

9 a.m.

Tuesday, May 8, 2007

[Ms DeLong in the chair]

The Chair: I think we should call to order here. The first order of business, as usual, approval of the agenda. That was moved by Mr. Agnihotri. All in favour? Any opposed? Okay. That passed.

Next, of course, approval of the committee meeting minutes from the last time. Has everybody had a chance to have a look at them? I know that everything arrived rather late yesterday, so I'm hoping people had a chance to look through them. Any discussion on the minutes? Oh, we don't have a mover yet for approval. Mr. Johnson. Okay. So all in favour of approving the minutes as stated? Any opposed? That passed.

Now let's just jump into the work that we have to do here. What we've got to do is decide how to move ahead with both Pr. 1 and Pr. 2. We are tight for time today. Some people have meetings at 9:30 that they've got to go to. Other people have meetings at 10. So we're going to be a little bit tight.

I understand that Dr. Brown has a suggestion.

Dr. Brown: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. As you have pointed out, we did receive some materials yesterday, including some proposed amendments, dated May 8, to Bill Pr. 1, CyberPol – The Global Centre for Securing Cyberspace Act. I spent some time last evening trying to review the materials, but as my fellow members of the committee will appreciate, we are in a busy legislative session.

This proposal, while it certainly has some intriguing aspects to it and I believe has merit, is quite unique in that it deals with some areas of sensitivity, including policing and intelligence gathering. It did come to us in what I would charitably refer to as an incompletely thought-out state in terms of a number of aspects, including the corporate governance of the centre, the responsibilities and liabilities of the directors, the succession of the body corporate, and its constitution.

I believe that we would be doing a disservice to the petitioners of this bill if we proceeded in its present state. I think that we need to give these matters careful deliberation, as I said, because of the sensitivity of the area that we're dealing with. I think that these matters of corporate governance and liabilities and succession and so on are quite sensitive.

What I would propose to the committee is that we defer deliberations on Bill Pr. 1 for a period of several weeks. I'm going to suggest a period of four weeks in order that we can fully digest the consolidated amendments that have been proposed and weigh these in view of what the corporate structures are in other instances in terms of societies and corporations and that we weigh some of the effects that might be felt in terms of liability given the fact that we are in the stated objects of this corporation dealing with intelligence gathering and policing matters.

The Chair: Maybe we should turn to our counsel here. Shannon, do you have any further comments in this area in terms of the materials that we've received?

Ms Dean: I'm at the behest of the committee. If they want me to review the materials, I'm happy to do so. I understand that there's an issue about timing this morning. Certainly, if the committee wants to discuss, I believe Dr. Brown's motion is to defer consideration for four weeks. Presumably we'd have another meeting scheduled for deliberations in four weeks as I understand your motion.

Dr. Brown: Yes.

The Chair: Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would tend to support Dr. Brown's motion except that I'm not sure how much urgency the petitioners have put on this, whether or not, you know, a shorter period, maybe two weeks rather than four weeks might be helpful. But I do support the intent of Dr. Brown's motion in that we as a committee could use the time to do a little bit more review of the matter, and it might also give the petitioners some more time to tidy up what they've put before us, and then, hopefully, we may be able to move forward in some manner. I do agree that the proposal has merit but certainly warrants some more meat to the bone, so to speak.

Mr. Dunford: I want to support Dr. Brown. He has a great deal of educational background, including in law. I, like maybe most of the other members, really haven't had a chance to look at the material, so I'm prepared to certainly defer any decision I would make until I know that Dr. Brown is satisfied one way or another. I think that in politics we have to do this because we can't know everything. I think we have to at times pick out members of the group that we belong to and who we have to believe in and not necessarily follow their lead but give them an opportunity to fully extend their thoughts or investigate the situation thoroughly from their aspect.

As far as the four weeks I don't have anything to say about that other than we should be determining the agenda. I'm well aware after 14 years of doing this that everyone that comes to us wants us to play their agenda. I for one don't feel that we have to do that all of the time. So if Dr. Brown needs four weeks to do his examination, I'm quite happy with that.

Dr. Brown: Well, Madam Chair, if I could just respond to Mr. Roger's suggestion that perhaps a shorter interval might suffice. My reasoning in looking at a longer period such as four weeks would be that if the members of the committee did identify particular areas of concern that remain outstanding, there would still be some opportunity for the petitioner to make some further submissions and perhaps suggest that it would be appropriate to make further amendments to the proposal that they have. If we did it in two weeks, I doubt whether or not we'd have that opportunity to allow them to respond. So that was my reasoning in suggesting that perhaps four weeks would be better than two weeks. I know that we will still be in session in four weeks, so I don't think that there is an undue hardship.

The Chair: May I make the suggestion that, first of all, we vote on whether we want it deferred and after that discuss the length of time that it should be deferred? Okay. So we already have a motion on the floor that it be deferred. Do we have to amend that motion?

9:10

Mr. Loughheed: Yeah. I think the four weeks are in there.

The Chair: Oh, okay. So we need someone to make that amendment. Mr. Loughheed making that amendment to have it deferred. All in favour?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? None opposed. It passes.

Okay. So in terms of the time frame to have this come back to us, any further discussion on whether it should be two weeks or four weeks or some other time frame?

Dr. Brown: Well, Madam Chair, my suggestion was that it be four weeks, and I'm prepared to move to that effect, that we defer deliberations on Bill Pr. 1 for a period of four weeks.

The Chair: Any other discussion?

Mr. Doerksen: I don't object to the four weeks. I think the purpose of the four weeks is to make sure that this is a bill that we can pass. If we're going to defer it and just defeat it, then let's not waste any more time on it. But I think there should be an understanding that we want to clean this bill up for the petitioners to make sure that it is presentable. I want to make sure that that's clear as well.

There were a couple of points that I raised that were not addressed in their amendments. One was the naming of Ian Wilms as chair of the Calgary Police Commission. His representation here clearly came with a different title, representing the chiefs of police, I think, across the country, or the Canadian organization. And Kristen Lawson also. They are the two people identified in the bill. Maybe my understanding is not correct, but I had suggested that they name positions as opposed to individuals, and that wasn't addressed in their amendments. Also, when I read the letters from their supporting people, I didn't really get the sense from the letters that these were blanket endorsements of a certain direction. They were kind of nice letters.

Again, if we're going to do four weeks, let's come back with a bill that we can support. Otherwise, let's not waste any more time.

Dr. Brown: Madam Chair, just in response to Mr. Doerksen's comments. While, as I said, I certainly think that this proposal has merit, I would not want in any way prejudge the deliberations of the committee by saying that by deferring it for four weeks and looking at any inadequacies of it, we are thereby implying that we will endorse the petitioners' bill at the end of the day. I'm not suggesting that. What I am suggesting is that it certainly has merit, but it is quite unique and requires perhaps some further adjustments in order to make it palatable to the committee. Whether or not that is achievable and whether or not we have at the end of the day, in four weeks, a bill that is acceptable to the committee I think is very much a matter for the committee to decide at that time.

Mr. Prins: I would like to support this motion as well to go to four weeks, but I'd like to know what the process is between now and four weeks, if we're actually going to have another meeting, get the proponents back to the meeting and discuss these possible amendments. I would like to know what the process is from now till four weeks from now.

Ms Dean: I would just ask the committee what they're looking for specifically. I mean, the process can be determined by you today. If you're asking for additional submissions with respect to specific issues such as the corporate governance provisions, the liability clauses, this can be done in writing. Or is the committee looking to have the petitioner come back?

Mr. Amery: Madam Chair, first of all, I agree with Dr. Brown that we should wait three weeks, not four, to come back and discuss this bill. However, I'm reviewing the minutes here, and I see that the two departments involved have expressed some concern about the bill: the department of the Attorney General and the department of the Solicitor General. They said that there should be some slight changes made to the bill. Did they come back with any changes or any recommendations yet from the departments of the Solicitor General and the Attorney General?

Ms Dean: With respect to the department of the Solicitor General the specific legislative change they were suggesting was removal of the words "government response" in the objects of the proposed centre, and that's been reflected in the proposed amendments.

They did also circulate late yesterday afternoon some additional comments. They have flagged concerns with respect to the exemption from liability provision, which was alluded to by Dr. Brown. They've also expressed specific wording in the bill that makes it clear that this is not a government agency and that the entity cannot name government employees as governors, or government employees cannot serve as directors.

The Chair: I think that we have determined already that we are going to defer the bill. So the question is: how long should we defer it? Essentially, the feeling that I'm getting is that we need to defer it as long as it takes to get the proper information and get some of this resolved but to move it forward as quickly as possible in terms of our decision-making process.

Mr. Elsalhy.

Mr. Elsalhy: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I agree with the four weeks. Some members in this committee actually received their update last night. I actually saw mine this morning, so I honestly didn't have time to go over it. In terms of what's between now and the four-week period, instead of us asking questions on our own and sending those questions to the petitioners, should we actually give them to Parliamentary Counsel for the committee and then centrally fire them out? Then when we get the answer, all members will have the answer? Is that my understanding?

Ms Dean: Sure, we can have that kind of process in place. I mean, I'll have to set some timelines. For example, I'll just throw this out to you for your consideration.

Mr. Elsalhy: I definitely have concerns.

Ms Dean: One week: for the next week if you have some concerns that you would like addressed by the petitioner in writing . . .

Mr. Elsalhy: I can send them to them through you.

Ms Dean: You can send them to me. I'd like to get it out to the petitioner's counsel as a package.

Mr. Elsalhy: Actually, I'd prefer this because now it offers every member of this committee the chance to actually read what my concerns were, and if Dr. Brown had concerns, then I can view those as well instead of just going one on one and, you know, me sending it to them directly and then them answering me directly. Actually, that's probably preferred. And I agree with the four weeks. This is not a casual or generic piece of legislation.

Ms Dean: I would just ask members of the committee, if we're operating on the four-week timeline, to have their questions to me by Monday.

The Chair: So you're saying one week to get them and then give them three weeks to respond.

Ms Dean: No. I think the concern that's been raised here today is that there are materials that have been provided under the wire here, and the committee needs more time to digest them. You have to appreciate that I do ask that these things be provided about three business days prior so there is sufficient time for distribution, but sometimes that just doesn't occur. But I would ask that they be delivered – the response is one week prior to the deliberation date, so that would give him two weeks.

The Chair: So is the general consensus, then, that it should be four weeks? Well, we've got to do a motion. The motion is on the floor for four weeks.

Oh. We've got more discussion. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Well, thank you, Madam Chairman. A quick comment and then a question through you to the Parliamentary Counsel. It's my hope that the additional time will give us the opportunity for something more meaningful that we can consider. Whether we can pass it or not remains to be seen. The idea is that we would get some answers and maybe some further amendments that might make this, certainly, more worthy of consideration.

My question is about process. Looking at the time and realizing that if we defer it to another meeting like this four weeks from now, we're fairly close to the end of this portion of the session anyways. For argument's sake let's say that we're out of here sometime in early June, and we don't have the chance as a committee to get back together to look at this again for this spring sitting. Does this then come back in the fall? What does it mean for moving it forward? That's my question about process, whether we would consider a shorter time span, two weeks or three weeks versus the four, in terms of what it means.

9:20

Ms Dean: If your question is whether there would be enough time for the bill to get through the House if it's recommended by the committee if we schedule a meeting for four weeks from now, yes, I think that there would be enough time. I mean, the committee is going to decide today when it's going to meet next. But one month from now would put us in the first week in June.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you.

Mr. Dunford: Well, again, we're into agendas here. You know, let us set the agenda. The bill has to go through the Legislature at some point in time. Does anybody have any pressure on them – I don't – as to whether it's now or in the fall? We can meet out of session – can we not? – as a committee to go through our investigation?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Dunford: Why not?

An Hon. Member: No budget.

Mr. Dunford: Why can't we meet whenever we want?

The Chair: Do we have budget to do that?

Mr. Dunford: Well, we can do it for free. We're getting paid as MLAs.

The Chair: Ordinarily if a committee such as ours meets outside of session, then the travel costs and things like that have to be charged back to the committee.

Ms Calahasen: They do?

The Chair: Yes. It's not assumed that we'll be here. I mean, essentially the bill can't move ahead if we're not in session anyway, so there's no real need to meet if we're not in session. If session has ended before the four weeks are up, then we've got to go . . .

Ms Dean: It's not going to end.

The Chair: But, essentially, there's no need to meet, you know, when we're not sitting. So if we do miss it, then we'll be meeting back when we're back in session.

Now, has everybody spoken? I thought I missed a hand somewhere. No? Okay. So the motion on the floor is four weeks. All in agreement?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: Any opposed? That passed unanimously. Okay. That one's looked after.

Okay. Crest Leadership Centre Act. Ms Dean, do you have any comments on that one?

Ms Dean: Thank you, Madam Chair. There were amendments that were presented by the petitioner and then in consultation with the ministries of Advanced Education and Education and myself. We redrafted these amendments to reflect the concerns that were raised at the hearing. I'm happy to walk through those amendments with you right now.

Madam Chair, I believe that Mr. Lukaszuk has a question.

The Chair: Mr. Lukaszuk.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Thank you. Ms Dean, following the presentation during our last meeting, with Bill 1 I understand the purpose and the reason why the proponents would choose this vehicle as one to proceed with, but with the Crest Centre don't we already have mechanisms, vehicles in place by which to achieve all of their desired outcomes without having to go through this entire process? Are we just making it more convenient for them? Because, frankly, I don't think we're in the business of making things more convenient to individual entities if there already is a vehicle in place by which they can incorporate themselves, provide any and all services that they already provide, and not be hindered in any way. Can you give me one tangible argument why they need this bill and what more they could do with this bill that's of any material value that they could not do with current incorporation vehicles?

Ms Dean: Mr. Lukaszuk, I think you've been in receipt of my Parliamentary Counsel reports.

Mr. Lukaszuk: That's why I asked you the question.

Ms Dean: My opinion is quite clear that there are other avenues for the petitioner to follow with respect to incorporating an educational centre. The petitioner can incorporate a business corporation, the petitioner could incorporate a society, or the petitioner could incorporate a charitable organization under part 9 of the Companies Act.

Mr. Lukaszuk: So perhaps we should have a discussion on whether this bill should proceed to begin with, and this discussion could be facilitated by my putting forward a motion that Bill P r. 2 not proceed.

The Chair: I think we're getting a little ahead of ourselves here because that is essentially, I mean, the decision that we have to make today, whether or not we're going to proceed with this bill. So I think that we've got quite a bit of work to do before we're to that point of making that decision.

I would like to start with an overview of what we have received here. Then could we get into the discussion? Is that all right with everyone here?

Mr. Lukaszuk: As long as we get to the point where we decide whether we proceed with this bill. If members around the table have already made up their minds, unless you have any additional information that wasn't available to us prior to our last meeting, then, sure, we can invest the time in discussing it. But if you have no additional information, speaking for myself, I think I'm ready to vote.

The Chair: Did you get your package of information last night?

Mr. Lukaszuk: And read it diligently, yes.

The Chair: So you did get more information. Okay. Some of us did not get the chance to read it.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Then I will withdraw the motion and table it later.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms Dean: In terms of additional materials that were circulated with respect to this bill, there was a letter from Mr. Chipecur. It's a two-page letter. I leave that for you to review.

With respect to the proposed amendments I would propose that I just walk briefly through those. It's this document right here. It's a two-page document. Again, these amendments were prepared in consultation with the ministry officials that were in attendance at last week's hearing.

First, amendment A simply removes one of the named individuals from the founding directors.

Amendment B deals with amendments to section 3, which deals with the objects of the centre. In response to concerns raised by the Department of Education, the references to secondary schools or secondary education have been removed. There's also been clarification that the type of study to be offered is in the area of leadership and other related fields. This is in response to comments from the department of advanced education. Finally, clause (e) has been replaced to make it clear that the centre is restricted to awarding only degrees in divinity and other certificates and diplomas provided that these programs have met requirements under Alberta legislation regarding approval of programs.

Amendment C deals with the changes to section 5. Again, these are amendments that provide clarity regarding the powers of the centre by expressly stating that it can only provide degree programs in divinity, and any programming in other areas must comply with the laws of Alberta.

At the top of page 2 the change there removes reference to the centre's ability to establish schools. Now it simply reads that it can establish, maintain, and operate training centres.

Finally, the last clause again is a reiteration of the centre's restriction with respect to degree-granting powers. It makes it clear that it can only grant degrees in divinity, and with respect to other programs it must comply with the laws of Alberta.

So those are the amendments.

9:30

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Doerksen: Maybe you are privy to this information, but I'm not. Why is Vaughn Inman being removed? Is there a reason for that?

The Chair: I don't believe that there was any correspondence that referred to why that was.

Mr. Doerksen: Okay. The second question I have actually has to do

with the bill itself that was attached to the letter which seems to infer that the Crest name has been deleted.

Ms Dean: I can comment on that. When I was working with Mr. Chipecur's assistant, she had initially provided changes whereby the word "Crest" was replaced with "CREST," so it would connote an acronym, and she indicated that it was an acronym. However, subsequent discussions with Mr. Chipecur indicated that Crest was not an acronym. So at the end of the day Crest remains as it was originally drafted, C-r-e-s-t.

Mr. Doerksen: Oh, okay. All right. Now I understand what happened there.

Ms Calahasen: Why was Vaughn Inman deleted?

Ms Dean: I have no information on that.

The Chair: Ms Dean, do you have any comments on why schools have been incorporated by the government in the past? You know, why is it that we have done this 60 times before? Why is it that we use private bills to incorporate schools?

Ms Dean: If I can just reframe your question, Madam Chair, the Private Bills Committee has on no occasion incorporated Bible colleges. That's been a practice. But increasingly over the last few years the department of advanced education has voiced some concern with respect to the private bill process. As noted in the correspondence from advanced education, it may create a false impression in terms of legitimacy of this institution because there are still legislative requirements that must be met with respect to the programming. So, yes, there is precedent for incorporating Bible colleges through the private bills process; however, increasingly in the last few years the department of advanced education has noted its concern, and they've reiterated that this year.

Mr. Dunford: I agree with the response. I agree that the department of advanced education has those concerns, but I want to allay the fears of the committee as to whether that's a positive or a negative. That is simply a statement of fact. They have reason to be concerned. Whether we as Albertans or whether we as politicians need to share the same concern I think is a matter for discussion around this table. The department has characterized itself in the past by being very controlling over an enterprise such as training. So I for one would not be supportive of defeating this bill just because there was some concern about training centres popping up in a very dynamic economy and just because advanced education didn't have full control over it.

The Chair: Any more discussion on this?

Where are we in terms of the decision-making here? Is it time for a motion as to whether or not we're going to move forward with this?

Dr. Brown: I'd like to hear Mr. Lukaszuk's motion at this time. I think we're ready to proceed with deliberation on a motion.

The Chair: On whether to move forward with it.
Mr. Lukaszuk.

Mr. Lukaszuk: Thank you. If everyone is satisfied, I would move a motion that
the Standing Committee on Private Bills recommend to the Legislative Assembly of Alberta that Bill Pr. 2 does not proceed.

The Chair: Seconder?

Dr. Brown: You don't need a seconder.

The Chair: No seconds at all? Don't we get to do that?

Dr. Brown.

Dr. Brown: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would speak in favour of Mr. Lukaszuk's motion. I don't think that this bill passes the hurdle which was pointed out by Parliamentary Counsel in the initial materials, the memorandum which we received relating to it, and that is that I believe that it fails to meet the test for a private bill in that the petitioner has not established that the objects of this bill could not be achieved through public legislation, that there are ways to proceed, not under the department of education necessarily, but under the Societies Act or I believe it's part 9 of the Companies Act, they could proceed with a not-for-profit organization. So I don't believe that there's anything that's particularly unique about this particular proposal for a school that can't be met by the existing legislation.

I think that there is something to be said for some consistency in the way that organizations and educational institutions are governed and in terms of the liabilities which are assumed, the responsibilities that are assumed by the directors of those entities. I think that that consistency is best achieved by proceeding under an existing piece of legislation. So my support is in favour of the motion put by Mr. Lukaszuk.

Mr. Doerksen: Well, I'd like to actually speak in opposition to the motion because I have no issue with what Crest Leadership Centre is trying to do here. Mr. Dunford articulated many of my reasons quite well, so I won't repeat those. I haven't heard from any of the committee what harm this does either, and these people who are establishing this school have their reasons for wanting to establish a school this way. It's an avenue that is available to them, which has been done in the past, and I support that.

Mr. Dunford: Well, I'm speaking against the motion. I think that part of the culture and the economic structure that we have in this province is one for entrepreneurship, one for leadership in various areas. I do agree with the mandate of this particular training centre in the sense that they're focused on leaders of the future. Let me tell you, in the corporate experience that I have and now in politics there's a real need for this type of training centre. I'm satisfied with the concern that the petitioner had that is articulated in *Hansard* about their difficulty with going to one of the existing methodologies of being incorporated. I think that they should be given the freedom to incorporate in how they feel is the best manner, and I don't see a concern that an ordinary Albertan would have with it.

The Chair: Mr. Rogers.

Mr. Rogers: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would speak in favour of the motion. For a number of the same reasons that Mr. Dunford has mentioned, I too have no problem with the premise of what this centre is trying to do, the work that they want to do, but it's my understanding and it has been reiterated here many times that the purpose for taking this avenue through the private bills process is typically when there aren't other legislative avenues available, and from everything I've heard, we do have these other avenues. I would suggest that if the petitioner is having issues with the department – for example, in terms of just being controlling – then they do have the opportunity to lobby members that sit around this

table and others that can help to move their point of view through the process. So I certainly see merits in what this group is trying to do, and I think there's a need for it, but my recommendation would be that they use the other typically available avenues and that this particular private bills process is not necessary to achieve these aims at this time.

9:40

The Chair: Mr. Elsalhy.

Mr. Elsalhy: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would speak in favour of the motion to not allow this bill to proceed as proposed by my colleague from Edmonton-Castle Downs. I am not necessarily against people coming to the Private Bills Committee to seek the assistance of the Assembly in the incorporation or in the establishment, but I always question the need or the desire to come before this committee and ask for this type of endorsement, this type of assistance. I usually as a layman perceive this as them seeking a statement of status, that they're special somehow, that they're not like everybody else.

We have heard that occasionally this committee has approved Bible colleges or Bible schools. That's fine. But we also have charter schools, and many charter schools are available throughout the province, and they carry out religious studies most of the time. I actually have one in my constituency, Talmud Torah, which carries out elementary studies, you know, for Jewish children. Mr. Lukaszuk has one in his constituency in Edmonton-Castle Downs which teaches Islamic studies and Arabic language and so on. So special status might not be necessary, in my opinion.

The other thing is that, yes, the petitioner brought back some proposed language amendments, but I think they're still leaving it up to themselves as to how they want to proceed and which courses they want to teach. For example, they now talk about postsecondary education and leadership, and then they say: and other related fields as the board may from time to time determine. In another section they're talking about dissemination of knowledge, whether theoretical or practical, in leadership and other related fields and so on. I don't like this vagueness or this openness in their mandate.

Mr. Dunford said that sometimes we perceive the Department of Education as liking to have too much power and maintaining a lot of control. I agree with him that sometimes it appears to be excessive, but you know what? If we're going to look at all the different government departments, I agree that this is one department that needs to have this much power. It's a department that basically enforces guidelines and standards, and they look at minimum things that we have to meet, and these guys have to be prepared to appear before the Department of Education or Advanced Education and say: "This is what we're proposing. Do you approve?"

The other thing is that I see nowhere here that they have to abide by the, you know, rulings or recommendations of something like the Campus Alberta Quality Council, which is entrusted to maintain all those standards and to actually make sure that courses taken in one institution are comparable to another or they do the transfers between the institutions and so on. Campus Alberta I don't think has been consulted. I see this bill as, you know, trying to seek that special status and also trying to give the petitioners all that leeway or all that room to manoeuvre outside the regulatory process.

So I am hesitant to support this bill, and as such I am going to vote in favour of Mr. Lukaszuk's motion. Thank you.

The Chair: Ms Dean has a comment.

Ms Dean: Just a minor clarification with respect to the reference to

Campus Alberta. There was a representative from the ministry of advanced education, and her role is in connection with Campus Alberta. So that consultation did occur.

Mr. Elsalhy: Okay. Did she say that she was concerned?

Ms Dean: Well, at the end of the day what they've proposed are changes to the bill which make it clear that any programming must comply with laws of Alberta. So that's reflected in the amendments.

Mr. Elsalhy: Okay.

The Chair: Have I missed anyone? Question?
Oh, sorry. Mr. Lougheed.

Mr. Lougheed: I, as others have spoken, am really in favour of the objects as outlined in this Bill Pr. 2, and they should be commended for their goals. But I also will support the motion until I have more evidence that other avenues have been exhausted. This is pretty well the last one available to them, so I'll be supporting the motion.

Ms Calahasen: Well, I wasn't here to listen to the proponents as they described what they were going to do and the questions that were asked. However, I did read the information, and I really like what they want to do. I think their objects are pretty clear in terms

of where they want to go. But I, too, have concerns relative to other avenues that need to be pursued. I believe that they have to work with the other avenues before I will support this going through. So I do support the Member for Edmonton-Castle Downs.

The Chair: Okay. We have a motion on the floor that this bill be defeated, that we not bring it forward to the House. All in favour? Opposed? Okay. That motion passed, so this bill will not be moving forward.

Mr. Dunford: Can my opposition be recorded in *Hansard*?

The Chair: I believe you just recorded it.

Mr. Dunford: Thank you.

The Chair: According to our agenda the next question is: is there any other business that we need to deal with?

The next meeting we decided would be four weeks from today, so that would be four weeks from today, on a Tuesday. A notice will be sent out.

Could I have a motion to adjourn? Mr. Rogers. All in favour of adjournment? Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 9:48 a.m.]