



**Legislative Assembly
Province of Alberta**

No. 75

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS

First Session

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

Monday, December 2, 2013

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

Members' Statements

Ms Fenske, Hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan-Vegreville, made a statement recognizing December 3, 2013, as the International Day of Persons with Disabilities.

Mrs. Towle, Hon. Member for Innisfail-Sylvan Lake, made a statement regarding the inadequate medical attention senior Violet McDonald received while in the McKenzie Towne Care Centre and the poor state of seniors' care in Alberta.

Mr. Jeneroux, Hon. Member for Edmonton-South West, made a statement regarding the University of Alberta's medical school, the Edmonton Clinic Health Academy, the Kaye Edmonton Clinic, and the value of training and retaining medical students.

Ms Kubinec, Hon. Member for Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock, made a statement regarding the work of the Education Act Regulatory Review Committee and the feedback the committee received.

Ms DeLong, Hon. Member for Calgary-Bow, made a statement regarding the importance of making alternate transportation arrangements to avoid drinking and driving.

Dr. Swann, Hon. Member for Calgary-Mountain View, made a statement regarding recent actions of the Government that may eliminate collective bargaining and the right to strike for Alberta's public servants.

Presenting Petitions

Mrs. Jablonski, Hon. Member for Red Deer-North, presented a petition from 1,148 Albertans urging the Government to take the necessary measures, including the introduction of proposed amendments to existing legislation, to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the pheasant release program, which has been an important part of Alberta's hunting tradition, heritage, and culture for over 65 years.

Mrs. Jablonski, Hon. Member for Red Deer-North, presented a petition from 52 Albertans urging the Government to introduce a Bill which will preserve Albertans' 65-year investment in the pheasant rearing, release and hunting of pheasants program such that it maintains and enhances our hunting culture and heritage through the program's support by the Department of Environment and Sustainable Resource Development; Tourism, Parks and Recreation; Agriculture and Rural Development; and Culture and Community Spirit (for a fair share of province-wide lottery profits).

Introduction of Bills (First Reading)

Notice having been given:

Bill 211 Education (International Language Programs) Amendment Act, 2013 —
Mr. Luan

Tabling Returns and Reports

Hon. Mr. Rodney, Associate Minister of Wellness, pursuant to the Health Professions Act, cH-7, s4(2):

Alberta College of Optometrists, 2012 Annual Report to Government
Sessional Paper 1196/2012-13

Hon. Mr. Griffiths, Minister of Municipal Affairs:

9 recent letters and email messages and an excerpt from the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association newsletter dated November 28, 2013, all expressing support for the proposed Government amendments to Bill 28, Modernizing Regional Governance Act

Sessional Paper 1197/2012-13

Mrs. Jablonski, Hon. Member for Red Deer-North:

Petition from 61 Albertans urging the Government to take the necessary measures, including the introduction of proposed amendments to existing legislation, to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the pheasant release program, which has been an important part of Alberta's hunting tradition, heritage, and culture for over 65 years

Sessional Paper 1198/2012-13

Ms Blakeman, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre:

Email message dated November 21, 2013, from Donette Kingyens of Edmonton to Ms Blakeman, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Centre, expressing opposition to the proposed changes to the Public Service Pension Plan

Sessional Paper 1199/2012-13

Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, requested and received the unanimous consent of the Assembly to waive Standing Order 7(7) in order to complete the Daily Routine.

Mr. Donovan, Hon. Member for Little Bow:

News release dated February 25, 2010, entitled “Enforcement order issued to composting operator,” prepared by the Government of Alberta, relating to comments made by Mr. Donovan during Oral Question Period on December 2, 2013

Sessional Paper 1200/2012-13

Mr. Eggen, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Calder:

Copies of 85 handwritten postcards and notes expressing opposition to post-secondary education funding cuts

Sessional Paper 1201/2012-13

Hon. Mr. Zwozdesky, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly:

Memorandum dated November 29, 2013, from Hon. Mr. Lukaszuk, Deputy Premier and Minister of Enterprise and Advanced Education, to Hon. Mr. Zwozdesky, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, responding to the Speaker’s November 28, 2013, request for additional information concerning the purported question of privilege raised by Ms Notley, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, on behalf of Mr. Mason, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood, on November 27, 2013

Sessional Paper 1202/2012-13

Privilege - Independence of the Members’ Services Committee, a Government-issued Brochure, and Media Briefing on Bills

Honourable Members, I have a somewhat lengthy ruling, and I hope I could have your attention as I go through it. Your Chair has given very serious and careful consideration, and I am now prepared to rule on the purported question of privilege that was raised by the Leader of the New Democrat Opposition on Wednesday, November 27, 2013, which was subsequently argued by the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona that day and can be found on pages 3166 and 3167 of Alberta Hansard. The Members for Airdrie, Edmonton-Centre, and the Deputy Premier also participated in that discussion, and their comments can also be found in Hansard on pages 3167 through 3170 for last Wednesday.

The central issue of the purported point of privilege is this: Did the Government's brochure, titled "The Building Alberta Plan," prejudge the actions of a committee of this Assembly, and was this Assembly also, perhaps, prejudged with respect to presuming passage of certain Bills and whether a news conference on Bills 45 and 46 was also, somehow, disadvantaged by not all Members having seen them before they were offered to others outside the Assembly. The brochure that I referred to was tabled on November 27 by the Honourable Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Clareview and is now a Sessional Paper, number 1181/2012-13.

With respect to the formalities, the Speaker's office did receive notice of the purported question of privilege on Wednesday, November 27 at 11:20 a.m., so the requirements of Standing Order 15(2) were, in fact, met. The November 27 notice of the question of privilege from the Leader of the ND opposition referred to his ability to perform as a member of the Members' Services Committee had been breached: "by actions which have predetermined a decision yet to be made by the committee." The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona clarified and expanded upon the alleged breaches of privilege during her November 27 comments, that I referenced a moment ago. Essentially, there are actually three purported questions of privilege, which the Chair outlined last Thursday, November 28 at page 3208 of Alberta Hansard.

The first is that the brochure prejudged a decision of the Special Standing Committee on Members' Services by referring to the multi-year wage freeze taken by MLAs as that decision has not yet been made and was, in fact, not made until the committee met last Friday, November 29.

The second point is that the brochure prejudged a decision by the Assembly as it referred to public sector employees taking multi-year wage freezes when that was the subject of at least one Bill before the Assembly. The Member for Edmonton-Strathcona was at a disadvantage on that point as Bill 46, the Public Service Salary Restraint Act, had been introduced in the Assembly literally minutes before she rose to speak to the question of privilege. In fact, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona did not have the Bill when she was speaking.

The third purported question of privilege concerns a news conference about Bills 45 and 46 prior to their introduction in the Assembly.

The Chair finds that it appears that the Member raised the question of privilege concerning the Members' Services Committee at the earliest opportunity since that Leader received the brochure in question on Tuesday. The notice did not refer to the news conference on the Bills, which is the subject of another related question of privilege, but given the circumstance, the Chair is satisfied that it was raised when the event occurred and does meet the requirements of Standing Order 15(5). Likewise, the issue about the brochure, assuming that Bill 46 had passed, was raised at the earliest opportunity and was done so under Standing Order 15(5) as well.

The following day your Chair asked the Government some questions concerning the purported question of privilege, which can be found at pages 3208 and 3209 of Alberta Hansard for November 28. The Chair asked when the brochure was produced, who produced it, when and how and to whom it was distributed, and whatever other information might be useful for your Chair to know under the circumstances.

With respect to the news conference on Bills 45 and 46 the Chair asked whether it was a news conference or was it a technical briefing; exactly, what was it? What time did it start? When did it finish? Was there more than one media session or technical briefing? And where was it held?

Earlier today your Chair – moments ago, actually – tabled the November 29, 2013, memo from the Deputy Premier to me, in which was provided answers to these questions. The Chair had asked that any response be received before 4:00 p.m. last Friday, and the Deputy Premier's memo was, in fact, received in my office at 3:27 p.m. on that day.

With respect to the allegation concerning premature disclosure at news conferences, I have this to say. The response from the Deputy Premier clears up the purported question of privilege alleging that there was a news conference concerning Bills 45 and 46 prior to their introduction in the Assembly on November 27. To release details of a Bill or the Bill itself to persons who are not Members once the Bill is on notice on the Order Paper but before it is introduced in the Assembly could be a contempt of the Assembly, as you all likely know. This ground has been covered recently in the Assembly in the context of a purported question of privilege involving the Minister of Transportation and Bill 32. On October 31, 2013, it was found that there was no prima facie case of privilege. Members can find the applicable citations to the relevant authorities at pages 2655 through 2657 of Alberta Hansard for that day. There were some comments in that ruling that will be referred to later.

In his November 29, 2013, memo on the purported questions of privilege, the Deputy Premier indicated that there was to be a technical briefing followed by a news conference on the two Bills in question. He states,

The Bills were introduced at approximately 3:00 p.m. on Wednesday, November 27, 2013. A news release was issued after each Bill was introduced. The Bill 45 news release was issued at 3:09 p.m. and the Bill 46 news release was issued at 3:10 p.m. The technical briefing with the media did not begin until after the Bills were introduced and the Ministers both arrived in the media room.

The Deputy Premier attached the news releases to his memo which I referred to moments ago. In fairness, the Deputy Premier provided similar information in his remarks on the purported question of privilege at page 3170 of Alberta Hansard for November 27, 2013. Accordingly, there was no release of the Bill or any technical briefing provided to persons who were not Members prior to the introduction of those Bills in this Assembly.

For the record, Hansard advises that Bill 45 was read a first time at 3:03 p.m. and Bill 46 at 3:04 p.m. on the day in question. As there was no early release of information, there is no prima facie question of privilege on that point.

With respect to presuming decisions of the Assembly and its committees, I have the following comments to make. The next two purported questions of privilege are not as easily dealt with. The document that precipitated these questions of privilege was the aforementioned brochure called "The Building Alberta Plan." On page 6 of this document the following statement appears: "Public sector employees, including teachers, doctors and government managers, – as well as MLAs – are leading by example with multi-year wage freezes because it's the responsible thing to do for our province." It actually goes on, also, to talk about MLA pay being frozen for one year.

With respect to the timing of the brochure in question, the Deputy Premier was very forthcoming in his November 29, 2013, memo. He indicates that "printing of The Building Alberta Plan started the week of October 7, 2013." Enough copies were printed for every Alberta home. Delivery of that brochure to the public, according to the Deputy Premier, began on November 21, 2013.

Now on the issue of a multi-year pay freeze for Members, there was a motion for consideration by the Members' Services Committee provided to the Speaker's office by the Member for Calgary-Varsity on Monday, November 25, 2013, which was, then, very quickly sent out to all members of the committee that day by my office, along with another notice as requested by the Leader of the ND Opposition. Last Friday, November 29, 2013, the Members' Services Committee agreed to a freeze in salary, or more accurately, not to apply the mechanism for providing increases to Members' salaries until March 31, 2017. Prior to that meeting, the committee had voted at its February 7, 2013, meeting, to suspend the increase in MLA salaries for one year. That is until March 31, 2014. No motion was passed to suspend the increase over a number of years.

There has not been such a motion since the new remuneration rates for Members were put into place following the 2012 general election. As discussed, Bill 46, which imposes a settlement on public service employees should an agreement not be reached, was not introduced in this Assembly until Wednesday, November 27. In his memo the Deputy Premier indicates that the text of the brochure was written in October and that distribution commenced on November 21. Clearly, this was well before there was any motion proposed to the Members' Services Committee for a multi-year freeze, and certainly before any was approved. It may go without saying, but this was also well before there was indication to the Assembly that Bill 46 was forthcoming. In terms of what aspect of the doctrine of parliamentary privilege might apply, the Member for Edmonton-Strathcona provided the definition of contempt from the standard Commonwealth text, Erskine May, 24th edition, at page 251:

Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results, may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent of the offence.

In the October 31, 2013, ruling, which was referenced earlier, your Chair used the definition of contempt, found at page 82 of House of Commons Procedure and Practice, second edition. That reference can be found at page 2656 of Alberta Hansard. The point is that a contempt of the Assembly differs from a breach of privilege since contempts may be affronts to the dignity or authority of the Assembly, which may not fall into a category or specifically defined privileges.

In 1989, for example, Speaker Fraser of the Canadian House of Commons commented on this distinction when he was faced with a similar question to what is now before this Assembly. In the House of Commons case the government of the day advertised on August 26, 1989, that: "Canada's federal sales tax system will change. Please save this notice. It explains the changes and the reasons for them." The tax of the day was to be replaced by the Goods and Services Tax, GST. The legislation to put the GST in place had not, however, yet been passed, which led to a serious question of privilege in the House of Commons.

In his October 10, 1989, ruling on this subject, found at pages 4457 through 4461 of House of Commons Debates, Speaker Fraser stated at page 4459:

In summary, all breaches of privilege are contempts of the House, but not all contempts or necessarily breaches of privilege. A contempt may be an act or an omission. It does not have to actually obstruct or impede the House or a Member. It merely has to have the tendency to produce such results.

In the case before us today it is argued that the ND Opposition Leader was obstructed in performing his duties. I reject that argument largely for the same reasons Speaker Fraser did in 1989. He stated once again at page 4459 of House of Commons Debates:

In order for an obstruction to take place, there would have had to be some action which prevented the House or Members from attending to their duties or which casts such serious reflections on a Member that he or she was not able to fulfill his or her responsibilities. I would submit this is not the case in the present situation.

However, this finding alone does not end the matter. The actions by the government of our day could constitute a contempt if it is found that they offend the dignity and authority of this Assembly.

Members may recall that in the October 31, 2013, ruling in the Alberta Legislative Assembly your Speaker gave the following warning at page 2656 and 2657 of Alberta Hansard.

Furthermore, in my view, any prior advertising about the nature of a bill must be undertaken very, very cautiously, if it is undertaken at all, so as to not create any impression that the contents of the bill are already law when the Assembly has not even seen the bill yet, much less debated it and passed it. In this respect, members may wish to examine the decision of the Ontario Speaker in 1997 when the government of the day advertised a certain bill as if it had already been passed. In this respect, please visit Ontario Hansard of January 22, 1997, at pages 6441 through 6443.

In that Ontario case of January 22, 1997, a prima facie case of contempt was found, and in his ruling then Speaker for the Ontario House, Speaker Stockwell, states with respect to the House of Commons case at page 6442 of Ontario Hansard for January 22, 1997, as follows:

In ruling that there was no case for contempt, Speaker Fraser appears to have accepted the submissions of government ministers that the government had never intended the advertisements in question to be anything more than “informational” and that it had never been the government’s intention to suggest that legislation would not be submitted to Parliament for debate.

For your information, I listened very intently to the submissions made by the Deputy Premier on November 27, and I did not hear the sort of assurances that guided Speaker Fraser in 1989. In finding a prima facie case of contempt in Ontario, Speaker Stockwell said at pages 6442 and 6443 of Ontario Hansard,

It is not enough for yet another Speaker to issue yet another warning or caution in circumstances where the wording and circulation of the pamphlet appear on their face to cross the line. I say in all candour that a reader of that document could be left with an incorrect impression about how parliamentary democracy works in Ontario, an impression that undermines respect for our parliamentary institutions.

Obviously, your Speaker has very serious concerns about the advertising that was undertaken in the Alberta brochure, which is central to the point of privilege before us today. As indicated in my earlier comments, the Alberta Government was warned to not try and presume that the Assembly would pass legislation through some form of their own advertising. As your Speaker I was representing the interests and role of the Assembly in our parliamentary form of democracy. In Alberta and throughout Canada we have a form of responsible government.

As Speaker Kowalski, my predecessor, commented on May 1, 1997, at page 319 of Alberta Hansard for that day,

The principle of the executive being responsible to the Assembly is the cornerstone of responsible government in this country.

In his text *Constitutional Law of Canada*, third edition, by author Peter Hogg, Mr. Hogg goes so far as to say: "Responsible government is probably the most important non-federal characteristic of the Canadian Constitution." In the Province of Alberta the executive is composed of the members of the Executive Council, all of whom have taken and subscribed to the oath for cabinet ministers.

In his 1989 ruling at page 4461 of House of Commons Debates Speaker Fraser of Ontario requested that departments study his ruling carefully, pointing out that "we are a parliamentary democracy, not a so-called executive democracy, nor a so-called administrative democracy."

In your Chair's view the situation is more similar to what occurred in Ontario in 1997 rather than to what occurred in the House of Commons in 1989, as I referenced earlier in these comments, because this Government of Alberta was warned recently, as recently as October 31 of this year, in a previous ruling that I made and within which I advised the Government that it should not advertise in a way that presumes a decision of the Assembly or, by extension, a decision not yet made by one of the Assembly's committees.

It is clear to your Chair that the advertising in the brochure I referenced earlier did presume that a decision had been made by the Members' Services Committee and to which the Assembly has delegated the ability to make decisions about Members' pay and benefits. That decision had not been made, in fact. That decision had not been made until the following Friday. Let me make sure I said that correctly, I am of the opinion that the advertising in the brochure presumed a decision that had not yet been made by Members' Services Committee.

The Chair also finds that the brochure created the impression that legislation was in effect concerning public service salaries when, in fact, the Bills had not been introduced. The advertising does show some disrespect for our legislative process and by extension, perhaps, for the Assembly itself. It should be very clear that in our form of democratic government the Assembly is owed total respect by Executive Council, by all members of Government, by all Members of the House regardless of the capacity in which they serve.

The continued absence of adherence to some of the proprieties of this institution causes your Chair a great deal of grief and anguish, and it also caused us again an enormous number of hours of research delving into case precedent, delving into former rulings, looking at other Assemblies and so on and so on. I would estimate that collectively we spent almost 200 hours over the weekend, a number of us, looking into this and asking Speakers in other jurisdictions and other Parliamentary Counsel and so on for their examples. I would hope that the dignity and authority of this Assembly and of its delegated committees would be given greater respect from this day forward.

Accordingly, your Chair finds that the advertising undertaken by the Government on page 6 of the aforementioned brochure, The Building Alberta Plan, does constitute a prima facie case of privilege. It is a breach of that privilege under Standing Order 15(6), as it is a form of contempt of this Assembly and of one of its committees.

That concludes my ruling on that matter. I would invite anyone from the Government side should they wish to rise and issue a statement of whatever kind, and I will deal with it from there.

Hon. Mr. Lukaszuk, Deputy Premier and Minister of Enterprise and Advanced Education, apologized to the Assembly and the Speaker declared the matter closed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Written Questions

The following Written Questions were accepted:

WQ42. Asked for by Mr. Wilson:

From May 1, 2009, to May 1, 2013, how many individuals were trained to complete Supports Intensity Scale interviews, and what specific training is required in order to qualify them to administer the interview?

WQ43. Asked for by Mr. Wilson:

From May 1, 2012, to May 1, 2013, how many clients did the Persons with Developmental Disabilities program serve, and how many completed the Supports Intensity Scale interview process?

Public Bills and Orders Other Than Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

On the motion that the following Bill be now read a Second time:

Bill 208 Seniors' Advocate Act — Mrs. Towle

A debate followed.

Debate adjourned, Mr. Lemke speaking.

Motions Other Than Government Motions

518. Moved by Ms Calahasen:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the Government to develop and implement a program encouraging Albertans to invest in, and make use of, renewable and alternative energy technologies in the province in order to strengthen Alberta's leadership in energy innovation and greenhouse gas reductions.

A debate followed.

Hon. Mr. Denis, Deputy Government House Leader, requested and received the unanimous consent of the Assembly to reduce the interval between division bells to one minute.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to. With Mrs. Jablonski in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 39

Amery	Fraser	McIver
Bhullar	Goudreau	Olesen
Bilous	Hale	Olson
Brown	Horne	Quadri
Calahasen	Jeneroux	Rodney
Cao	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	Scott
Casey	Kennedy-Glans	Swann
DeLong	Khan	Towle
Denis	Klimchuk	VanderBurg
Donovan	Lemke	Weadick
Drysdale	Leskiw	Webber
Fawcett	Luan	Woo-Paw
Fenske	Lukaszuk	Xiao

Against the motion: 0

Adjournment

The Acting Speaker adjourned the Assembly at 6:02 p.m. until 7:30 p.m.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2013 — 7:30 P.M.

Government Motions

49. Moved by Hon. Mr. Hancock:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 45, Public Sector Services Continuation Act, is resumed, not more than two hours shall be allotted to any further consideration of the Bill in Second Reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the Bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

Pursuant to Standing Order 21(3), Mr. Anderson commented on the time allocation motion.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to. With Mrs. Jablonski in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 35

Amery	Goudreau	Luan
Bhullar	Hancock	Lukaszuk
Brown	Horne	Olesen
Casey	Horner	Olson
Dallas	Hughes	Quadri
DeLong	Jeneroux	Rodney
Denis	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Dorward	Kennedy-Glans	Weadick
Drysdale	Khan	Webber
Fawcett	Klimchuk	Woo-Paw
Fenske	Lemke	Xiao
Fraser	Leskiw	

Against the motion: 12

Anderson	Bilous	Rowe
Anglin	Hehr	Sherman
Barnes	Mason	Swann
Bikman	Notley	Towle

Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

On the motion that the following Bill be now read a Second time:

Bill 46 Public Service Salary Restraint Act — Hon. Mr. Horner

A debate followed.

Hon. Mr. Hancock moved adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to. With Mrs. Jablonski in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 35

Amery	Goudreau	Luan
Bhullar	Hancock	Lukaszuk
Brown	Horne	Olesen
Casey	Horner	Olson
Dallas	Hughes	Quadri
DeLong	Jeneroux	Rodney
Denis	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Dorward	Kennedy-Glans	Weadick
Drysdale	Khan	Webber
Fawcett	Klimchuk	Woo-Paw
Fenske	Lemke	Xiao
Fraser	Leskiw	

Against the motion: 12

Anderson	Eggen	Rowe
Anglin	Hehr	Sherman
Barnes	Mason	Swann
Bilous	Notley	Towle

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

Unanimous consent was not granted.

On the motion that the following Bill be now read a Second time:

Bill 42 Securities Amendment Act, 2013 — Hon. Mr. Horner

Hon. Mr. Horner moved adjournment of the debate, which was agreed to.

Government Motions

52. Moved by Hon. Mr. Hancock:

Be it resolved that when further consideration of Bill 46, Public Service Salary Restraint Act, is resumed, not more than two hours shall be allotted to any further consideration of the Bill in Second Reading, at which time every question necessary for the disposal of the Bill at this stage shall be put forthwith.

Pursuant to Standing Order 21(3), Mr. Anderson commented on the time allocation motion.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to. With Mrs. Jablonski in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 35

Amery	Hancock	Lukaszuk
Bhullar	Horne	Olesen
Brown	Horner	Olson
Casey	Hughes	Quadri
Dallas	Jeneroux	Rodney
DeLong	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Denis	Kennedy-Glans	Weadick
Drysdale	Khan	Webber
Fawcett	Klimchuk	Woo-Paw
Fenske	Lemke	Xiao
Fraser	Leskiw	Young
Goudreau	Luan	

Against the motion: 12

Anderson	Eggen	Rowe
Anglin	Hehr	Sherman
Barnes	Mason	Swann
Bilous	Notley	Towle

Privilege - Time Allocation Motions

Mr. Mason, Hon. Member for Edmonton-Highlands-Norwood, raised a purported question of privilege under Standing Order 15 regarding the use of time allocation motions on two Bills before the Assembly.

The Acting Speaker heard from Mr. Mason, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Hehr, and Hon. Mr. Hancock.

The Acting Speaker ruled that there was no prima facie question of privilege.

Government Bills and Orders

Second Reading

On the motion that the following Bill be now read a Second time:

Bill 45 Public Sector Services Continuation Act — Hon. Mr. Hancock

A debate followed.

Pursuant to Government Motion 49 agreed to on December 2, 2013, and pursuant to Standing Order 21(1), at 11:10 p.m., the question was immediately put on the motion for Second Reading of Bill 45, Public Sector Services Continuation Act, which was agreed to. With Hon. Mr. Zwozdesky in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 36

Amery	Fenske	Leskiw
Barnes	Fraser	Luan
Bhullar	Goudreau	Lukaszuk
Brown	Hancock	Olesen
Casey	Horne	Olson
Dallas	Jablonski	Quadri
DeLong	Jeneroux	Rodney
Denis	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Donovan	Kennedy-Glans	Weadick
Dorward	Khan	Webber
Drysdale	Klimchuk	Woo-Paw
Fawcett	Lemke	Xiao

Against the motion: 8

Anglin	Hehr	Sherman
Bilous	Mason	Towle
Eggen	Notley	

On the motion that the following Bill be now read a Second time:

Bill 46 Public Service Salary Restraint Act — Hon. Mr. Horner

A debate followed.

Pursuant to Government Motion 52 agreed to on December 2, 2013, and pursuant to Standing Order 21(1), at 1:24 a.m., the question was immediately put on the motion for Second Reading of Bill 46, Public Service Salary Restraint Act, which was agreed to. With Hon. Mr. Zwozdesky in the Chair, the names being called for were taken as follows:

For the motion: 30

Amery	Fraser	Luan
Bhullar	Goudreau	Lukaszuk
Brown	Hancock	Olson
Casey	Horne	Quadri
Dallas	Jeneroux	Rodney
DeLong	Johnson (Calgary-Glenmore)	VanderBurg
Denis	Kennedy-Glans	Weadick
Dorward	Khan	Webber
Drysdale	Klimchuk	Woo-Paw
Fawcett	Leskiw	Xiao

Against the motion: 9

Anderson	Bilous	Notley
Anglin	Eggen	Sherman
Barnes	Hehr	Towle

The following Bills were read a Second time and referred to Committee of the Whole:

Bill 45 Public Sector Services Continuation Act — Hon. Mr. Hancock

Bill 46 Public Service Salary Restraint Act — Hon. Mr. Horner

Adjournment

On motion by Hon. Mr. Hancock, Government House Leader, the Assembly adjourned at 1:37 a.m. Tuesday, December 3, 2013, until 1:30 p.m.

Hon. Gene Zwozdesky,
Speaker

Title: Monday, December 2, 2013