who are living rough. I talked to folks outside the Bissell Centre, outside of Radius, formerly the Boyle McCauley health centre, other spots where people are hanging out and just living their lives. I truly believe that everybody should have access to voting, whether they have a roof over their head or not, and I know my colleagues do, too.

Folks who live rough may not have ID. It's easy for people across the aisle to dismiss that. I've never been unhoused, but I've talked to a lot of folks who are unhoused. If you've not been in that situation, it's really difficult to imagine what it's like when you're living out of a tent or you're couch surfing. You don't have the resources; you don't have the family or any sort of community network. It's understandable that they might not have ID, so vouching is a key way for folks without ID to be able to vote. It allows another person to vouch for them just as it would make sense. So by eliminating vouching, you're essentially suppressing those folks' voices.

Members opposite, I've heard them say things like: oh, no, they can just go to a social service agency or they can go to the navigation centre to get ID. Well, guess what? Thanks to UCP cuts there are very few social agencies open during the day. Many have had to close their doors to offering any sort of day services. Yes, the navigation centre is one spot. I will give credit where it's due, that a hub for getting ID was needed, but that's one spot in

Edmonton, one spot in Calgary. What about rural folks? Rural homelessness has skyrocketed under the UCP. Where do folks go for ID in rural communities where there are no resources? The list of rural communities that have lost services is a long one. I share all of this to say: why? Why is the UCP taking away the democratic right of Albertans, of my constituents?

Of course, I've talked a lot about one population, unhoused folks or those who are precariously housed, but these concerns apply to many other communities as well: racialized Albertans, Indigenous Albertans, seniors, rural Albertans, disabled Albertans, and more. The list goes on. It's not too late to abandon this flawed legislation. We've asked the members many times: what problem are you trying to solve here other than suppress the voices of our constituents? We've not gotten an answer.

I urge the UCP to abandon this legislation, to do the right thing just for once. I know that myself and my colleagues over here will not be supporting Bill 54. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Nixon: Excuse me.

Mr. Haji: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: We're going to call that my mistake. Hon. Member for Edmonton-Decore, please go ahead, and hon. member, we'll get to you next.

Mr. Haji: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues have spoken to the human aspect that is around Bill 54 in terms of exclusion and in terms of democratic participation and the implications that it will have on those who are unhoused, disabled Albertans, Indigenous communities, and many other marginalized communities that are already struggling to participate in our democratic processes, but I wanted to shift and speak to something else.

Bill 54 does one thing. It does lay the groundwork for a sovereignty crisis, not because Albertans asked for it but because this government is choosing divisive policies to distract Albertans from the reality that they face on a daily basis. Mr. Speaker, I do recognize that Alberta deserves a strong voice in the national conversations, but true strength is not found in threatening referenda or in chasing costly legal battles that pit us against the rest of Canada, our country. It creates economic uncertainty, which chases away the investment that this province needs so much.

I believe Alberta is well positioned to be the leader in the Confederation. I believe building a common ground with other provinces and advocating for shared priorities like infrastructure investment, resource development, fairness in equalization – all of these are possible with the right leadership.

Bill 54 creates economic uncertainty by entertaining referenda and paving the way for separation. Well, the former Premier and the founder of the UCP calls it, and I quote, playing with fire. This kind of stuff is kryptonite for investors' confidence. That is a quote from Jason Kenney, the former Premier of the province, speaking today to the media. The former Premier said, and I quote: if Albertans doubt that, look at the real historical example of what happened in Quebec's economy as a result of merely the election of the PQ government, including the billions of investment dollars that fled the province in the face of instability.

Bill 54 paves the way for these realities. The industry is speaking about it already. ATCO chief executive Nancy Southern said today that she doesn't think talk of separation should receive any economic oxygen. She added, and I quote, that the discussion alone is already shaking the confidence of foreign companies looking to invest in large-scale ATCO projects.

10:30

The Premier recently made a trip to visit Asian countries. The argument made was attracting investment and improving the economic activities of the province. Again I quote, the chief executive of ATCO says: our Japanese partners or our Southern Korean partners wanting to invest in a multibillion-dollar brand in the heart of Alberta say, well, what are the rules going to be? These are the questions they will be asking. What's the currency that Alberta is going to use? Is there security around this? Who's going to trade with this, Nancy asks. How do we get to tidewater? These are the questions that the companies have already. How do we get our product to our country? These are the questions that investors are asking. They are very concerned. That is a quote from the chief executive of ATCO.

Mr. Speaker, democracy doesn't thrive in isolation. It thrives in dialogue. Democracy thrives when we engage with our fellow Canadians. Playing with fire doesn't help our economy, and that's exactly what Bill 54 is doing. Alberta's strength has always come from its people, not from paper declarations of sovereignty, not from manufactured grievances, not from creating economic instability and uncertainty, and certainly not from a vote on separation, as my colleagues have already alluded to. This is the reality that this bill will introduce not only today but in the future investment of this province, and recovery from that will take years, years of lost economic opportunities we cannot afford.

I urge all members, including the Minister of Justice, to oppose this bill, not because we don't love Alberta, Mr. Speaker, but because we do. Thank you.

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

Mr. Nixon: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to rise and express my support for this important piece of legislation. Also, just before I start, it's my first opportunity to congratulate you, my long-time colleague in this Chamber, on making it to the chair. Thank you very much for putting yourself forward. I do look forward to watching your time as Speaker.

I do want to talk a little bit about some of the comments that were made by the hon. members, particularly in regard to ID. I find it quite shocking, the theory that is being brought forward by the Official Opposition when it comes to this legislation in regard to identification and the restricting of individuals being able to vote.

Now, I'll tell you what I think is most shocking about it in a moment. I think it's because if you compare – actually, I'll tell you. In general it's because if you compare what the United Conservative Party and the current government has done when it comes to caring for the homeless in this province with what the NDP's agenda is and what they have pushed forward as their plan to care for the very same demographic, it becomes very, very clear that their purpose, their process, would make it very, very hard for those individuals to vote.

But I do want to correct a couple of things on the record. First, before I get into that, Mr. Speaker, it's alarming that after all this time the NDP still does not understand the incredible work that is taking place in the navigation centres with multiple different ministries in our two largest cities that has resulted in extraordinary things, particularly around IDs. To continue to stand in the Chamber and to say that the government of Alberta is not giving people IDs is to simply just ignore very simple facts that have been expressed in this Chamber many, many times.

I'll start with Edmonton, Mr. Speaker. About 6,640 unique individuals have accessed life-changing services through the

Edmonton navigation centre since it opened. Over 27,271 services have been made available to support those individuals, and of those services, in the case of Edmonton, 6,768 pieces of identification have been provided, which certainly would aid people in voting but also in important social areas of their lives, to gain access to things like medical care, to gain access to things like medicine and other supports that they may want.

Now, Calgary we opened a little bit later, about a half a year later as we realized the success that we saw taking place with the Edmonton navigation centre. In that case there's been almost 27,000 unique services provided to individuals who have accessed the Calgary navigation centre and, of that, just shy of 4,500 pieces of ID.

Now, there are other things that take place in the navigation centre. I don't want the Official Opposition to leave here and say that it's just producing IDs. It's creating all sorts of other services from housing to financial supports, addiction supports, and everything in between. But it's very clear that pretty significant services are being provided to the homeless to make sure that they get IDs.

Now, if we take the NDP's argument, which is that we should just proceed with allowing homeless individuals to live inside tents inside our communities, to be victimized by gangs, to sometimes be burnt to death because it's a tough thing to heat, to have females being trafficked – as the former chief of police in Edmonton, Dale McFee, said, that when they went into some of these encampments, Mr. Speaker, shockingly, they found minors who were being sexually sold right here on the streets in Edmonton, about 10 minutes from here. The Official Opposition's strategy was to keep that existing.

Now, why this matters in the context of voting is: how would you expect those individuals to go and vote? If you would prefer them not to be able to get IDs, be able to identify themselves, participate in the democratic process, and get other services, and somehow think that it will magically help them more just to leave them inside those tents and that they're going to come and participate in our democracy is outrageous and quite a bizarre thing to argue about.

It just shows, again, that the Official Opposition can't seem to get past whatever it is that their staff wrote them through AI on their computers, and they come in here and give a speech just like you've heard tonight, going on and on and on about how you would expect homeless people in that environment to not be able to vote now because they magically have to get IDs that are being provided for them by the government; instead, if we just left it at the status quo in the circumstances that we've seen, that they would come and vote.

You know, I grew up at a homeless shelter. I wasn't homeless, but I did grow up in a homeless shelter. I can tell you that in all the years I was there – Mr. Speaker, you were there with us when you were our Calgary councillor. Without a doubt, many times, you know the environment that we're talking about, and not once – not once – was I sitting there with somebody right on the streets living in a tent or a temporary structure or a sleeping bag where they said, "Oh, man; you got to get me to vote right away," before they asked me: "Can you please get me shelter? Can you please get me food? Can you please get me my medicine? Can you please get me all the things that I need," for which we then bring them to the services. The NDP want us to just leave them on the streets, provide them no services, and then come here and pretend like they're advocating for the homeless.

If they were truly advocating for the homeless, Mr. Speaker, then when I became minister, I would not have found an entire homeless structure that had been underfunded for decades, all under the

NDP's mandate, that had not had its beds increased to the population that we were seeing, that would have had services like the navigation centre already built. I would not be spending my time right now going and helping the hon. the Minister of Health with homeless people inside emergency rooms because the NDP would have got down to actually doing work. The problem, though, is that they don't want to do the work. They actually don't want to because their philosophy is to continue to leave individuals living on the streets in terrible, terrible circumstances.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Official Opposition, that they should come up with better arguments because they've lost all credibility on this file. They lost all credibility on how they care for the homeless because they didn't care for the homeless. Their philosophy was to abandon them. They lost credibility when it comes to affordable housing when they built no new affordable housing units in their entire time in government, not one increase to the stock of affordable housing.

10:40

Ms Gray: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Yes. Point of order.

Point of Order Relevance

Ms Gray: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Apologies. I'm just going to grab my standing orders. I think I've got it here.

Mr. Sabir: It's 23(b).

Ms Gray: Twenty-three (b). Thank you. Thank you very much to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on relevance, but I also would like to make an argument to you under 23(h), (i), and (j). I appreciate you standing for me, Mr. Speaker, but I'm going to be a minute. I was just listening to the debate here in this Chamber tonight about Bill 54 ...

The Speaker: I'm advised by my table officers that the time is up.

Ms Gray: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

The Speaker: I apologize for that. But I will take a second and remind the hon. member that no matter how friendly it is, bringing the Speaker into debate is not allowed in the House. I let you finish your speech, in the same way I let the member from the other side finish their speech when I reminded them of the same rule. [interjection]

I thought we heard at one point that that member was finished talking.

Now, having said all of that, I hesitate to interrupt everything else, but pursuant to Government Motion 77, agreed to earlier this evening, one hour of debate has now been completed, and I am required to put to the Assembly all necessary questions to dispose of Bill 54, Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, at third reading.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 10:42 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

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

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 45 Against – 35

[Motion carried; Bill 54 read a third time]

The Speaker: Hon. members, it's always a great day when I get to learn something, and what I learned is that with a time allocation if a point of order is called and there's not time to argue it, it has to get argued after the vote.

The hon. Leader of the Official Opposition.

Ms Gray: Oh, excellent, Mr. Speaker. But at this point I will waive that point of order.

Thank you very much.

Bill 55 Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (continued)

The Speaker: Thank you, hon. members. Pursuant to Government Motion 78, agreed to earlier this evening, not more than one hour shall be allotted to any further consideration of Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, in the third reading.

Okay. We have a speaker. The hon. Member for Calgary-North East.

Member Brar: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's an honour and privilege to rise in this House today to speak on the important piece of legislation of Bill 55. I want all members in this House to imagine that the year is 1935 and you are a young Mahatma Gandhi waiting to board a train. As the train arrives, you board the train, and while you are boarding the train, one of your sandals slips off onto the station. What will you do in that case? Will you come out of the train to retrieve your sandal, or will you leave that sandal and continue your journey on the train? I want you to think about that, and I'll come to this story before I close.

10:50

Let me call Bill 55 what it really is. It is not modernization; it is privatization in slow motion. This bill is not about efficiency; this bill is about control, a bureaucratic shuffle that puts ideology before empathy. This bill restructures Alberta's health care system in ways that silence local voices and concentrate power. It eliminates community health councils, erasing the grassroots voices that have held this system accountable. It replaces hospital boards with operators hand-picked by the minister, bringing politics into patient care. It centralizes HR. It centralizes IT and admin, adding more red tape while cutting local lifelines. Perhaps most dangerously, it moves medical officers of health directly under political control.

Who does this bill affect, Mr. Speaker? It doesn't affect the well connected or the insiders of the UCP. It doesn't affect the corporate lobbyists. It affects Albertans like Rajvir, a taxi driver in Calgary-North East. Rajvir's wife collapsed last year. He called 911, but the ambulance took over 40 minutes to arrive. She survived, barely. Rajvir told me: I can drive people all over the city, but I couldn't get help fast enough to save my own wife.

This bill does not fix that. It doesn't shorten ambulance wait times. It doesn't hire more doctors or nurses. It doesn't restore trust in our public health care system. Instead, Mr. Speaker, it gives the minister unilateral power to change hospital bylaws without any oversight. It removes transparency in hospital data processing. It politicizes health leadership, silencing medical officers. This does not help Albertans. Albertans don't feel that this government has got the right priorities, and they don't feel that this government represents them. This government is weak, weak, and weak.

Mr. Speaker, let me share another story with you. One person asked his friend, "What would you do if a predator chases you in the forest?" and the friend replied, "I'll take out my gun and shoot." "What if you don't have a gun?" He said, "I'll take out my knife and attack." The friend asks, "What if you don't have a knife?" He said, "I will take out the pepper spray and use it." The friend said, "What if you don't have pepper spray?" He said, "I'll run and climb a tree." He said, "What if the predator climbs up the tree as well?" That's when the friend paused and asked: "Before you ask me any further questions, you need to clarify. Are you on my side or on the side of the predator?"

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, Albertans are that friend, cornered and chased. Similarly, this UCP needs to clarify. Which side are they on? Are they on the side of Albertans, or are they on the side of the predator of separatism that is chasing Alberta's economy, that is chasing Alberta's health care, and, more importantly, the dreams and future of Albertans? The UCP has shown which side they are on with bills 50, 51, 54, 55, and the list goes on. They are certainly not on the side of Albertans.

What we need is not more restructuring. What we need is more doctors, more nurses, ambulances to show up on time, clear communications during outbreaks of diseases like COVID-19 or measles, and we need justice for families failed by the system. Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are on the side of Albertans. We stand with Albertans like Rajvir.

Let me return to the story of Gandhi and the sandals. Do you know what Gandhi actually did in that situation, Mr. Speaker? When Gandhi lost one sandal, he took off his other sandal and threw it on the station. Why? He said that anyone who will find the sandal will find a whole pair to wear. That is compassion, that is empathy, and that is leadership. Bill 55 utterly lacks all three. Instead of holding on to power, Gandhi gave dignity. Instead of walking alone with less, he let someone else walk with more. That's what Albertans expect of us, not to hold on to control for ourselves but

to give people what they need to move forward with dignity, with care.

Mr. Speaker, the measure of government isn't how it treats the powerful but how it protects the public, not how much control it can seize but how much dignity it can deliver. This UCP government has failed at that, and I request all members of this Assembly to vote against Bill 55.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Member Ceci: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, will be voting against Bill 55. Thank you to my friend from Calgary-North East, who just spoke and gave some really colourful examples, real-life examples, of why this is not the bill to support.

You know, I think that this Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, doesn't meet the test of what's required to address our health care system. When we think about our health care system, I think, generally people would say that we need more front-line workers in health care. They would say that we need emergency rooms to be open throughout the province. We know far too often they're not open throughout the province. They may be open in more urban, staffed areas, but across the province daily we're hearing that in rural areas the emergency rooms aren't open and people have to travel 60 kilometres or more to get to one that's open. People would say: what do we want our health care to be able to do? We would like there to be shorter wait times for all sorts of procedures in hospitals.

Those are the focus that Albertans have when they think about improving our health care system. Bill 55, the Health Statutes Amendment Act, is not what an Albertan would say that they need, certainly not what a sick person would say that they need. They would say: we need more staff in hospitals, we need more emergency rooms open for the times when I need to get there and have that support, and we need shorter wait times for necessary surgeries. This bill fails on all of those points because it doesn't address where Albertans are and where they want to be in terms of our health care system.

Albertans would also say that they believe strongly in public health care, and what this bill is all about is not public health care. This is around – and my colleague who is shadow minister for Health has said it eloquently. She has said that this is about the privatization, the Americanization. I think my colleague from Calgary-Mountain View has said that this is about the Americanization of health care. You know, one of the things that separates us from them down south, south of the border, the 49th parallel, and one thing that Canadians are really proud of, is that we have medicare, we have public health care. That's something that the New Democrats, both in Saskatchewan and federally when Tommy Douglas went to the federal government and worked in opposition there, were able to achieve: medicare for all. Public health care is something that is a line that New Democrats won't ever cross or won't ever give up.

11:00

This bill is about control by this government over the needs of patients in hospitals. It's not about investment into our health care services and programs. As I said, it's about privatization. You'd think a government would go to people who work in the system and say: "Look, we're going to focus on improving the health care system in this province. Give us some of your ideas, you know, more than focus groups, more than, I guess, getting people who have the experience and who have the knowledge of what's necessary to make life better for Albertans who are sick or who are

needing health care. What do you think would make that better?" Bill 55 is not something they would come up with, Mr. Speaker.

Does anyone believe that those in health care would come up with Bill 55 if asked, you know, blue-sky: how would you improve the system? I don't think so. The people who have dedicated themselves to improving the lives of Albertans through their health care delivery aren't being recognized with Bill 55. As I said, this is more about the current government exerting its control over all aspects of health care and making a really bad job of it in the process.

Corporations are identified throughout here as persons who can form hospitals, and corporations, we know, are in things like health care and other sectors for profit-making. For profit-making. That's not public health care. Public health care is dedicated as a social good to improve the lives of the citizenry, not to skim off profits and see corporations mete that out to their investors.

Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues on this side, believe that when governments are elected, they're to do good for the people that they serve, not for the corporations that want to make money off the people who are necessarily needing support for their health care needs. We saw some pretty incredibly bad situations where Albertans left hospital, as my colleague the shadow minister for Health says, and they wound up in motels. That sort of thing shows the kind of value that is placed on lives, and it's not a very high bar in terms of what a corporation will do given the opportunity to make sure that they are able to address the needs of their investors over the needs of the people who they're supposed to be able to serve.

We've had a really great health care system in this province. We've had investments into health care. We have some incredible services and abilities that our health care system can deliver, but right now I fear that far too many people working in health care, whether they're ancillary to the actual kind of medical side and supporting the medical side or they're in the medical side, are all feeling like they're not being heard, they're not being understood, and their morale is not at the highest. We have seen doctors fight with government, government fight with doctors. In the previous government to this one, the AMA contract was ripped up. So the disrespect shown to people who have dedicated long years of training to be specialists in their field was embarrassing, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues and I, I think, on this side hold those people in high regard, and we want to invest in them as opposed to making sure corporations get the benefit.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Deol: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity. I specifically rose in this House to add my comments to Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, on behalf of my constituents and the people who I met with in the last four or five days while we were debating on Bill 54.

Mr. Speaker, I have visited the hospital in my community for the past three, four days. I had the opportunity or reason to be there. I have been speaking to people who were there as patients, the workers, and the people waiting and crying in pain, sitting there for hours and hours to be seen by doctors in the emergency waiting room, and people on stretchers in hallways waiting to be seen by the doctors for eight hours, nine hours. Coincidentally, this morning I was talking to them that we were debating, some folks I was talking to about Bill 54 in the House. I have seen the staff, actually, running around and working hard to make up, the stress of the work they have in the emergency department, and the doctors working under the pressure. So I got a strong message from my constituents and the people I met inside the hospital, outside the hospital, in the

community. That was the specific reason I asked my colleagues: I need a few moments to stand up in this House to deliver their message to please oppose this bill in this House.

Mr. Speaker, in this crisis of affordability, when the prices are going up and the minimum wage in Alberta hasn't changed in the last seven or eight years, the grocery prices are hiking, utilities are getting unaffordable, and insurance prices are legislated to rise by 15 per cent by this UCP government, when people are facing that crisis and this UCP government is asking Albertans why around a million Albertans lack family doctors – they do not have a doctor – the government is opening a path, a way where Albertans will now need to, you know, look at their wallet before they even think of looking for medical help.

Mr. Speaker, this UCP government cancelled the south Edmonton hospital. If that hospital had been on schedule, we would have been actually inaugurating that hospital probably next year or the year after that. The hospital had passed its first phase and was ready to go to its next phase of \$900 million, and this government cancelled it without consultation and without reason, knowing that our health care facilities are overcrowded, and we are short of space, and we are short of staff, and people are struggling with life-threatening illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, it's very wrong. We cannot allow this government to dismantle our public health care. What I heard: Albertans will not let this government go unchecked.

I strongly oppose this bill. Thank you.

11:10

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

Member Miyashiro: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are a few of us old enough in this Assembly to have witnessed the evolution of health care in Alberta, so I'm going to give you a little history lesson. We once had local hospital boards and local health unit boards, which meant local health care decisions were made locally in order for timely response to local and emerging issues, with some big-picture health decisions obviously co-ordinated and made by Alberta Health. We evolved to regional health authorities in the '90s – that's the 1990s – which enabled residents of smaller municipalities within every region to have fair access to health care services across that region. It also led to the development of large regional hospitals accessible by all residents of a region, and those residents also had access to more specialized services in Calgary and Edmonton and, once again, timely access to health care and timely local response to emerging issues.

I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that this system was the most effective and efficient for those of us living within the boundaries of the Chinook regional health authority. We were actually held up very often as the poster child for the way a health authority should be run. But then we blew that up, and we centralized the health care system only because the Conservative government of the day decided that the regional health authorities were a bit too autonomous and had too much control. So we redid Alberta Health, which was to be the policy and regulatory body, and Alberta Health Services, which became the operational body of the health care system. This was supposed to separate as much as possible the policy and operation sides of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I provide that short history to contrast that with the disjointed system created by this UCP government. Let's fragment the health care system across several new operational entities: Acute Care Alberta, Primary Care Alberta, assisted living Alberta, which requires the creation of another entity to ensure system integration and a new shared sector services agency to manage the back-office administrative function, which seems to create more red

tape, but, hey, that can't be true because this is the government of red tape reduction. Let's also centralize operations and control of the system in Alberta Health.

Related to this is updating provisions to ensure that sector ministers are responsible for approving hospital-related bylaws within their sector. Oh, yeah, I forgot to mention that each of these entities above gets a sector minister who's underneath the Health minister. They're not really a minister; they're just kind of a minister. They're semi. Does this mean that ministers of these entities are creating hospital-related bylaws irrespective of what their colleagues create? Remember, I said that the sector ministers are responsible for approving hospital-related bylaws within their sectors. Does this mean that the minister responsible for integration – I just made that up because it sounded right – makes sure that these bylaws are compatible? How is this operationalized for hospital staff? More importantly, how does this make sense? But I digress.

What else is being done to fragment the system? Let's make Alberta Health Services into just another service provider because, as the UCP said, they had a monopoly on health services. Imagine that, Mr. Speaker: the government department responsible for health care service delivery having a monopoly on health services. It boggles the mind.

Current wording on page 90 of the bill enables the minister to designate "a person other than a provincial health agency or provincial health corporation" if the minister is satisfied that that person can deliver health services in an approved hospital. Mr. Speaker, to define a person, in the Business Corporations Act: corporations are considered persons in Alberta. So in this context a person other than a provincial health agency or a provincial health corporation is what we're talking about.

The oversight, Minister, in this – I'll get to my point in a second. The Minister of Health in this case is satisfied the minute the person is capable of delivering hospital services in an approved hospital. It's also up to the minister to designate the person based on any other factors determined by that minister, and that minister has considered any recommendation by the provincial health agency for the establishment of the health sector with respect to whether that person should be designated. You know what this sounds like, Mr. Speaker? It sounds an awful lot like private operators operating our hospitals at the whim of the minister.

Under the section called discharge or transfer of patients hospital operators will be able to continue to transfer and discharge patients into motels, hotels, shelters, the street whenever they feel like it. Of course, Mr. Speaker, discharging people to random places is part of every discharge treatment plan that facilitates the best health outcomes. No, it really isn't. Obviously, it doesn't.

Mr. Speaker, I can continue with a more fulsome critique of this bill, but I must cede my time to my colleague.

But a few final thoughts. It's really unfortunate this bill does not create more physicians, fix wait times in ERs, reduce wait times for surgeries and MRIs, which illustrates that this government does not seem to place timely and effective patient care at the top of its priorities. Mr. Speaker, it's truly unfortunate that this bill is an attempt by this government to concentrate decision-making in the hands of politicians versus allowing operational autonomy for medical professionals. I'm opposed to Bill 55, and it should be defeated.

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

Mr. Haji: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise tonight to speak against Bill 55, a bill that, under the pretext of administrative modernization, quietly lays the foundation for privatized hospital

operations in Alberta. This bill amends 54 consequential acts across 19 ministries, a sweeping overhaul. At its core Bill 55 creates the legal architecture to allow private corporations to operate Alberta's public hospitals. Alberta's public health care system is not perfect, but Albertans believe deeply in the principle that care should be based on need, not the ability to pay. Bill 55 quietly undermines that very principle.

One of the most alarming provisions in this bill is the new section in the Provincial Health Agencies Act that allows the minister to designate any person or private corporation as an operator for approved hospitals. We're not talking about ancillary services or facility management or CSFs; we are talking about the operation and the delivery of hospital care. In Bill 55 as presented there are no requirements for public accountability, there are no requirements for restrictions on profit motives, and there are no clear criteria for how or why a private entity would be chosen over a public entity. If the minister believes a person is capable, that's enough. That's not oversight. That's a blank cheque for privatization.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just bureaucratic change; this is actually a shift in philosophy. Bill 55 paves the way for a two-tiered system where one who can pay jumps the queue while others wait longer, leading to differential health outcomes. Down the line probably – I hope this is not the case – some of us will use this card while others get a different one.

11:20

Mr. Speaker, we have all been receiving e-mails and communications from our constituents, Albertans who are concerned. I want to quote for you. One constituent said, and I quote, "What keeps me up at night is not just how long I may have to wait for surgery – it's the fear that someone with more money will simply skip the line." I will quote another one, Mr. Speaker. "I don't want a hospital corporation deciding what is cost-effective;" I want the health professionals, the doctors and the nurses, deciding what is best for my health.

These are not abstract fears, Mr. Speaker. They are real. They are valid. They are widespread. Bill 55 is the first step to move us away from the promise of universal public health care towards a future where profit and policies work hand in hand. For those reasons, I urge all members of this House to stand on the side of public health care and vote against Bill 55.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

Dr. Elmeligi: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, it's my pleasure to actually rise tonight to speak to Bill 55, especially since I didn't get to speak to Bill 54 because we ran out of time. It's really too bad because I had a story about my dad that was really, really good that I really wanted to share with everybody, but you know what? Y'all missed it. I guess that's just your loss. He was a great man, and he would have loved for me to share that story. You'll have to wait for the next super corrupt bill, I guess.

Mr. Ellingson: Like this one.

Dr. Elmeligi: Yeah. Like this one.

I come from a family where my mom was a registered nurse, so I come from a family that values public health care. I think what really challenges me with this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it actually builds on previous bills that weaken the public health care system and start to build a private health care system. The problem with private health care is that it's not free. It costs a lot of money, and it basically means that the people who have money get care and the

people who don't don't or they don't get it in as timely a fashion or they don't get it as high a quality or they don't get to stay in hospital for as long to recover from their surgeries.

We're also debating this bill at a time of the greatest scandal in Alberta history, largely centred around health care and procurement of private surgical facilities and their contracts. Where did those private surgical facilities come from, Mr. Speaker? It turns out they came from this government in Bill 26, so it seems like we're seeing a pattern here where this government chooses to prioritize private surgical facilities, and then this bill opens the door for private hospitals. I find that gravely concerning, not just because it weakens the public system, but I truly do believe that public health care is the greatest gift we give each other as a society.

It is one of the things that distinguishes us from the U.S. very, very clearly. Even when you talk to Americans, the one thing that they say that they think is different between Canada and the U.S. is our public health care. I can think of a long list of reasons why we're different from the U.S., and I guess I could have shared some of those in my debate on Bill 54, too, but I didn't get to. It's okay. I'll focus on this one because this one is also a pile of garbage.

I want to say that in this bill there are provisions for the minister to designate hospital operators that the minister deems capable. Now, I find this language particularly concerning because the Minister of Health right now will not always be the Minister of Health. When we include subjective language in bills like "the minister deems capable," that could mean something totally different several years from now when we have a different Minister of Health, probably an NDP minister, but you know, I digress. What is the criteria that is deemed capable for a hospital operator? How can we be sure, based on the language in this bill, that that operator will not be a private person or a private entity, essentially creating a private hospital?

The other part of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it allows for the decisions of discharge of patients from these private hospitals to not actually be coming from health care professionals but be coming from the administrators of the building. Administrators in a private hospital that operates like a business may not have the best interests of the patient in mind, and health care should always be about the patient. It should not be about the operator. It should not be about the business. It should be about taking care of people. This bill does not take care of people. It dismantles what is, honestly, our best social system, and it's disgusting. Like, it's just really gross.

The current allegations of corruption: whether they're true or whether they're not, we don't know because there's not going to be a public inquiry. There'll be all these other investigations that are quasi-good or quasi-real and the results may or may not be public and people may or may not testify. Anyway, with all of those current allegations, Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to trust this government to provide any kind of meaningful public health care that actually serves the people.

What I do think is possible is that this bill does allow for private hospital facilities. And then I start to think: well, what does that mean? Does that mean that we'll have a series of Mraiche hospitals scattered around Alberta with a whole bunch of Turkish Tylenol and useless PPE and big warehouses and, you know, a couple of surgical rooms, I guess? We'll throw those in because we're related to those private surgical facilities. Is this the system that we're trying to set up to serve Albertans? I sure hope not, but it definitely makes me think about it.

Bill 55 should have at least been amended to ensure private hospital operators are not permitted, and it wasn't. I've heard the minister stand here and talk about all of the consultations that her ministry has conducted around health care over the last year, and that is true. I have attended those consultations in my riding, and

this idea of privatized hospital operators was not consulted on. The idea of refocusing health care into four different buckets was also not consulted on. So it's pretty difficult and a little bit jarring for me to sit here and listen to the minister talk about the great consultation she's been doing or her ministry has been doing when they haven't asked the right questions. They haven't actually asked people what they think about this. They're just throwing it out there and ramming it through with time allocation, not giving us a chance to debate it and not adequately consulting the public or health care professionals in the development of these pieces of legislation.

Bill 30 in 2020 lowered the bar for private clinics and private surgical facilities, and now we're seeing what happens with that. Earlier today I tabled a letter from an anaesthesiologist who lives in my riding who's being forced to work in private surgical clinics instead of working in the public system because that's where she's being directed to work. Rather than serving the public, rather than public hospitals having operating rooms that are actually operating on people, we're funnelling resources towards private surgical facilities and then literally boasting about how many more surgeries they're doing. The spin, Mr. Speaker, that we have to sit through in question period, acting as if health care is being improved under this government's watch, kind of makes me puke in my mouth a little bit. [interjections] Yeah. Well, just being truthful over here.

The reality is, Mr. Speaker, that Albertans want publicly funded and publicly delivered health care that meets the needs of their families and loved ones. They want accountability, honesty, and transparency not just in health care but across this government as a whole, and they're not getting it anywhere. I guess Albertans will just have to wait until we have an NDP government, who can actually deliver on accountability, honesty, and transparency and make sure that our public health care system stays public.

11:30

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

Mr. Ellingson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah. Thank you, government, I guess, for the few minutes that we get to stand up and speak to Bill 55, the Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, which makes sweeping changes and enables sweeping changes to the health bill.

As we've heard from the minister, this is a hefty bill. But while the minister does say that, you know, it being a long bill in and of itself makes it a good bill, that isn't the case. Just because it's 164 pages doesn't make it a good bill. In fact, we had some experience earlier today where we saw this bill was rushed. It's clumsy, in that two weeks after it being introduced, we got an amendment from the government with six more pages of sleight of hand that they missed in the first round. That's not uncommon for this government, Mr. Speaker. Rush through ill-planned, uninformed legislation and either introduce amendments while it's still in debate and then push it through or write another piece of legislation later to fix it.

The minister tells us also that there's really no need to debate the clauses of the bill because they're relatively innocuous. They just make some simple changes. She'd like us to believe that the 47 acts were revised simply to exchange the words "regional health authority" for "provincial health agency." I'm thankful for the minister to pointing me to specific items in the bill to actually look at more closely to see whether or not this was the case, you know, so let's take a look and ask a couple more questions.

Let's look at page 27, section 24(2)(a) and ask some questions about the changes that were being made. The minister might, if given the chance, tell us that this is simply preamble in a previous act, and why would we care about what we find in the preamble, Mr. Speaker? But in amending the preamble, provincial health

agencies that have replaced regional health authorities will not, as regional health authorities did, assess the health needs of the population, determine priorities, allocate resources, and ensure reasonable access to those services.

As my colleague from Calgary-North East so eloquently pointed out, Bill 55 takes away local voices, and in taking away those local voices, it appears that we apparently no longer need to assess needs, determine priorities, allocate resources, or ensure access. I guess these things are no longer important in health care. I don't think any of us should be surprised with these small changes given that this is a government that is systematically dismantling both planning and reporting on government services across the board, so it's no surprise to see it here in Bill 55.

These changes were reinforced on page 81 of the bill, where the Provincial Health Agencies Act is amended to remove all regional input into establishing targets for health as well as the allocation of financial, human, and physical resources. Does the minister care at all about health care planning, or is she just too busy shuffling deck chairs, firing senior administration and board members to be concerned with something so trivial as health care planning?

Previously the Calgary zone had developed a Calgary zone health care plan, providing strategic direction for the next 15 years. One might wonder now with Bill 55 and this act removing regional work, placing all of that work in central control: does the 15-year strategic plan of the Calgary zone still have any relevance? Are we still looking at that given that central control is now standard for this government?

This bill also deletes all of section 4 in the Hospitals Act. Section 4 deals with the creation and management of regional health foundations. It doesn't amend how they are created or governed; it deletes them. These foundations do great work raising funds for local health priorities. As an example, the Calgary Health Foundation last year raised over \$50 million for cardiac care, Indigenous health, mental health, seniors' health, surgery, and women's health, but since we no longer care about regional planning – the Calgary Health Foundation also has over \$100 million of investments, generating annual income to support the same outcomes – the bill doesn't suggest what will happen to those foundations. It doesn't replace the language governing hospital foundations. It simply deletes it, leaving us all to wonder: what will we be doing? I don't know. Maybe it's going to be somewhere mysteriously in the regulations, like every other piece of legislation this government puts forward.

I already noted in this debate that Bill 55 removed the language about regional health authorities assessing needs, determining priorities, allocating resources. Is this all now under the direction of the minister? I'll remind this House that is the same minister that's at the centre of the corrupt care scandal, which alleges that this minister took direct control over purchasing decisions that directed hundreds of millions in contracts to political insiders. How can we trust this minister and this government, and how can we agree to a bill that places even more authority in the control of this minister? The answer is, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot.

Now let's talk about the minister denying that this bill opens the door for further private-sector delivery in our health care system. Of course, again, the minister has pointed out that that clause is simply a minor change, the clause that changes the management of hospitals to operators, a vague, open-ended word that could result in hospitals being run by nongovernment operators. This was articulated by many of my colleagues in talking about: what does this mean with this play on words with operators, approved hospitals? As my colleagues have asked the question, is this opening the door for the privatization of hospitals?

I will say that this is a slippery slope. I think many Albertans and families of Albertans have experienced themselves in hospitals in

the United States when they're on vacation or maybe snowbirding. And you know what, Mr. Speaker? Sometimes those hospitals they land in in the United States are not-for-profit hospitals, but they still end up with surprise bills for out-of-pocket expenses not covered by insurance providers. I think we have to question here: even if they're not-for-profit providers, will there be surprise out-of-pocket expenses that aren't covered? Are we going to now find, are we going to look at that anything that is not specifically listed in the Canada Health Act is now going to be not covered by insurance, and citizens are going to have to pay all on their own?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stand here representing the citizens of Calgary-Foothills and support this bill, and neither can any of my colleagues. Thank you.

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

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to Kapanen for scoring before I had an opportunity to speak to this bill so that my mom can tune in to watch.

I'd like to begin by introducing a hoist. The favourite of everyone's amendments, the hoist. The Speaker's first hoist.

11:40

The Speaker: Hon. members, this amendment will be known as amendment HA1.

Ms Hoffman: Thank you very much. I will start by recapping some of the amazing things we've heard tonight and just in this last hour, because the government has brought in time allocation. To all of my colleagues who've spoken in other readings: thank you so much. For those who didn't have an opportunity to say what they wanted to say: shame on the government. Shame on the government for bringing in such a heavy-handed bill at the last opportunity during the session and for ramming it through so quickly.

Thank you to my colleague for Calgary-North East tonight for speaking about Gandhi and his focus on compassion and care and how that relates to the values that we should all be delivering in public health care.

Thank you to the Member for Calgary-Buffalo for talking about the corporatization of health care that is under way in this bill. At the beginning of this session we talked about cuts, chaos, and corruption, and now we have yet more Cs, including cruelty and corporatization. Definitely not something that the Premier or any member of the government campaigned on in the last provincial election.

Thank you to the Member for Edmonton-Meadows for talking about what an improvement the government could actually be providing, focused on improving access to family doctors; instead, the government is focused on moving pieces around and dismantling the parts of our health care system that are still intact.

Thank you to the Member for Lethbridge-West for giving us a bit of a history lesson in the chaos that we've experienced under the Conservative government's repeated attempts to dismantle public health care, yet another step on that here today.

Thank you to the Member for Edmonton-Decore for talking about specific constituents, people who are impacted by fear that they will lose access to health care services, that they are so rightfully entitled to, because somebody has deeper pockets and can jump to the front of the line.

Thank you to the Member for Banff-Kananaskis for talking about how important engagement is, engagement on democracy, engagement on legislation as it relates to health care, and highlighting the fact that the government has failed to engage properly on so many pieces of legislation, Bill 55, the Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, included among that.

Thank you to the Member for Calgary-Foothills for talking about the importance of regional voices and making sure that we have local decisions made by folks in those local areas, not by one minister and one office. I say this as the former Health minister.

When the then Premier, Rachel Notley, called me and told me that I'd be her Health minister, it wasn't an ask; it was a tell. I remember saying: thank you, Premier; can you tell me why you think I'll be successful in that role? She talked about some nice things about me, but I'm going to tell you that the main thing she said was that it was really important that the Health minister not think that they were the expert, not think that they were the one who was in the best position to solve everyone's problems, but that they be somebody who gathers the evidence, respects experts, brings those collective opinions forward, and makes informed decisions based on that feedback from experts. I knew I could do that. I knew I could work with others and bring forward experts.

Very early on in my time as Health minister I had the honour of hiring Dr. Karen Grimsrud as the chief medical officer of health. I have to say that that was a big role and a big responsibility that she took on. I am so grateful that she was there when we found things like the Domtar site in northeast Edmonton, that had contaminated soil, and the importance of what I thought was the right thing to do, to inform everyone who lived in that area of the potential impacts and the fact that we found this and that we were acting on it. If we didn't have a chief medical officer of health who felt confident that she could come and share that information, I don't think that we would have been able to give assurances to people.

I fear that what we're seeing under the current government and potentially under future governments would be a government to say: "You know what? We don't need to tell them because it's going to be fine." You know what? It is going to be fine, but I think the right thing to do is give people information, evidence, and enable them to be able to make the decisions to ensure their own safety and well-being.

I thought that my whole speech was going to focus around the chief medical officer of health when I originally saw this piece of legislation because of how consolidated the power is in the minister's office around taking away the medical officers of health from being regional experts, as we've heard in some of our other speeches, and working in local partnership with other decision-makers. When I was on the Edmonton public school board I worked a lot with the medical officers of health, specifically Chris Sikora, around making sure that we were making good decisions in schools around public health, and I'm really proud that we were able to do that.

Now they're moving all of those medical officers of health into the department so that they will report to the chief medical officer of health, which the government is incredibly struggling to find anyone who's able to take that role on permanently who has the expertise. No wonder why. They chased one out of the province, stopped her from getting a job after that even, and then when the second one came in, he was muzzled and not allowed to speak. No wonder why the medical officers of health aren't interested in being the chief medical officer of health in this province.

Now the government is saying in this bill, Bill 55, a garbage bill, so eloquently said by the Member for Banff-Kananaskis, that they are asserting that they will become department employees reporting to the chief medical officer, reporting to the deputy minister, reporting to the minister, reporting to the Premier. That is not what good public health looks like, and the government should be both embarrassed and ashamed of the fact that they are causing that much lack of trust and confidence. I worry that we're going to lose our medical officers of health and that we will never be able to attract a quality chief medical officer of health under the current

government's leadership. That is a serious concern. So is the extreme privatization that this opens the door to.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the government brought this in among the final days of this sitting of the Legislature, their final bill, the fact that the government has brought in closure at every stage to move this through, I think, speaks to the fact that they don't want Albertans to know what's in it. They don't want Albertans to know that they are creating opportunities for corporations to come in and take ownership of our incredibly important public health facilities.

I will say for anyone living in a rural riding: your hospital is not profitable. It shouldn't be profitable. Most hospitals in urban settings aren't profitable either. They shouldn't be profitable.

Where people have found opportunities to make money in the past in other jurisdictions is off private surgical centres. And boy, oh boy, in Alberta have they ever made money off private surgical centres. That has been under the current government. There was some unparliamentary language used to describe these contracts, but I will instead say: sweet, sweet contracts. Like, if you own the private surgical centre, you are making some sweet, sweet profits. Great profit margins.

There are members in the government caucus who are also in the front bench who've written letters – actually, two cabinet ministers now; it used to be a cabinet minister from Fort McMurray, a parliamentary secretary from West Yellowhead, who's now a cabinet minister, and a private member from Fort McMurray – promoting the expansion of private, for-profit opportunities. Websites where the people selling shares into these organizations said: "Don't worry. You will double your profits or more in the first five years alone. There's so much money to be made on private health care." And how did the Premier react? She added them to even higher positions of authority within her own caucus. That is . . .

Mr. Getson: Hear, hear. Well done, guys. Good job.

Ms Hoffman: Nobody on the other side should be proud and cheering for private health care, especially the Member for Lac Ste. Anne-Parkland, who is supposed to be the whip and who's supposed to be in this place bringing decorum to it and instead is bringing in garbage legislation that is going to privatize health care.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring forward a hoist amendment. This is an opportunity for the government to give a sober second thought. Sober second thought. This would actually say that the bill "be not now read a Third time but that it be read a Third time this day six months hence." Give your heads a shake. Stop what you're doing and what you're rushing through. Ralph Klein would have . . .

The Speaker: Through the chair.

Ms Hoffman: Mr. Speaker, through the chair, Ralph Klein would have never tried to railroad a piece of legislation like this through this place. Never. He made lots of other bad decisions, but he would have never tried to blindside Albertans. He tried to convince them that two-tiered health care was right, and it . . .

The Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt, hon. member. [interjections] Order. Order. It's good. We're having fun. It's almost midnight. Thank you.

I hate to interrupt, but pursuant to Government Motion 78, agreed to earlier this evening, one hour of debate has now been completed, and I'm required to put to the Assembly all necessary questions to dispose of Bill 55, Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025, at third reading.

The first question is on the amendment before us now, the hoist amendment.

Ms Hoffman: Yeah, we went there. [interjections]

The Speaker: Order, please. It's my turn. It's my turn. [interjections]

[Motion on amendment HA1 lost]

The Speaker: We're still in my turn, if you don't mind, folks.

Now that takes us to the main motion, which is third reading of Bill 55, the Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025.

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

[Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung at 11:50 p.m.]

[One minute having elapsed, the Assembly divided]

[The Speaker in the chair]

For the motion:

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

Against the motion:

Al-Guneid	Elmeligi	Kayande
Arcand-Paul	Eremenko	Metz
Batten	Ganley	Miyashiro
Boparai	Goehring	Renaud
Brar	Gray	Sabir
Calahoo Stonehouse	Haji	Schmidt
Ceci	Hayter	Shepherd
Chapman	Hoffman	Sigurdson, L.
Dach	Hoyle	Sweet
Deol	Ip	Tejada
Eggen	Irwin	Wright, P.
Ellingson	Kasawski	

Totals: For – 44 Against – 35

[Motion carried; Bill 55 read a third time]

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to request unanimous consent of the Assembly that notwithstanding Standing Order 77(1) we move immediately to third reading of Bill Pr. 5.

The Speaker: Hon. members, the hon. Government House Leader has asked for unanimous consent to move to Bill Pr. 5. I will only ask one question. Do any of the hon. members object?

[Unanimous consent granted]

Private Bills Third Reading

Bill Pr. 5 Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act

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

Member Miyashiro: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move third reading of Bill Pr. 5, Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 5 read a third time]

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader.

Mr. Schow: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that is how you give a third reading speech right there.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to request unanimous consent of the Assembly that notwithstanding Standing Order 77(1) we move immediately to third reading of Bill Pr. 6.

The Speaker: The hon. Government House Leader has moved unanimous consent to continue with Bill Pr. 6 for the next reading. All in favour, please say aye.

[Unanimous consent granted]

Bill Pr. 6 Burman University Amendment Act, 2025

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

Mrs. Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move third reading of Bill Pr. 6, Burman University Amendment Act, 2025.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill Pr. 6 read a third time]

The Speaker: Hon. members, it's midnight, and you know what that means. It means that our page Tori just turned 18 years old, which means Tori can do anything she wants within the laws of this province and this country. Happy birthday. [Members sang *Happy Birthday*] That is truly the most love we've had in here all day, so that's a good thing.

12:00

Statement by the Speaker Remarks at the End of the Spring Sitting

The Speaker: Hon. members, as this spring sitting comes to a close, I want to take a moment to thank every one of you for your hard work, your commitment, and – let's be honest – for your patience with a brand new untested Speaker over the last couple of days. Thank you for that. It's been an honour to take on this role. I appreciate the trust you placed in me, and I will continue to do my best to uphold the dignity, fairness, and good humour that Albertans expect from their Legislature and the chair of it.

To the Government House Leader, the Official Opposition House Leader, the leadership of all the parties, and to each and every member in this Chamber: thank you for your service to Albertans. The strength of our democracy depends not just on passionate debate

but on co-operation, discipline, and mutual respect even when we strongly disagree. Everybody in this room has shown all of that and more. Thank you.

Of course, none of this happens without the dedicated professionals who support all of our work. Thank you to our table officers, who have saved my bacon numerous times in the last couple of days; our security staff; and the many other teams behind the scenes. Thank you to those in administration, the library, the Legislature cafeteria, our communications office. All you people carry a heavy load very often without recognition, and I want you to know that your efforts are truly appreciated by the elected members here.

A special thanks as well to the Speaker's office staff, who managed to keep things moving even as the office was in transition this week. Your guidance has been invaluable.

Over the course of this session there's been serious debate, thoughtful exchange, a few late nights, a bit of levity and a bit of other. The work hasn't always been easy, but it's important work, and it's meaningful to the roughly 5 million Albertans whom we serve. As we all return to our communities whether near or far, I hope that we carry with us a sense of pride in what's been done and in the efforts that we have put forward.

I wish all of us a bit of rest in the days ahead because we have had some long nights. Alberta will be waiting for you. I expect there will be a few town halls and barbecues, and I hope they go well for everybody and that you enjoy them.

With that, hon. members – in fact, I think I've got to let the hon. Government House Leader speak before I finish that sentence.

Mr. Schow: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I begin, I would say: how about them Oilers? [some applause] I didn't see you clapping, Mr. Speaker. What's that all about?

The Speaker: Every good story needs a hero and a villain, hon. House leader.

Mr. Schow: Well, it's good to see the boys are buzzing, but there's still a big slate ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I would say in closing that I want to thank the Premier. I want to thank the Speaker's office, past and present. I want to thank you, Speaker, for taking on this role. I also want to thank the LASS for all their diligent work keeping us safe; table officers; the pages; of course *Hansard*, who is here for every single word of this. I want to thank my House leader team. I'd like to thank the Opposition House Leader team.

Also, I want to basically finish by thanking all members of the Assembly for their diligent work except the Member for Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills. Mr. Speaker, how many standing ovations can you get? Like, would you just leave already? We love you, Coop. All that to say that I wish everyone a very safe and happy summer. Enjoy it with your families, your constituents, and friends.

With that, pursuant to Government Motion 74 I wish to advise the Assembly that the business of the 2025 spring sitting is now concluded.

The Speaker: Hon. members, I wish you all well and all safe travels.

[Motion carried; the Assembly adjourned at 12:05 a.m. on Thursday pursuant to Government Motion 74]

Bill Status Report for the 31th Legislature - 1st Session (2023-2025)

Activity to Thursday, May 15, 2025

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 — Alberta Taxpayer Protection Amendment Act, 2023 (Smith)

First Reading — 10 (*Oct. 30, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 57-58 (*Nov. 1, 2023 aft.*), 96-97 (*Nov. 2, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 145-47 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 147-54 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c6]

Bill 2 — Alberta Pension Protection Act (Horner)

First Reading — 89-90 (*Nov. 2, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 154-55 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 274-85 (*Nov. 21, 2023 aft.*), 336-43 (*Nov. 23, 2023 aft.*), 394-400 (*Nov. 28, 2023 aft.*), 424-30 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 522-30 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft.*), 552-59 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 565 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve.*), 583-90 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 cA-29.5]

Bill 3 — Opioid Damages and Health Care Costs Recovery Amendment Act, 2023 (Williams)

First Reading — 22 (*Oct. 31, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 90-93 (*Nov. 2, 2023 aft.*), 180-87 (*Nov. 8, 2023 aft.*), 272-73 (*Nov. 21, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 307-09 (*Nov. 22, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 334-36 (*Nov. 23, 2023 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c10]

Bill 4 — Tax Statutes Amendment Act, 2023 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 55 (*Nov. 1, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 159-63 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 155-56 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 187-90 (*Nov. 8, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 309-13 (*Nov. 22, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 336 (*Nov. 23, 2023 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2023 c13]

Bill 5* — Public Sector Employers Amendment Act, 2023 (Horner)

First Reading — 55-56 (*Nov. 1, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 156-57 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 190-97 (*Nov. 8, 2023 aft.*), 265-72 (*Nov. 21, 2023 aft.*), 403-09 (*Nov. 28, 2023 aft.*), 430-35 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 456 (*Nov. 30, 2023 aft., passed*), 519-22 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., recommitted*), 559-62, 563-64 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed on division; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 515 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., recommitted to Committee of the Whole*), 564-55 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve.*), 575-83 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on Proclamation; SA 2023 c12]

Bill 6 — Public Health Amendment Act, 2023 (Amery)

First Reading — 90 (*Nov. 2, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 157-58 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 313-20 (*Nov. 22, 2023 aft.*), 435-38 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 456-62 (*Nov. 30, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 462 (*Nov. 30, 2023 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c11]

Bill 7 — Engineering and Geoscience Professions Amendment Act, 2023 (Sawhney)

First Reading — 111 (*Nov. 6, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 158-59 (*Nov. 7, 2023 aft.*), 273-74 (*Nov. 21, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 400-03 (*Nov. 28, 2023 aft.*), 423-24 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 514-15 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c7]

Bill 8 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2023 (Amery)

First Reading — 209 (*Nov. 9, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 299-307 (*Nov. 22, 2023 aft.*), 438-41 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 515-18 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft.*), 546-52 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 564 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve.*), 569-75 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2023 c8]

Bill 9 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2023 (Schow)

First Reading — 478 (*Dec. 4, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 513-14 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 546 (*Dec. 6, 2023 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 590-92 (*Dec. 7, 2023 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c9]

Bill 10 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 673 (*Mar. 12, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 705-16 (*Mar. 14, 2024 aft.*), 868-73 (*Mar. 26, 2024 aft.*), 904-05 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft.*), 899-901 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft.*), 970-75 (*Apr. 9, 2024 aft.*), 1003-05 (*Apr. 10, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1005-09 (*Apr. 10, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1040-43 (*Apr. 11, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2024 c4]

Bill 11 — Public Safety Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Ellis)

First Reading — 685 (*Mar. 13, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 976-90 (*Apr. 9, 2024 aft.*), 1009-15 (*Apr. 10, 2024 aft.*), 1091-96 (*Apr. 16, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1217-20 (*Apr. 23, 2024 aft.*), 1334-41 (*May 7, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1448-55 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force May 16, 2024, except section 1, which comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 c6]

Bill 12* — Consumer Protection (Life Leases) Amendment Act, 2024 (Nally)

First Reading — 727 (*Mar. 18, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1015-22 (*Apr. 10, 2024 aft.*), 1043-46 (*Apr. 11, 2024 aft.*), 1096-102 (*Apr. 16, 2024 aft.*), 1135-40 (*Apr. 17, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1220 (*Apr. 23, 2024 aft.*), 1239-48 (*Apr. 24, 2024 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 1367-74 (*May 8, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force May 16, 2024; SA 2024 c3]

Bill 13 — Real Property Governance Act (Guthrie)

First Reading — 779 (*Mar. 21, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1102-09 (*Apr. 16, 2024 aft.*), 1132-35 (*Apr. 17, 2024 aft.*), 1161-63 (*Apr. 18, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1220-28 (*Apr. 23, 2024 aft.*), 1341-43 (*May 7, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1395-1400 (*May 9, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force May 16, 2024, with some sections deemed to have come into force on March 21, 2024; SA 2024 cR-5.3]

Bill 14 — Appropriation Act, 2024 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 791 (*Mar. 21, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 855-63 (*Mar. 26, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 887-93 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft.*), 903 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 920-24 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 28, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on March 28, 2024; SA 2024 c1]

Bill 15 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2024 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 841 (*Mar. 25, 2024 eve., passed*)

Second Reading — 863-68 (*Mar. 26, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 893-99 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft.*), 901-04 (*Mar. 27, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 924 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed*), 920 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft.*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 28, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on March 28, 2024; SA 2024 c2]

Bill 16 — Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Nally)

First Reading — 935-36 (*Apr. 8, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1127-32 (*Apr. 17, 2024 aft.*), 1248-53 (*Apr. 24, 2024 aft.*), 1279-82 (*Apr. 25, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1456-60 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1490-92 (*May 15, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2024 c7]

Bill 17 — Canadian Centre of Recovery Excellence Act (Williams)

First Reading — 959 (*Apr. 9, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1156-61 (*Apr. 18, 2024 aft.*), 1272-79 (*Apr. 25, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1361-67 (*May 8, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1464-66 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 cC-1.5]

Bill 18* — Provincial Priorities Act (Smith)

First Reading — 993 (*Apr. 10, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1122-27 (*Apr. 17, 2024 aft.*), 1209-17 (*Apr. 23, 2024 aft.*), 1253-60 (*Apr. 24, 2024 aft.*), 1329-34 (*May 7, 2024 aft.*), 1533-40 (*May 21, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1540-42 (*May 21, 2024 aft.*), 1569-77 (*May 22, 2024 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 1664-68 (*May 28, 2024 aft.*), 1692-99 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 cP-35.5]

Bill 19 — Utilities Affordability Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Neudorf)

First Reading — 1177 (*Apr. 22, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1344-48 (*May 7, 2024 aft.*), 1400-03 (*May 9, 2024 aft.*), 1455-56 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1460-64 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 1492-96 (*May 15, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2024 c8]

Bill 20* — Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (McIver)

First Reading — 1271 (*Apr. 25, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1374-82 (*May 8, 2024 aft.*), 1562-69 (*May 22, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1591-94 (*May 23, 2024 aft.*), 1669-75 (*May 28, 2024 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 1699-1700 (*May 28, 2024 eve.*), 1712-13 (*May 28, 2024 eve.*), 1729-35 (*May 29, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation, except ss 2(24) and (25), which come into force on January 1, 2025; SA 2024 c11]

Bill 21 — Emergency Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Ellis)

First Reading — 1394 (*May 9, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1508-19 (*May 16, 2024 aft.*), 1542-48 (*May 21, 2024 aft.*), 1634-41 (*May 27, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1649-50 (*May 27, 2024 eve.*), 1675-81 (*May 28, 2024 aft.*), 1683-84 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1700-01 (*May 28, 2024 eve.*), 1704--11 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 30, 2024; SA 2024 c9]

Bill 22 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (LaGrange)

First Reading — 1447 (*May 14, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1594-1600 (*May 23, 2024 aft.*), 1641-48 (*May 27, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 1650 (*May 27, 2024 eve.*), 1684-90 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1700-01 (*May 28, 2024 eve.*), 1713-15 (*May 28, 2024 eve.*), 1735-41 (*May 29, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 c10]

Bill 24* — Alberta Bill of Rights Amendment Act, 2024 (Amery)

First Reading — 1754-55 (*Oct. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1788-1805 (*Oct. 29, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1819-36 (*Oct. 30, 2024 aft.*), 2051-58 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft.*), 2082 (*Nov. 21, 2024 aft.*), 2144-45 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 2171-72 (*Nov. 27, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 5, 2024; SA 2024 c12]

Bill 25 — Early Learning and Child Care Amendment Act, 2024 (Jones)

First Reading — 1818 (*Oct. 30, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1855-56 (*Oct. 31, 2024 aft.*), 1907-12 (*Nov. 5, 2024 aft.*), 2027-29 (*Nov. 19, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2189 (*Nov. 27, 2024 aft.*), 2191-94 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2222-27 (*Nov. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 c13]

Bill 26 — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (No. 2) (LaGrange)

First Reading — 1848 (*Oct. 31, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Second Reading — 1900-07 (*Nov. 5, 2024 aft.*), 1969-77 (*Nov. 7, 2024 aft.*), 2137-40 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2145-50 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft.*), 2172-77 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2299-305 (*Dec. 3, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2024 c16]

Bill 27* — Education Amendment Act, 2024 (Nicolaides)

First Reading — 1848 (*Oct. 31, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1912-20 (*Nov. 5, 2024 aft.*), 2020-27 (*Nov. 19, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2177-89 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 2305-11 (*Dec. 3, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 c14]

Bill 28 — Meat Inspection Amendment Act, 2024 (Sigurdson, RJ)

First Reading — 1818 (*Oct. 30, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1854-55 (*Oct. 31, 2024 aft.*), 1966-69 (*Nov. 7, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2058-60 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2066-68 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 5, 2024; SA 2024 c18]

Bill 29 — Fairness and Safety in Sport Act (Schow)

First Reading — 1848-49 (*Oct. 31, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1934-40 (*Nov. 6, 2024 aft.*), 2088-92 (*Nov. 21, 2024 aft.*), 2140-44 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2150-52 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2311-14 (*Dec. 3, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 cF-2.5]

Bill 30* — Service Alberta Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Nally)

First Reading — 1868 (*Nov. 4, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1946-53 (*Nov. 6, 2024 aft.*), 2068-70 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2082-88 (*Nov. 21, 2024 aft.*), 2194-97 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve., passed with amendments*)

Third Reading — 2227-31 (*Nov. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 c20]

Bill 31 — Justice Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Amery)

First Reading — 1898 (*Nov. 5, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2029-35 (*Nov. 19, 2024 aft.*), 2270-78 (*Dec. 2, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2319-23 (*Dec. 3, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2376-79 (*Dec. 4, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force December 5, 2024, except s. 1(4), which comes into force on proclamation, SA 2024 c17]

Bill 32 — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (No. 2) (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 1868 (*Nov. 4, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1940-46 (*Nov. 6, 2024 aft.*), 2198-201 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2314-17 (*Dec. 3, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2336-37 (*Dec. 3, 2024 eve.*), 2366-69 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft.*), 2379-89 (*Dec. 4, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2024 c15]

Bill 33* — Protection of Privacy Act (Glubish)

First Reading — 1931 (*Nov. 6, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2060-66 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft.*), 2201-05 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve.*), 2231-33 (*Nov. 28, 2024 aft.*), 2278-80 (*Dec. 2, 2024 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 2351-57 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 2360-63 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on the proclamation of SA 2024, cA-1.4; SA 2024 cP-28.5]

Bill 34* — Access to Information Act (Nally)

First Reading — 1931 (*Nov. 6, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2035-38 (*Nov. 19, 2024 aft.*), 2153-57 (*Nov. 26, 2024 aft.*), 2259-66 (*Dec. 2, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2281-84 (*Dec. 2, 2024 eve.*), 2323-32 (*Dec. 3, 2024 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 2363-66 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 cA-1.4]

Bill 35 — All-season Resorts Act (Schow)

First Reading — 1965-66 (*Nov. 7, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2205-10 (*Nov. 27, 2024 eve.*), 2266 (*Dec. 2, 2024 aft.*), 2267-70 (*Dec. 2, 2024 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2332-35 (*Dec. 3, 2024 eve.*), 2357-59 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 2371-76 (*Dec. 4, 2024 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2024 cA-38.5]

Bill 36 — Miscellaneous Statutes Amendment Act, 2024 (Schow)

First Reading — 2050 (*Nov. 20, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2280-81 (*Dec. 2, 2024 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2335-36 (*Dec. 3, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 2389-90 (*Dec. 4, 2024 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 5, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2024 c19]

Bill 37 — Mental Health Services Protection Amendment Act, 2025 (Williams)

First Reading — 2402 (*Feb. 25, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2441-50 (*Feb. 26, 2025 aft.*), 2976 (*Apr. 17, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3061-70 (*Apr. 29, 2025 eve.*), 3219-20 (*May 6, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 3283-87 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c12]

Bill 38 — Red Tape Reduction Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Nally)

First Reading — 2437 (*Feb. 26, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2534-44 (*Mar. 13, 2025 aft.*), 2642-47 (*Mar. 24, 2025 aft.*), 2796-804 (*Apr. 8, 2025 aft.*), 2867-68 (*Apr. 10, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3220-26 (*May 6, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 3287-89 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2025 c15]

Bill 39* — Financial Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 2478 (*Mar. 10, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2692-98 (*Mar. 25, 2025 aft.*), 3046-49 (*Apr. 29, 2025 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3231-35 (*May 6, 2025 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)
Third Reading — 3322-25 (*May 8, 2025 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c9]

Bill 40 — Professional Governance Act (Sawhney)

First Reading — 2499 (*Mar. 11, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2724-29 (*Mar. 26, 2025 aft.*), 3022 (*Apr. 28, 2025 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3112-17 (*Apr. 30, 2025 eve.*), 3178-82 (*May 5, 2025 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 3319-22 (*May 8, 2025 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 cP-25.5]

Bill 41 — Wildlife Amendment Act, 2025 (Loewen)

First Reading — 2511 (*Mar. 12, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2841-48 (*Apr. 9, 2025 aft.*), 2924 (*Apr. 15, 2025 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3105-12 (*Apr. 30, 2025 eve.*), 3175-78 (*May 5, 2025 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 3261-63 (*May 7, 2025 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c16]

Bill 42 — Appropriation Act, 2025 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 2618 (*Mar. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2679-85 (*Mar. 25, 2025 aft., passed on division*)
Committee of the Whole — 2712-21 (*Mar. 26, 2025 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 2743 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft.*), 2745-49 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 27, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on March 27, 2025; SA 2025 c1]

Bill 43 — Appropriation (Supplementary Supply) Act, 2025 (\$) (Horner)

First Reading — 2667 (*Mar. 24, 2025 eve., passed*)
Second Reading — 2686-92 (*Mar. 25, 2025 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 2721-24 (*Mar. 26, 2025 aft., passed*)
Third Reading — 2743-44 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft.*), 2749-50 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*Mar. 27, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on March 27, 2025; SA 2025 c2]

Bill 44* — Agricultural Operation Practices Amendment Act, 2025 (Sigurdson, RJ)

First Reading — 2577 (*Mar. 18, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2913-18 (*Apr. 15, 2025 aft.*), 2976 (*Apr. 17, 2025 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3071-73 (*Apr. 29, 2025 eve.*), 3182-85 (*May 5, 2025 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)
Third Reading — 3195-96 (*May 5, 2025 eve., passed*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c4]

Bill 45 — Critical Infrastructure Defence Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 2597 (*Mar. 19, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2804-11 (*Apr. 8, 2025 aft.*), 3022-25 (*Apr. 28, 2025 eve., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3191-94 (*May 5, 2025 eve., passed*)
Third Reading — 3363-64 (*May 12, 2025 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 15, 2025; SA 2025 c5]

Bill 46 — Information and Privacy Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Glubish)

First Reading — 2613 (*Mar. 20, 2025 aft., passed*)
Second Reading — 2830-34 (*Apr. 9, 2025 aft.*), 3049-54 (*Apr. 29, 2025 aft., passed*)
Committee of the Whole — 3135-41 (*May 1, 2025 aft.*), 3269-75 (*May 7, 2025 aft.*), 3368-75 (*May 12, 2025 eve., passed on division*)
Third Reading — 3413 (*May 13, 2025 aft.*), 3414-18 (*May 13, 2025 aft.*), 3423-25 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed on division*)
Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 15, 2025; SA 2025 c11]

Bill 47 — Automobile Insurance Act (Horner)

First Reading — 2629 (*Mar. 24, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2811-16 (*Apr. 8, 2025 aft.*), 2924-28 (*Apr. 15, 2025 aft.*), 2952-59 (*Apr. 16, 2025 aft.*), 3087-93 (*Apr. 30, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3227 (*May 6, 2025 aft.*), 3329-31 (*May 6, 2025 eve.*), 3279 (*May 7, 2025 eve.*), 3357-63 (*May 12, 2025 eve.*), 3427-34 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 3441 (*May 13, 2025 eve.*), 3444-50 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 cA-47]

Bill 48 — iGaming Alberta Act (Nally)

First Reading — 2711 (*Mar. 26, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2834-41 (*Apr. 9, 2025 aft.*), 2952 (*Apr. 16, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3038-46 (*Apr. 29, 2025 aft.*), 3281-83 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 3289-91 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 cI-0.2]

Bill 49* — Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Ellis)

First Reading — 2762 (*Apr. 7, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2862-67 (*Apr. 10, 2025 aft.*), 2919-24 (*Apr. 15, 2025 aft.*), 2972-76 (*Apr. 17, 2025 aft.*), 3117-21 (*Apr. 30, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3185-91 (*May 5, 2025 eve.*), 3434-41 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed on division; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 3472-74 (*May 14, 2025 aft.*), 3477-84 (*May 14, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 15, 2025 with exceptions; SA 2025 c14]

Bill 50* — Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (McIver)

First Reading — 2787 (*Apr. 8, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2939-52 (*Apr. 16, 2025 aft.*), 2976-81 (*Apr. 17, 2025 aft.*), 3093-100 (*Apr. 30, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3264-69 (*May 7, 2025 aft.*), 3375-82 (*May 12, 2025 eve., passed on division; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 3441-42 (*May 13, 2025 eve.*), 3450-56 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on various dates; SA 2025 c13]

Bill 51 — Education Amendment Act, 2025 (Nicolaidis)

First Reading — 2787 (*Apr. 8, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3011-16 (*Apr. 28, 2025 eve.*), 3121 (*Apr. 30, 2025 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3275-78 (*May 7, 2025 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 3364-66 (*May 12, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2025 c6]

Bill 52 — Energy and Utilities Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Neudorf)

First Reading — 2859 (*Apr. 10, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3016-22 (*Apr. 28, 2025 eve.*), 3100-03 (*Apr. 30, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3214-19 (*May 6, 2025 aft.*), 3229-31 (*May 6, 2025 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 3316-19 (*May 8, 2025 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2025 c8]

Bill 53 — Compassionate Intervention Act (Williams)

First Reading — 2910 (*Apr. 15, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3055-61 (*Apr. 29, 2025 eve.*), 3141-43 (*May 1, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3210-14 (*May 6, 2025 aft.*), 3279-80 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 3419-23 (*May 13, 2025 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2025 cC-21.5]

Bill 54* — Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (Amery)

First Reading — 3037 (*Apr. 29, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3235-40 (*May 6, 2025 eve.*), 3291-96 (*May 7, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3408-13 (*May 13, 2025 aft.*), 3491-98 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed on division, amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 3500-01 (*May 14, 2025 eve.*), 3504-11 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation except s9 which comes into force May 15, 2025; SA 2025 c7]

Bill 55* — Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025 (LaGrange)

First Reading — 3134 (*May 1, 2025 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3240-48 (*May 6, 2025 eve.*), 3296-3301 (*May 7, 2025 eve.*), 3348-55 (*May 12, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 3402-08 (*May 13, 2025 aft.*), 3484-90 (*May 14, 2025 aft.*), 3498-99 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed on division, amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 3501-02 (*May 14, 2025 eve.*), 3511-17 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation with exceptions; SA 2025 c10]

Bill 201 — Alberta Health Care Insurance (Access Fees) Amendment Act, 2023 (Brar)

First Reading — 90 (*Nov. 2, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 114-25 (*Nov. 6, 2023 aft.*), 234-37 (*Nov. 20, 2023 aft., reasoned amendment agreed to on division; not proceeded with*)

Bill 202 — Education (Class Size and Composition) Amendment Act, 2023 (Chapman)

First Reading — 209 (*Nov. 9, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 237-46 (*Nov. 20, 2023 aft.*), 358-64 (*Nov. 27, 2023 aft., defeated on division; not proceeded with*)

Bill 203 — Foreign Credential Advisory Committee Act (Dyck)

First Reading — 111 (*Nov. 6, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 364-70 (*Nov. 27, 2023 aft.*), 479-86 (*Dec. 4, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 730-43 (*Mar. 18, 2024 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 805-12 (*Mar. 25, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 28, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on June 28, 2024; SA 2024 cF-16.5]

Bill 204 — Municipal Government (National Urban Parks) Amendment Act, 2023 (Lunty)

First Reading — 332 (*Nov. 23, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 486-92 (*Dec. 4, 2023 aft.*), 649-58 (*Mar. 11, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Committee of the Whole — 812-17 (*Mar. 25, 2024 aft.*), 938-48 (*Apr. 8, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Third Reading — 1059-66 (*Apr. 15, 2024 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*May 16, 2024 aft.*) [Comes into force May 16, 2024; SA 2024 c5]

Bill 205 — Housing Statutes (Housing Security) Amendment Act, 2023 (Irwin)

First Reading — 510 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 658-62 (*Mar. 11, 2024 aft.*), 948-50 (*Apr. 8, 2024 aft.*), 1066-71 (*Apr. 15, 2024 aft.*), 1178-81 (*Apr. 22, 2024 aft., defeated on division; not proceeded with*)

Bill 206* — Child and Youth Advocate (Parent and Guardian Liaison) Amendment Act, 2024 (Cyr)

First Reading — 917-18 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1181-90 (*Apr. 22, 2024 aft.*), 1294-1300 (*May 6, 2024 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 2491-92 (*Mar. 10, 2025 aft.*), 2557-70 (*Mar. 17, 2025 aft., passed on division; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 2632-39 (*Mar. 24, 2025 aft., passed on division*)

Royal Assent — (*Mar. 27, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on proclamation; SA 2025 c3]

Bill 207 — Skilled Trades and Apprenticeship Education (Valuing Skilled Workers) Amendment Act, 2024 (Hoyle)

First Reading — 1152-53 (*Apr. 18, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1300-09 (*May 6, 2024 aft.*), 1417-20 (*May 13, 2024 aft., defeated on division; not proceeded with*)

Bill 208 — Psycho-Educational Assessment Access Act (Hayter)

First Reading — 1359 (*May 8, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 1420-29 (*May 13, 2024 aft.*), 2764-70 (*Apr. 7, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 209 — Reconciliation Implementation Act (Arcand-Paul)

First Reading — 1868-69 (*Nov. 4, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2770-76 (*Apr. 7, 2025 aft.*), 2883-90 (*Apr. 14, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 210 — Employment Standards (Protecting Workers' Tips) Amendment Act, 2024 (Gray)

First Reading — 2350 (*Dec. 4, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 2890-93 (*Apr. 14, 2025 aft., adjourned*), 2995-3006 (*Apr. 28, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 211 — Arts and Creative Economy Advisory Council Act (Ceci)

First Reading — 1590 (*May 23, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3006-07 (*Apr. 28, 2025 aft.*), 3159-68 (*May 5, 2025 aft., defeated on division*)

Bill 212 — Organ and Tissue Donor Information Agreement Act (Metz)

First Reading — 1663 (*May 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Second Reading — 3339-40 (*May 12, 2025 aft., defeated*)

Bill 213 — Cancer Care Delivery Standards Act (Goehring)

First Reading — 2298 (*Dec. 3, 2024 aft., passed*)

Bill 214 — Eastern Slopes Protection Act (Miyashiro)

First Reading — 1729 (*May 29, 2024 aft., passed*)

Bill 215 — Prohibiting Ownership of Agricultural Lands (Pension Plans and Trust Corporations) Act (van Dijken)

First Reading — 2221 (*Nov. 28, 2024 aft., passed*)

Bill Pr1 — St. Joseph's College Amendment Act, 2023 (Sigurdson, L)

First Reading — 289 (*Nov. 22, 2023 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*), 421 (*Nov. 29, 2023 aft., reported to Assembly; proceeded with*)

Second Reading — 455 (*Nov. 30, 2023 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 515 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., passed*)

Third Reading — 530 (*Dec. 5, 2023 aft., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*Dec. 7, 2023 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on December 7, 2023; SA 2023 c14]

Bill Pr2* — Community Foundation of Medicine Hat and Southeastern Alberta Amendment Act, 2024 (Justin Wright)

First Reading — 918 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*)

Second Reading — 1633 (*May 27, 2024 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1691 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed; amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 1711 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 30, 2024; SA 2024 c21]

Bill Pr3 — Providence Renewal Centre Amendment Act, 2024 (Calahoo Stonehouse)

First Reading — 918 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*)

Second Reading — 1633 (*May 27, 2024 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1691 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1711 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 30, 2024; SA 2024 c22]

Bill Pr4 — Rosebud School of the Arts Amendment Act, 2024 (Petrovic)

First Reading — 918 (*Mar. 28, 2024 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*)

Second Reading — 1633-34 (*May 27, 2024 eve., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 1691 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 1711-12 (*May 28, 2024 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent — (*May 30, 2024 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force on May 30, 2024; SA 2024 c23]

Bill Pr5 — Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act (Miyashiro)

First Reading — 2741 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*)

Second Reading — 3471-72 (*May 14, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3499 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed*)

Third Reading — 3518 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent —(*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 15, 2025]

Bill Pr6* — Burman University Amendment Act, 2025 (Johnson)

First Reading — 2741 (*Mar. 27, 2025 aft., passed; referred to the Standing Committee on Private Bills*)

Second Reading — 3472 (*May 14, 2025 aft., passed*)

Committee of the Whole — 3499-500 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed, amendments agreed to*)

Third Reading — 3518 (*May 14, 2025 eve., passed*)

Royal Assent —(*May 15, 2025 outside of House sitting*) [Comes into force May 15, 2025]

Table of Contents

Government Bills and Orders

Committee of the Whole

Bill 54 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025.....	3491
Division	3492
Division	3498
Bill 55 Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025	3498
Division	3499

Third Reading

Bill 54 Election Statutes Amendment Act, 2025.....	3500, 3504
Division	3510
Bill 55 Health Statutes Amendment Act, 2025	3501, 3511
Division	3501
Division	3517

Private Bills

Committee of the Whole

Bill Pr. 5 Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act.....	3499
Bill Pr. 6 Burman University Amendment Act, 2025.....	3499

Third Reading

Bill Pr. 5 Community Foundation of Lethbridge and Southwestern Alberta Act.....	3518
Bill Pr. 6 Burman University Amendment Act, 2025.....	3518

Government Motions

Time Allocation on Bill 54.....	3502
Division	3502
Time Allocation on Bill 55.....	3503
Division	3504

Statement by the Speaker

Remarks at the End of the Spring Sitting	3518
--	------

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