

[Ms Graham in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, colleagues. I'll now call this meeting of the Standing Committee on Private Bills to order. Today is our meeting to deliberate on the various bills that we've had hearings on. All five of them we will hope to deal with today.

In your materials you have the proposed agenda for today, and I would ask, subject to any changes that need to be made, for a motion to approve that agenda.

MR. STRANG: So moved, Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: All opposed, please say no. The motion is carried.

The next item on the agenda, then, is the adoption of the minutes from our last meeting of April 4, 2000. All right. Mr. Thurber moves the adoption of the minutes as circulated. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: All opposed, please say no. That motion is carried.

That then takes us to the business of the day, unless there are any matters that members need to raise at this time. What I would be proposing to do today is to deal with each private bill individually, to just summarize quickly the purpose of the bill and the evidence that we heard in support of it. I would also be asking then for a motion to either see the private bill proceed in the Assembly, proceed in the Assembly with amendments, or not proceed, which of course are the three main options that this committee has in making a decision with respect to a private bill.

I wanted to also mention to you that if we are able to complete our work today, then I will be reporting on the decisions of the committee today in the Legislature, and then I anticipate that these bills will be moved for second reading at 4:30 this afternoon.

If we might, then, we'll deal with Bill Pr. 1, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the Province of Alberta Repeal Act, which is sponsored by Mr. Coutts. As you will recall, the petitioner in this matter is the Grand Lodge of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the Dominion of Canada, and the petitioner is requesting the repeal of the 1913 Alberta private act which created a provincial entity, which we heard has remained inactive from the date of royal assent back in 1913.

As you will recall, the evidence we heard was that there was a similar federal act which was given royal assent some two months after the provincial act was assented to. Since then, all provincial lodges in Alberta have been chartered by the federal body under the federal legislation such that there's never been any business conducted by the provincial entity – no contracts entered into, basically no functions performed – and therefore no parties have been affected in any way. This legislation has been on the books since 1913, and nothing has been done to remove it, so in an effort to eliminate any confusion that could arise from the continuation of this provincial private act on the books, the petitioner has sought its removal and repeal.

That being the case, Mr. Coutts, you'd like to make a motion?

MR. COUTTS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Yeah, I'd like to move that Bill Pr. 1, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the Province of Alberta Repeal Act, proceed as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Is there any discussion relative to this motion? Okay. All in favour of the motion as made by Mr. Coutts, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed? That motion is carried. Thank you.

All right. Moving on, then, to Bill Pr. 2, William Roper Hull Child and Family Services Amendment Act, 2000. As you will recall, William Roper Hull Child and Family Services is petitioning the Assembly for amendments to its incorporating statute, the William Roper Hull Child and Family Services Act, which was I think passed in 1953 and has been amended several times since. The amendments are three, and the first one is a request to change the name from William Roper Hull Child and Family Services to Hull Child and Family Services for the purposes of simplicity and identification in the community.

The second amendment is a request to extend the mandate of this treatment facility, which is a treatment facility attending to the needs of children under the age of 18 with severe behavioral and emotional difficulties. What is being sought is an extension of the mandate to include the treatment of adults, and the target group here are those adolescents who have been in treatment with the facility who reach the age of majority and still require continuing support, although not of the same degree. As we were told, there are approximately 20 individuals over the age of 18 who are receiving services from Hull Home at this time. This has gone on for some period of time under either the PDD program or the AISH program, so this request is to confirm a practice that has been going on for some period of time and seemingly with positive results.

The third request for an amendment is a provision to allow the trustee, in this case Royal Trust, to appoint a representative to the board. That is, I believe the manager of Royal Trust is the designated representative, and this is to allow a designate of the manager to be appointed to the board.

Since we had the hearing in this matter and received oral evidence, there have been four additional pieces of documentation provided to us, which you have for your review. The first is a letter from the executive director, Mr. George Ghitan, of Hull Child and Family Services giving further particulars about the work of the treatment facility and the numbers of children and families receiving treatment at that facility. I think that was in response to Mr. Pham's questions. As you can see, the treatment facility serves approximately 500 children and families at any point in time and, as indicated, over 1,000 children and families in any given year. There are more details on the group of adults that would be assisted by the second amendment, those that reach the age of 18 years chronologically but are still functioning emotionally and behaviorally at a lower level.

9:14

We also have the letter from Mr. Ron LaJeunesse, executive director of the Canadian Mental Health Association, dated April 13, 2000, providing support for the amendments sought. A similar letter from Ms Lynne Duncan, Deputy Minister, Alberta Health and Wellness, again indicates support but also raises the question that was raised by Mr. Renner as to why Hull Home has not seen fit to proceed by way of incorporation as a society rather than seeking amendments to its private bill. Then lastly is a letter of April 14 from the Deputy Minister of Human Resources and Employment,

Shelley Ewart-Johnson. I would point out to you that in this letter the deputy minister points out that

it is important to ensure that government approval for Hull Home to have adult residents does not imply that government funding for these residents is automatically forthcoming

and has recommended that

funding matters be fully clarified before Hull Home is permitted to accept adult clients.

I would just bring to your attention the point that I already made, that there was a fair amount of evidence in the hearing that the adults being treated were those being funded under PDD or AISH.

Unless Parliamentary Counsel has anything else to add, I would entertain, then, a motion on this.

Mr. Pham.

MR. PHAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to move that

Bill Pr. 2, William Roper Hull Child and Family Services Amendment Act, 2000, proceed as originally presented in the House.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you for that.

Is there any discussion? That being the case, all those in favour of the said motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried. Thank you.

We'll move on, then, to Bill Pr. 3, Westcastle Development Authority Repeal Act, sponsored by Mr. Coutts. You will recall that the petitioners in this case are the town of Pincher Creek and the MD of Pincher Creek No. 9, and the purpose of the bill is to repeal the act in question that was incorporated to own and operate the Westcastle ski hill. But circumstances have now changed, and all of the assets of that authority have been transferred to a new private company, which was formed to own and operate the Westcastle ski hill, and there's no further requirement for the Westcastle Development Authority. Therefore, the petitioners are asking that the authority be dissolved and the act repealed.

In support of the request, we have and you have the minutes of January 20, 2000, of the Westcastle Development Authority requesting that it be dissolved. We have the letter of April 5, 2000, from the Department of Municipal Affairs, which states that it has no objection to this dissolution. We have the Order in Council 591 of '97 authorizing the minister of environmental protection to sell the public lands which were held by the Westcastle Development Authority.

Mr. Coutts.

MR. COUTTS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'd like to move that Bill Pr. 3, the Westcastle Development Authority Repeal Act, proceed as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Mr. Coutts.

Mrs. Burgener.

MRS. BURGNER: I will abstain from voting, Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that. As before, I believe you are going to leave the Chamber; are you? Just momentarily.

Mrs. Sloan.

MRS. SLOAN: Yes. Madam Chairman, I have a question. One of the questions that I have – and this information was not brought

forward – is whether or not there are any legal claims that are currently unsettled against the Westcastle Development Authority or any type of appeals or proceedings of any legal nature that are outstanding and not settled.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. I'll just have to review the transcript on this. Was that a question that you asked during the hearing?

MRS. SLOAN: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's something that you are just wondering about today? Okay. Let us just take a moment then.

MR. TANNAS: Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Tannas.

MR. TANNAS: I wonder if we would look at the minutes of the council meeting of January 10, 2000, where presumably Councillor Bourque has said "that Council agree to proceed to petition to repeal," et cetera, "and to set aside \$2,600, which is half of the cost to cover contingency fees and filing fee." That isn't absolute proof, but would you not presume from that that you've got a municipal body that says that that would be their half of outstanding fees or claims?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tannas, what are you referring to?

MR. TANNAS: This is the one provided by Mr. Evans, QC, and it's a council meeting of January 10. It says: page 3. It starts at the top with Green and then Bourque, and Bourque is the one I was referring to. This would be presumably the town because it refers to the other half of the costs to be paid by the MD. That's oblique.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Thank you for that, Mr. Tannas. Parliamentary Counsel, any comments?

MS DEAN: Just in response to Mrs. Sloan's question, I don't believe that question was put to the petitioner at the hearing on March 21. However, I would like to point out for the record that this petitioner did comply with the advertising requirements, which mandates that notice of this particular petition for a private bill be given in a daily newspaper and also in the *Alberta Gazette*. Our office is listed as a point of notification if anybody has any comments, concerns, or objections to the private bill, and we have not received any.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Just before I take Mr. Pham's question, to Mrs. Sloan again. I'd just like to remind members that both the Department of Environment and the Department of Municipal Affairs did review this private bill request and did respond indicating that there were no concerns on behalf of either department. As you will recall, all of the assets of the authority are now held by a new corporation that is operating.

Probably more importantly and in addition to what Mr. Tannas has already pointed out, I would direct members to the minutes of the meeting of January 20, 2000, of the Westcastle Development Authority, which you have. At the bottom of page 1 – and this is the minute that I referred to that actually called for the dissolution of the development authority. It did provide for in the minutes that outstanding bills to be paid are: to Meyers, Norris and Penny . . . which I know is an accounting firm, for their financial statement and to the MD of Pincher Creek [for a] WDA plaque and expenses associated with the opening of the day lodge at Castle Mountain Resort.
Mr. Pham.

9:24

MR. PHAM: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Just a point of clarification. In my opinion, I think that even if we repeal this act today, that should not have a direct impact on any legal proceedings that are already in progress. If that is the case, then I think that the point raised by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Riverview is a moot point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pham. I'll ask Parliamentary Counsel to comment on that later.

MRS. SLOAN: My question really was more in relation to appeals or processes, claims that might be more appropriately found under the departments of Justice and Alberta Labour than Environment and Municipal Affairs. Neither of those departments has commented on this application. I am assuming that the municipal district of Pincher Creek would be in a position legally where they would have to incur any outstanding appeals or legal claims, but that is not something that the bill expressly speaks about.

I also need to note for the record that I did not receive the January 10 minutes from Westcastle Development Authority. I do have a copy of the January 20 minutes, which you speak of, Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those are the ones.

MRS. SLOAN: Mr. Tannas spoke about the January 10 minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that in fact the council of the MD?

MR. TANNAS: No. It's the town. It refers to the MD.

THE CHAIRMAN: Have you checked, Mrs. Sloan, under tab 3?

MRS. SLOAN: Yes, I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we'll ensure that you get another copy.

MRS. SLOAN: Mr. MacDonald does not have this either.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, Mrs. Sloan, the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Department of Environment did comment on this, as I've already indicated. There is no requirement that the Department of Justice be notified of every lawsuit or every appeal. I mean, they could certainly determine that.

I'm going to ask Parliamentary Counsel to comment on Mr. Pham's remarks and on Mrs. Sloan's remarks. Subject to that, it would be my suggestion that perhaps we defer this matter and get the information confirmatory one way or the other, because I think it's important enough that we do that.

MS DEAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. The question, as I understand it, Mr. Pham, was whether the liabilities associated with any existing lawsuits would carry forward to some other entity subsequent to the repeal of this act. I think that you raise a good question. Certainly what I can do is explore that further. There are certain issues that I would have to research on that matter. I'm a little caught off guard by the question at this point, but I will undertake to provide an opinion to the committee on that point. Depending upon the wishes of the committee, I would like to raise this issue further with counsel for the petitioner. Again, it depends upon how the committee wishes to pursue this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jacques.

MR. JACQUES: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I've been listening to the dialogue and reflecting on the day that the petitioner was here. As I recall, there was ample opportunity to raise issues with them. There was no hint, no suggestion by any member of this committee or by any of the presentations that there were any untoward issues out there, that somebody was attempting to in any shape or form not make it before this committee. I think the evidence is quite clear.

I respect the member's question, but I would suggest that it's perhaps not relevant to the decision that we have to make today. If the member wishes to pursue that on a one-to-one basis with the petitioner, I would think that's up to her. I think the committee has done its work, and I think we should vote on it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for that, Mr. Jacques, and I know that Mr. Coutts wants to say something more.

You know, I guess we're not all perfect, and I think it is a legitimate question. It would have been better if the question could have been put during the actual hearing, but there still is an opportunity to deal with it. I think Mrs. Sloan has raised enough of an issue that it really does bear looking into, and I'm sure we can get it clarified. I'm sure everything will be fine.

My guess is that the opinion will be that once the authority is dissolved by repeal of the act, there's no body which a claimant can come after unless the new purchaser has assumed responsibility for outstanding claims, which we may find to be the case as well. Right now we'd just be speculating, so I think in fairness it's probably wiser that we defer this matter, subject to Mr. Coutts, who may persuade us otherwise.

MR. COUTTS: Well, thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm just looking at the declaration of the counsel for the petitioner, being Mr. Evans, acting on behalf of the municipality of Pincher Creek and the town of Pincher Creek. In his testament he mentioned – and it's recorded on page 10 of the Private Bills *Hansard* account. I'll read it for the record again.

The process has now evolved where the WDA, Westcastle Development Authority, no longer has any assets. An agreement was worked out between the town and the municipal district of Pincher Creek and the Westcastle Development Authority after the last sale of lands to Castle Mountain Resort Inc. whereby the assets were transferred to the town and the municipal district.

It goes on to say that "the purpose for the act in the operation of the ski hill no longer exists." That certainly did deal with the assets.

I would remind everyone that this private company, Castle Mountain Resorts Inc., as pointed out in the testament, has been operating the ski hill since 1996, and any liabilities that would have come would have been either put into the agreement or left out of the agreement between Westcastle Development Authority and the new owners. That leaves a three- or four-year span here, whichever way you wish to look at it, to look after any liabilities. I'm very confident that the municipal district of Pincher Creek and the municipality of Pincher Creek would not have brought this forward had there been any liabilities. Therefore, I believe that this should go forward as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, thanks, Mr. Coutts. I'm sure what you say will be ultimately borne out. I think that, in fairness, we would be having to make some assumptions where we really don't have the evidence to make the assumption. We don't have a copy of the agreement between the development authority and the new operator, Castle Mountain. I'm sure that what you say is most likely going to be contained in the agreement, but we don't have it, so we'd be making quite a leap there to make the assumption. I'm sure everything will be fine, but I don't really think we have the evidence before us today.

Mr. McFarland, you wanted to speak; did you? Okay.
Mrs. Sloan.

9:34

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm not wishing to prolong the proceedings this morning. I would be most satisfied if clarification were brought to the committee, if the mover of the motion is willing to withdraw his motion, or I'm prepared to amend it to say that we postpone the motion definitely until we've received clarification relative to this matter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, I'll entertain that in a moment, after Mr. Pham.

MR. PHAM: Just in terms of the process. We have heard arguments from both sides, one to proceed and one to delay and wait for more information. I think that just to complete the process, we should have a vote on Mr. Coutts' motion. If that motion is defeated, then someone else can raise another motion to seek more information. I think that's the way to do it. We cannot have two motions on the table at the same time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that, Mr. Pham.

Unless there are any other comments to be made, then I am going to put the question to you as moved by Mr. Coutts.

MRS. SLOAN: Madam Chairman, may I seek clarification? If the motion then passes, I am concluding that we would not have clarification of this question that I've raised.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's correct.

MRS. SLOAN: So can we actually convince ourselves that we've fulfilled our legislative responsibility in this committee to overlook or dismiss the resolution of potential legal or labour board proceedings?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that is the question. That is the question that all members on this committee, when they vote, will have to ask themselves.

MRS. SLOAN: Well, I would respectfully, then, move an amendment
to postpone the motion to approve definitely until information has been received to clarify the concerns that I have raised.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will entertain that motion after we've voted on Mr. Coutts' motion. I think all members are aware of the point that you raise. I think it's legitimate. Speaking for myself as chairman, I think it is preferable that we defer the matter and get the evidence, which I'm sure is readily available, to satisfy your question, but I will put the question to the committee members now.

MR. MARZ: Just a clarification, Madam Chairman. Are we voting on the amendment to the motion or on the motion and then the amendment?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm going to put the question to you based on the motion made by Mr. Coutts, which was to have the bill proceed as presented in the Assembly. Depending on the result of that, there may or may not be a need for Mrs. Sloan's motion.

MR. MARZ: I stand to be corrected, but I thought the proper procedure is that if a motion is made, you vote on the motion. If an amendment to a motion is made before it's voted on, you vote on the

amendment first, and then you would vote on the motion as amended or not amended.

MR. PHAM: Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Pham.

MR. PHAM: On this point. I think we cannot have an amendment that would have the opposite effect of the motion. Otherwise, you can raise an amendment, and Mr. Coutts can raise an amendment to an amendment. It would keep on forever. I think the simplest way is to vote on the motion presented by Mr. Coutts. If the motion is defeated, then we can entertain another motion from Mrs. Sloan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Precisely.

Mr. Coutts, you wanted to speak again, and then I'm going to have Parliamentary Counsel just comment.

MR. COUTTS: Maybe, Madam Chairman, what we can do here this morning that would make this very simple is if I would withdraw my motion. I'm not sure about the process for that, whether or not the amendment should be withdrawn at the same time or before or after. I would be prepared to make a new motion that
we hold over Bill Pr. 3, Westcastle Development Authority Repeal Act, until clarification of the liabilities is before this committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. That sounds like a reasonable solution to our dilemma here today. Are committee members, then, in favour of Mr. Coutts' request to withdraw his motion, which was to see Bill Pr. 3 proceed as presented? All those in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Against, please say no. All right. That request, then, Mr. Coutts, is adopted.

You've now moved that
consideration of Bill Pr. 3 be deferred until information is received relative to the liabilities of the Westcastle Development Authority.

MR. COUTTS: Madam Chairman, just one more clarification on that. I assume that Parliamentary Counsel will be looking after that letter and the appropriate verbiage that will be needed to satisfy the members of the committee.

MS DEAN: What I would propose to do is forward some correspondence to the counsel for the petitioner requesting some sort of statutory declaration confirming that there are no outstanding liabilities with respect to the Westcastle Development Authority. That's merely a suggestion, unless committee members have other direction for me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then on the matter of Mr. Coutts' replacement motion.

MRS. SLOAN: I'm voting in support of Mr. Coutts' motion, but I'm wondering if Parliamentary Counsel could also inquire with respect to labour board proceedings, arbitrations. So it would be really an inquiry to the petitioner's legal counsel as to whether there are any liabilities or any labour disputes unresolved with the Westcastle Development Authority.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have a motion on the floor to look into the liabilities. That's a very broad category and I think would include what you're speaking of, Mrs. Sloan.

MR. JACQUES: Well, I'm a little surprised at the question the hon.

member raised, because I think if it's an issue of liability, then quite clearly I believe that Parliamentary Counsel would be particularly contacting the petitioner, and the petitioner would be making a statutory declaration, I assume, with regard to the best information they have. This is not an issue involving going to other ministries or departments, et cetera. They are providing a statutory declaration to this committee via Parliamentary Counsel, as I would understand it, which would effectively say either yes, we have these contingent issues or no, we don't have any, we haven't identified any, and we're not aware of any.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I expect that is the procedure that will be followed, and that will be the best evidence we're going to be able to get.

So then returning to Mr. Coutts' motion. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried. Thank you, everyone.

We'll move now to Bill Pr. 4, Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Amendment Act, 2000. Colleagues, you will recall that the Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority is requesting amendments to its incorporating private act, which is the Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority Act. The purpose of the amendment act is to allow for the merger of the responsibilities of the Heritage Advisory Board, which is a committee of the council of the city of Calgary together with the Calgary Municipal Heritage Properties Authority.

9:44

There are five specific requested amendments. The first one is to permit a change in name to the Calgary heritage authority for the new body; secondly, to expand the powers of the new authority, which would incorporate the current responsibilities of the Heritage Advisory Board together with the existing powers of the authority; thirdly, to expand the composition of the authority to include not less than 10 and not more than 12 electors, one of which may be a member of Calgary city council and one of which may be a member of this Assembly. The fourth amendment is to allow for the positions of director of finance and director of land to be removed from the act and allow Calgary city council to appoint advisers to the authority on financial and real property matters. Lastly are housekeeping amendments to reflect the current sections of the Municipal Government Act dealing with disclosure of pecuniary interests that apply to members of the authority; in other words, conflict of interest.

Community Development was requested to review this petition and bill and have responded by letter that they have no concerns.

I would entertain a motion at this time relative to this bill.

MR. STRANG: I'll move on behalf of Bonnie Laing that we proceed with this bill as presented.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Any discussion?

MRS. SLOAN: Madam Chairman, was the letter from Community Development circulated to the committee?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, it was. I believe you will find it under tab 4 with a copy of the bill and other supporting documentation, but if not, the clerk will provide you with a copy.

MRS. SLOAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll allow you an opportunity to review that.

Any other questions or comments?

Mr. Tannas, I have to apologize to you that I neglected to call on you to introduce your guests.

MR. TANNAS: Just moments after I had spoken with you, they left, so there's nothing we can do about it.

THE CHAIRMAN: My apologies.

MR. TANNAS: No, no. There was no delay on your part. They had their moment in the gallery and then were out. That's why I was trying to find them, but I'm supposed to meet them in 13 more minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Duly noted.

All right. Mrs. Sloan, you've received the letter from Community Development?

MRS. SLOAN: Yes, I have. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the motion by Mr. Strang, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed, please say no. The motion is carried.

Our final matter is to deal with Bill Pr. 5, the Calgary Foundation Act. As you will recall, this is a bill that if passed will repeal and replace the existing private act under which the Calgary Foundation was incorporated back in 1981 under the Calgary Foundation Act. It also contains a number of provisions which are different from the current legislation under which the foundation is operating, and I will go over those in a general sense for you at this time.

The first is to give broader powers of investment to the foundation and the ability for the foundation to delegate those powers. It also will provide for mandatory indemnification of directors and officers of the foundation. It will give expanded powers for the foundation to deal with gifts when the wishes of the donor are unclear or impossible to carry out. It gives express authorization for the foundation to manage funds on behalf of other charitable organizations. It removes certain procedural matters from the private act to allow for them to be dealt with in the foundation bylaws, and then there are a number of technical amendments to improve clarity and accuracy and to incorporate gender-neutral language.

I think you will recall that when we had the hearing on this matter, we were provided and still have the black-line version of the proposed bill which shows all of the changes to the act. We had an extensive hearing on this matter, and the questions that remained outstanding at the end of the hearing have been addressed by counsel for the petitioner, who is Ruth Spetz of Borden Ladner Gervais, who wrote to Parliamentary Counsel on April 7, 2000, responding to the outstanding issues relative to sections 17(1) and 18(1) of the bill, as well as a phrase used in section 6(3), "ordinary business practice of a foundation."

We've also been provided with the annual report of the foundation.

Mrs. Burgener, did you care to make a motion at this time?

MRS. BURGNER: Madam Chairman, I'm prepared to move that the bill proceed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any discussion?

All in favour of Mrs. Burgener's motion, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed, please say no. That motion is carried.

That completes all of the deliberating that we can do today. We will need to address a new date for the committee to meet to finalize Pr. 3 in virtue of the deferral, and I would be proposing Tuesday, May 2, after we return from the Easter break. Is that agreeable to members, generally?

AN HON. MEMBER: Could we meet at 9:30?

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. There's a desire to meet at 9:30 a.m. rather than 9 o'clock. Is that agreeable?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll meet, then, on Tuesday, May 2, at 9:30 a.m. in this Chamber to deal with Pr. 3.

MR. TANNAS: In the event that you haven't received the information that we requested, then there wouldn't be any point in meeting; would there?

THE CHAIRMAN: That's true, but I think we'll know that in time to address that.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. Good. That's all I was hinting at.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll certainly give you notice if that should happen.

All right. Is there any other business that needs to be discussed?

MR. THURBER: I move that we adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Thurber moves that we adjourn. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed, please say no. The motion is carried.

Thank you, everyone, for your diligence and patience this morning.

[The committee adjourned at 9:52 a.m.]