



**Legislative Assembly
Province of Alberta**

No. 25

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

First Session

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, December 3, 2012

The Speaker took the Chair at 1:30 p.m.

Members' Statements

Mrs. Jablonski, Hon. Member for Red Deer-North, made a statement regarding the Government's approach to inclusive education.

Ms Fenske, Hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville, made a statement recognizing December 3, 2012, as the International Day of Persons with Disabilities and recognizing recipients of awards from the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Mr. Cao, Hon. Member for Calgary-Fort, made a statement regarding the universal declaration of human rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948.

Mr. Bhardwaj, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Ellerslie, made a statement regarding the Métis Urban Housing Corporation.

Mr. Hehr, Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo, made a statement recognizing December 3, 2012, as the International Day of Persons with Disabilities and regarding personal care standards in long-term and community care facilities.

Notice of Motions

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, gave oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that, pursuant to Standing Order 3(9), the 2012 Fall Sitting of the Assembly shall stand adjourned upon the Government House Leader advising the Assembly that the business for the sitting is concluded.

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, gave oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 7, Election Accountability Amendment Act, 2012, is resumed, not more than two hours shall be allotted to any further consideration of the Bill in Committee of the Whole, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the Bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, gave oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 7, Election Accountability Amendment Act, 2012, is resumed, not more than two hours shall be allotted to any further consideration of the Bill at Third Reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the Bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, gave oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing, may meet at the call of the Committee Chair to review the Standing Orders and report any proposed or recommended changes to the Assembly.

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Horner, President of Treasury Board and Minister of Finance, gave oral notice of the following motion:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly concur with the continuation of the Alberta Treasury Branches Act.

Tabling Returns and Reports

Mr. Jeneroux, Hon. Member for Edmonton-South West:

Report entitled "APCCP Ipsos Reid Survey Results - March 2012, Support for a Wellness Foundation in Alberta," prepared by the Alberta Policy Coalition for Chronic Disease Prevention

Sessional Paper 375/2012

Hon. Mr. Denis, Minister of Justice and Solicitor General:

Reprints of five newspaper articles from 2000 and 2003 written by Danielle Smith relating to comments made by Hon. Mr. Denis, Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, during Oral Question Period on November 29, 2012
Sessional Paper 376/2012

Mr. Hehr, Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo:

Report dated March 1, 2011, entitled “Addressing the needs of Albertans with disabilities in home, supporting and long-term care living settings,” prepared by the Alberta Disabilities Forum
Sessional Paper 377/2012

3 recent email messages from Calgary residents expressing concern regarding the number of showers patients receive in care facilities
Sessional Paper 378/2012

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills:

News release dated November 10, 2011, entitled “Keystone delay costs Alberta treasury billions,” prepared by Alberta’s Wildrose Caucus
Sessional Paper 379/2012

Business Insider article dated December 1, 2012, entitled “Analyst Makes Bombshell Prediction of \$50 Oil, and More Production Than We Could Possibly Know What To Do With”
Sessional Paper 380/2012

Tablings to the Clerk

Clerk of the Assembly on behalf of Hon. Mr. Denis, Minister of Justice and Solicitor General:

Page 53 of the Law Society of Alberta Code of Conduct
Sessional Paper 381/2012

Privilege - Premier’s Responses During Oral Question Period

The Chair is prepared to rule on the purported question of privilege raised by the Official Opposition House Leader last Thursday, November 29, 2012. The debate on this issue can be found in Hansard for that day at pages 1184 through 1189.

In a proverbial nutshell the allegation by the Member for Airdrie is that the Premier deliberately misled the Assembly when she denied that the decision was made to retain a particular law firm for conducting litigation related to tobacco use while she was Minister of Justice.

In terms of formalities, notice of the purported question of privilege was received in the Speaker's office at 10:54 a.m. on Thursday, November 29, 2012, so the requirements of Standing Order 15(2) regarding notice have been met as the statements were alleged to have been made in the Assembly the day before.

The Chair notes that Standing Order 15(5) permits Members to raise a question of privilege "immediately after the words are uttered or the events occur that give rise to the question, in which case the written notice under suborder (2) is not required," but no one raised any objection on this point and, the Chair imagines that had it been raised, the Official Opposition House Leader would have said he needed time to review Hansard. The Official Opposition House Leader carefully and succinctly cited the relevant authorities on the issue of deliberately misleading the Assembly, including this Speaker's ruling of May 30, 2012, found at page 96 of Hansard for that day.

In making his presentation on the point of privilege before us today, the Official Opposition House Leader indicated that deliberately misleading the Assembly was a form of contempt which, as the Chair pointed out in another ruling last Thursday, at page 1190 of Hansard for that day, is treated as a question of privilege. The point is made in *Erskine May: The Law, Privileges, Proceedings and Usage of Parliament*, 24th edition, at page 254:

The Commons may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt. In 1963 the House resolved that in making a personal statement which contained words which he later admitted not to be true, a former Member had been guilty of a grave contempt.

Before ruling on this purported question of privilege before us today, the Chair wants to remind Members that this application places a Speaker of the House in a difficult situation because the Speaker's usual role is not to determine the merits or veracity of questions or answers in the Assembly. In fact, the Speaker's role in question period is stated at page 510 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, second edition, which states:

The Speaker ensures that replies adhere to the dictates of order, decorum and parliamentary language. The Speaker, however is not responsible for the quality or content of replies to questions.

The Speaker's role in the Assembly is to ensure that Members are allowed to exercise historic, if not their ancient, and constitutionally recognized right to free speech to the greatest extent possible consistent with the rules, the conventions, and the practices of the Assembly. On that point, any Member alleging that another Member is deliberately misleading the Assembly will be swiftly called to order by the Chair and asked to withdraw the comments. In the Chair's view, there have been numerous and far too many instances of this type of exchange occurring in this House this Fall Sitting. The only time that this type of allegation may be permitted is when a Member raises a purported question of privilege that a Member deliberately misled the Assembly, which is one reason why Speakers have continually cautioned Members that these allegations should only rarely be brought, as was indicated in my ruling of May 30, 2012.

To return to the matter raised by the Official Opposition House Leader. His allegation is that the decision was made to retain a law firm for tobacco litigation by the Premier when she was Minister of Justice and that statements to the contrary by the Premier constitute, in his opinion, deliberately misleading the Assembly. The test for such situations both in this Assembly and in the Canadian House of Commons is that articulated by David McGee, the former Clerk of the New Zealand House of Representatives, and stated in his book, *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, third edition, 2005, at pages 653, 654.

This test was recited by the Official Opposition House Leader last Thursday and also by this Speaker on May 30, 2012, but it bears repeating one more time:

There are three elements to be established when it is alleged that a member is in contempt by reason of a statement that the member has made: the statement must, in fact, have been misleading; it must be established that the member making the statement knew at the time the statement was made that it was incorrect; and, in making it, the member must have intended to mislead the House.

The Official Opposition House Leader was clear that, in his view, the decision had been made on awarding a contract to a law firm before the Premier resigned from Cabinet in February 2011, to run for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta.

The Member for Edmonton-Calder was more equivocal on this point and was perhaps more careful in his choice of words as he referred to "a process which ended in a decision being made" at page 1187 of Hansard for last Thursday which was not, with respect, what was alleged by the Official Opposition House Leader. He alleged that the decision had been made.

This is an important distinction, Honourable Members. If the Premier or the Government had denied that a process was underway to select a firm to handle the tobacco litigation prior to February 2011, then different considerations come into play in a forthcoming ruling. However, the allegation that the decision was made by the now-Premier on hiring a law firm to conduct the tobacco litigation was firmly rejected by the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General, by the Government House Leader, and by the now-Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development.

On the three elements of the test the Government House Leader was quite clear and succinct at page 1188 of Hansard where he stated:

There are clear explanations about what the process was. There are clear explanations about the result, how the decision was made. There's no misleading. There's no intent to mislead, so there's no mens rea. There's no actual misleading.

By definition mens rea means guilty mind.

The distinction between the process and the final decision on selecting a law firm was addressed by the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development when he said, at page 1188 of Hansard for last Thursday, the following:

Those are the facts as I know them, and I think that that supports the position of the Premier that there was no final decision. She may have identified a firm that she thought was appropriate, and this firm again, I'm told, was also selected by Nunavut.

In his comments last Thursday, at page 1187 of Hansard, the Minister of Justice and Solicitor General indicated that the then-Minister of Justice, now Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, authorized the contingency agreement with the law firm on June 21, 2011. A Government of Alberta news release which the Chair has discovered, dated May 30, 2012, and entitled "Alberta to launch lawsuit against tobacco manufacturers," indicates that "Alberta has retained Tobacco Recovery Lawyers LLP since June 2011, a consortium of law firms, to file the lawsuit on its behalf."

In this case, much hinges on the interpretation of the "decision to hire a firm." Certainly the Chair admits that this is getting into a case of semantics but it is evident that there was no final decision made as to the selection of a law firm for the tobacco litigation when the Premier was Minister of Justice. Clearly, a process was in place but that was not the basis of the purported question of privilege. Accordingly, the Chair cannot find that the three parts of the test have been made out. The determination of whether the Premier's statements were misleading is entirely subjective and depends greatly on the exact nature of the words used.

The Chair cannot find that the second and third parts of the test have been made out, namely that the Member making the statement knew at the time the statement was made that it was incorrect and that in making it, the Member must have intended to mislead the House. All three Ministers who spoke to the issue vehemently denied that any decision had been made at the time the Official Opposition House Leader alleges.

Certainly, the Premier was unequivocal that she did not make the decision on the matter of retaining a law firm when she responded to questions on November 28, 2012, at pages 1107 through 1109 of Hansard for that day and which statements are at the core of this purported question of privilege.

Members may think that this is a very difficult test to meet, and the Chair would agree. That is precisely why such allegations are hardly ever found to be prima facie questions of privilege. Versions of events and interpretation of those events by Members may and frequently do differ. This difference is a characteristic of parliamentary debate and is one reason why the Chair has referred frequently to paragraph 494 of Beauchesne's, sixth edition, at page 151 which states:

It has been formally ruled by Speakers that statements by Members respecting themselves and particularly within their . . . knowledge must be accepted. It is not unparliamentary temperately to criticize statements made by Members as being contrary to the facts; but no imputation of intentional falsehood is permissible. On rare occasions this may result in the House having to accept two contradictory accounts of the same incident.

The same point is made in House of Commons Procedure and Practice, second edition, at page 510 which states, commencing at line 6, the following:

In most instances, when a point of order or a question of privilege has been raised in regard to a response to an oral question, the Speaker has ruled that the matter is a disagreement among Members over the facts surrounding the issue. As such, these matters are more a question of debate and do not constitute a breach of the rules or of privilege.

For the reasons that the Chair has just spent some considerable time articulating this afternoon, there is no prima facie question of privilege. Accordingly, under Standing Order 15(7), there are no further proceedings on the matter. This matter is now concluded.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Written Questions

The following Written Questions were accepted:

WQ5. Asked for by Ms Smith:

Of the transfers received from the federal government, what is the total amount earmarked for health care for Aboriginal peoples in Alberta, and where and how were these funds spent during the past three fiscal years?

WQ6. Asked for by Ms Smith:

Of the transfers received from the federal government, what, if any, is the total amount earmarked for housing for Aboriginal peoples in Alberta, and where and how were these funds spent during the past three fiscal years?

WQ11. Asked for by Mrs. Forsyth:

Which physicians, psychiatrists, or pharmacists were consulted on Creating Connections: Alberta's Addiction and Mental Health Strategy dated September 2011?

WQ12. Asked for by Mr. Fox:

What are the criteria for determining the location of new registry offices in Alberta and do the communities of Blackfalds, Chestermere, and Redcliff meet these criteria?

WQ13. Asked for by Mr. Pedersen:

What Government of Alberta infrastructure projects are currently scheduled for Medicine Hat, and what are the projected costs and completion dates for each infrastructure project?

The following Written Question was accepted as amended:

WQ4. Moved by Mr. Barnes:

Have all the claims submitted to the 2011 Southern Alberta Disaster Recovery Program and the 2011 Spring South Eastern Alberta Disaster Program in regard to the June 2010 South Saskatchewan river basin flooding been finalized and what is the longest claimants had to wait to receive payment?

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, on behalf of Hon. Mr. Griffiths, Minister of Municipal Affairs, moved that the motion be amended to read:

Have all of the applications to the 2010 Southern Alberta Disaster Recovery Program and the 2010 Spring South Eastern Alberta Disaster Recovery Program been finalized, and how long did it take applicants to receive a first assistance payment once they provided all required information?

A debate followed on the amendment.

The question being put, the amendment was agreed to. With Mr. Rogers in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the amendment: 40

Allen	Goudreau	Luan
Amery	Hancock	McDonald
Bhardwaj	Hehr	Olesen
Bhullar	Horne	Olson
Brown	Horner	Pastoor
Calahasen	Hughes	Quadri
Cao	Jablonski	Quest
Casey	Jansen	Sarich
Denis	Jeneroux	Scott
Dorward	Johnson (Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater)	Swann
Drysdale	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Webber
Fawcett	Kubinec	Woo-Paw
Fraser	Leskiw	Young
Fritz		

Against the amendment: 16

Anglin	Hale	Smith
Barnes	McAllister	Stier
Bikman	Pedersen	Strankman
Donovan	Rowe	Towle
Forsyth	Saskiw	Wilson
Fox		

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, requested the unanimous consent of the Assembly to shorten the interval between division bells to one minute.

The following Written Questions were rejected:

WQ7. Moved by Mrs. Forsyth:

What is the projected annual cost to employ health-care professionals and other staff who will operate individual family care clinics?

A debate followed.

The question being put, the motion was defeated. With Mr. Rogers in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 18

Anglin	Fox	Smith
Barnes	Hale	Stier
Bikman	McAllister	Strankman
Bilous	Pedersen	Swann
Donovan	Rowe	Towle
Forsyth	Saskiw	Wilson

Against the motion: 36

Allen	Fawcett	Leskiw
Amery	Fraser	Luan
Bhardwaj	Fritz	McDonald
Bhullar	Hancock	Olesen
Brown	Horne	Olson
Calahasen	Hughes	Quadri
Cao	Jablonski	Quest
Casey	Jansen	Sarich
Dallas	Jeneroux	Scott
Denis	Johnson (Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater)	VanderBurg
Dorward	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Woo-Paw
Drysdale	Kubinec	Young

WQ8. Moved by Mrs. Forsyth:

What is the forecast for annual expenditures for the next four fiscal years for building or leasing family care clinics?

A debate followed.

The question being put, the motion was defeated. With Mr. Rogers in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 15

Barnes	Hehr	Stier
Bikman	McAllister	Strankman
Bilous	Pedersen	Swann
Forsyth	Rowe	Towle
Hale	Saskiw	Wilson

Against the motion: 38

Allen	Fritz	McDonald
Amery	Goudreau	Olesen
Bhardwaj	Hancock	Olson
Bhullar	Horne	Pastoor
Brown	Hughes	Quadri
Calahasen	Jablonski	Quest
Cao	Jansen	Sarich
Casey	Jeneroux	Scott
Dallas	Johnson (Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater)	Starke
Denis	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Dorward	Kubinec	Woo-Paw
Drysdale	Leskiw	Young
Fawcett	Luan	

Motions Other Than Government Motions

504. Moved by Mr. Hehr:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the Government to implement a policy to eliminate public funding to private schools.

A debate followed.

The question being put, the motion was defeated. With Mr. Rogers in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 3

Bilous	Hehr	Swann
--------	------	-------

Against the motion: 48

Allen	Fritz	Pedersen
Amery	Goudreau	Quadri
Barnes	Hale	Quest
Bhardwaj	Hancock	Rodney
Bhullar	Hughes	Rowe
Bikman	Jansen	Sarich
Brown	Jeneroux	Saskiw
Calahasen	Johnson (Athabasca-Sturgeon-Redwater)	Scott
Cao	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Starke
Casey	Kubinec	Stier
Dallas	Leskiw	Strankman
Denis	Luan	Towle
Dorward	McDonald	VanderBurg
Drysdale	Olesen	Wilson
Fawcett	Olson	Woo-Paw
Fraser	Pastoor	Young

Mr. Quest, Hon. Member for Strathcona-Sherwood Park, requested the unanimous consent of the Assembly to proceed to Public Bills and Orders Other Than Government Bills and Orders to allow consideration of Bill 201, Scrap Metal Dealers and Recyclers Identification Act.

Unanimous consent was not granted.

Adjournment

The Deputy Speaker adjourned the Assembly adjourned at 5:34 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2012 — 7:30 P.M.

Government Bills and Orders

Committee of the Whole

According to Order, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole and the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

(Assembly in Committee)

The following Bill was taken under consideration:

Bill 7 Election Accountability Amendment Act, 2012 — Hon. Mr. Denis

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, moved that the Bill be amended in section 83 in the proposed section 35(1)(a) by striking out “if the registered party, registered constituency association or registered candidate knows or ought to know that the prospective contributor is” and substituting “from”.

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, requested and received the unanimous consent of the Assembly to shorten the interval between division bells for this amendment to one minute.

The question being put, the amendment was defeated. With Mr. Rogers at the Table, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the amendment: 10

Anglin	Hale	Rowe
Barnes	McAllister	Saskiw
Bikman	Pedersen	Stier
Donovan		

Against the amendment: 30

Bhullar	Griffiths	McDonald
Cao	Hancock	Oberle
Casey	Hehr	Olson
Cusanelli	Hughes	Pastoor
Denis	Jansen	Rodney
Dorward	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Sandhu
Drysdale	Klimchuk	Scott
Eggen	Lemke	Starke
Fenske	Leskiw	Webber
Fraser	Luan	Woo-Paw

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, moved that the Bill be amended in section 100 in the proposed section 51.01(2) as follows:

- (a) by striking out “may serve” and substituting “must serve”;
- (b) by adding, “, and make a copy of the notice or letter public within 30 days” after “letter of reprimand”.

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, requested and received the unanimous consent of the Assembly to shorten the interval between division bells for this amendment to one minute.

The question being put, the amendment was defeated. With Mr. Rogers at the Table, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the amendment: 10

Anglin	Hehr	Saskiw
Barnes	Pedersen	Stier
Bikman	Rowe	Strankman
Eggen		

Against the amendment: 29

Bhardwaj	Griffiths	Oberle
Bhullar	Hancock	Olson
Cao	Hughes	Pastoor
Casey	Jansen	Rodney
Cusanelli	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Sandhu
Denis	Klimchuk	Scott
Dorward	Lemke	Starke
Drysdale	Leskiw	Webber
Fenske	Luan	Woo-Paw
Fraser	McDonald	

Mr. Saskiw, Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills, moved that the Bill be amended in section 100 in the proposed section 51.02

- (a) in subsection (1) by striking out “3 years” and substituting “7 years”;
- (b) in subsection (2) by striking out “3 years” and substituting “7 years”.

The question being put, the amendment was defeated. With Mr. Rogers at the Table, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the amendment: 9

Anglin	Donovan	McAllister
Barnes	Eggen	Pedersen
Bikman	Hehr	Saskiw

Against the amendment

Bhardwaj	Fritz	McDonald
Bhullar	Griffiths	Oberle
Cao	Hancock	Pastoor
Casey	Hughes	Rodney
Cusanelli	Jansen	Sandhu
Denis	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Scott
Dorward	Klimchuk	Starke
Drysdale	Lemke	Webber
Fenske	Leskiw	Woo-Paw
Fraser	Luan	

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, requested and received the unanimous consent of the Assembly to shorten the interval between any further division bells to one minute.

Mr. Eggen, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder, on behalf of Ms Notley, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, moved that the Bill be amended in section 100 in the proposed section 51.01(5)(a) by striking out “exceed \$10 000 for each contravention” and substituting “be less than the amount by which the contribution or contributions exceed the prescribed limit”.

The question being put, the amendment was defeated. With Mr. Rogers at the Table, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the amendment: 7

Barnes	Eggen	Pedersen
Bikman	McAllister	Saskiw
Donovan		

Against the amendment: 28

Bhardwaj	Fritz	McDonald
Bhullar	Hancock	Oberle
Cao	Hughes	Pastoor
Casey	Jansen	Rodney
Cusanelli	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Sandhu
Denis	Klimchuk	Scott
Dorward	Lemke	Starke
Drysdale	Leskiw	Webber
Fenske	Luan	Woo-Paw
Fraser		

And after some time spent therein, the Deputy Speaker resumed the Chair.

Progress was reported on the following Bill:

Bill 7 Election Accountability Amendment Act, 2012 — Hon. Mr. Denis

Ms Pastoor, Acting Chair of Committees, tabled copies of all amendments considered by Committee of the Whole on this date for the official records of the Assembly.

Amendment to Bill 7 (A2) (Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills) — Defeated on division

Sessional Paper 382/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A3) (Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre) — Defeated

Sessional Paper 383/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A4) (Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 384/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A5) (Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills) — Defeated on division
Sessional Paper 385/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A6) (Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 386/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A7) (Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 387/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A8) (Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills) — Defeated on division
Sessional Paper 388/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A9) (Hon. Member for Calgary-Buffalo on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 389/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A10) (Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona) — Defeated on division
Sessional Paper 390/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A11) (Hon. Member for Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 391/2012

Amendment to Bill 7 (A12) (Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder on behalf of the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona) — Defeated
Sessional Paper 392/2012

Adjournment

On motion by Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, the Assembly adjourned at 11:13 p.m. until Tuesday, December 4, 2012, at 1:30 p.m.

Hon. Gene Zwozdesky,
Speaker

Title: Monday, December 3, 2012