

[Ms Graham in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we'll get under way. Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this first organizational meeting of the Standing Committee on Private Bills to order. This will be our first meeting in the First Session of the 25th Legislature.

I'd like to introduce myself. I'm Marlene Graham, the Member for Calgary-Lougheed, who is your chair. I've been the chair of this committee since 1997. Our vice-chair is Ms Karen Kryczka, from Calgary-West.

I would like to welcome all returning members to this committee and many of the new members that we have joining us. I don't know why the majority of you are lined up in the back row. We're really not that frightening. Maybe it's a better vantage point from back there.

I would also like to introduce to you, if you haven't already met them, our table officers who assist this committee. We have Ms Shannon Dean, Parliamentary Counsel, who gives us some very valuable guidance in our deliberations in this committee. She provides briefings on the private bills and legal advice, procedural advice, and any other kind of advice we need. We also have as our administrative assistant Ms Florence Marston, who keeps all our paperwork straight. There can be a fair amount of paper in this committee. So we rely on them very much and appreciate their assistance.

The purpose of this first meeting is to give everyone some basic background on the workings of this committee, the Private Bills Committee. As well, we will review the petitions we have received to date. We will also set our schedule for the hearings into these petitions.

So having said that, at this stage of the proceedings I would ask you to look at your agenda, which is under the tab entitled Agenda in your binder, and I would entertain a motion at this time to approve our agenda.

MR. LORD: So moved.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Moved by Jon Lord that the agenda be approved. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

All right; we'll move, then, to the orientation. Between Ms Dean and myself, we will attempt to give you a background as to private bills. You will have received your binders this morning, and I would commend to you this insert called Petitioner's Guide to Private Bills Procedure. It's a useful summary of what private bills are and the procedure we follow in this committee.

I can tell you that private bills are a rather unique type of bill. Once passed, they have the same force and effect as any other bill, a government bill. They become a statute of the province of Alberta and are enforceable like any other statute, but they have a different origin and a different purpose. They are used when an individual or a group of individuals or a corporation needs some sort of relief that is not available in the general law. That may not make much sense to you at this point, but as we work through the petitions we have received and if you check some of the examples in this guide, it will make a bit more sense.

Just as an example, certain hospital boards or nonprofit bodies may need a certain type of corporate structure that they can't achieve

under existing legislation, so they are incorporated by way of a private bill. You'll see some examples of that today in the petitions we have received. As well, up until now – and it's still the existing law; we hope it will change with the proclamation of the new Insurance Act – all insurance companies in the province must be incorporated by way of a private bill. So those are just some examples of where private bills are used.

Just to summarize, when there's no other method of achieving your end under the existing legislation, no other method of, say, going to court and getting your relief, you can come and petition the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislature for the relief you want, and this committee deals with those issues.

The rules which govern the procedure in our committee are found in Standing Orders 85 to 89. You all have copies of the Standing Orders, so you can have reference to those. Very generally, the basic requirements are that, as I mentioned, a petition must be filed on behalf of the petitioner to both the Lieutenant Governor and the Legislative Assembly within the filing date, which is advertised in the major newspapers. You may have seen that. At about the time the session was announced, there were announcements in the major papers about this committee and the filing date for petitions. As well, the petitioner must advertise, give notice of the petition, one time in the *Alberta Gazette* and for two consecutive weeks in an Alberta newspaper with wide coverage, then produce proof of that advertising as well as filing a draft bill that follows the petition and a filing fee of \$200.

We must today review these petitions that we have received. We received four within the time deadline, and we must look at them in the light of the formal requirements. Once the petitions are received by the Legislature, they are referred to the chairman, and I then, as I did yesterday, present those petitions to the Assembly. Having done that, the petitions are referred back to the committee, and here we are today dealing with those petitions. We will review them, as I mentioned, to see if they comply with our Standing Orders, and as a result of our deliberations today I will then report to the Legislature, probably tomorrow, giving a report as to what we have concluded. Hopefully the Assembly will concur in that report. Typically it does.

Then the following day the petitions will be read and received, as you have probably heard other petitions read and received in the same fashion. Once that is done, the sponsors of the individual bills – and some of you may be sponsoring the bills. Each bill requires a sponsor, who doesn't have to be a member of this committee but must be a member of the Legislature, who is the person who will take the bill through the stages in the Legislature: first reading, second reading, committee, and third reading. Anyway, that person or their designate will introduce the bill for first reading.

Once that is done, we're then in a position to proceed with formal hearings into each of the petitions, and we will set the schedule for those hearings today. Those hearings take place in this Assembly, and this you will find quite interesting. All the participants – the petitioners, their counsel if they have lawyers, their witnesses, any other people that have an interest in the matter – are sworn in. Everybody gives evidence under oath. Members of the committee are able to ask questions. We have guidance from Parliamentary Counsel, who provides a thorough Parliamentary Counsel report in advance. After we have heard all the evidence, asked all our questions, we then deliberate on each of the matters at a subsequent date. We'll probably have two hearing dates, two different dates for hearings, and then a third meeting to deliberate.

Having heard all the evidence on each petition, we can do one of three things. We can recommend that the bill proceed as presented; secondly, that it proceed with amendment; or thirdly, that it not proceed at all. Once we have made our decision there, then I as the

chairman return to the Assembly, make another report as to our findings, and then the bills, depending on our findings, proceed through second reading, Committee of the Whole, and third reading if that is appropriate.

As you probably have noticed, all our proceedings, unless they are called in camera, or private, are recorded by *Hansard*, so you might just want to keep that in mind. We only meet during session. This is an all-party committee. Although I don't think Dr. Pannu is here, he is a member, so we have representation from all three parties.

I believe those will be all my comments at this point. I'm going to turn the proceedings over to Ms Dean to talk to us about the petitions we have received, but before I do that, are there any questions that have arisen?

9:15

MR. VANDERBURG: You said just the \$200 filing fee is all the petitioner is required to pay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. In terms of the financial . . .

MR. VANDERBURG: And that's their only cost to this Assembly?

THE CHAIRMAN: To the Assembly, but they may well have other costs if they hire legal counsel.

MR. VANDERBURG: So what's our average cost of a hearing after we do the advertising and the group here, the average cost with our staff time over the years?

THE CHAIRMAN: I haven't got that figure at my fingertips, but I'm sure we could undertake to get you some information on that.

MR. VANDERBURG: Just on fees and charges to the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right, certainly, unless, Ms Dean, you have any . . .

MS DEAN: I would just add to that. A lot of the costs of the hearing are staff, et cetera et cetera, and it's all absorbed in the House services budget under the Legislative Assembly.

MR. VANDERBURG: Oh, okay.

MS DEAN: For instance, the security guards, us, the supplies, that type of thing.

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure what is behind your question.

MR. VANDERBURG: Well, I'm just wondering why the \$200, why not \$500, why not \$100. I'm trying to figure out what the filing fee is supposed to represent.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I would think the purpose would be to certainly not make money but to be a reimbursement for actual costs, and certainly all the fees and charges the government charges are supposed to be in line with that principle. We went through a big procedure within the last couple of years where we reviewed and revised all government fees and charges to be compensation for actual costs, not a money-making scheme. But we'll see what we can do to get you that information.

Any other questions? Yes, Ms Kryczka.

MS KRYCZKA: It's in Standing Orders that we have that

information. Is that in the binder? I was looking for it. Standing Orders 85 to 90.

THE CHAIRMAN: They're not reprinted in the binder, but that is something we could do. They are contained in your Standing Orders if you just haul it out.

MS KRYCZKA: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: But certainly I think that's a reasonable request. We'll get them copied, and then you can include them in the binders. That's a good suggestion.

All right. I'll turn matters over to Ms Dean then.

MS DEAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I just want to welcome the committee members to the first meeting and explain that although I'll be running through the petitions very, very briefly here this morning, you will be getting a very lengthy report from me, which is required under the Standing Orders, and it will have lots of attachments and reference material. Just so you are aware, the summary that I am providing you today is not in replacement of that, but it's merely to go through the petitions to ensure that the filing requirements have been met.

Now, this year we have received four petitions for private bills. The first petition we received, for Pr. 1, is for the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer Amendment Act, 2001. I'm being reminded that there is a list of these petitions in the front of your binder.

Mrs. O'Neill has agreed to sponsor Bill Pr. 1. The petitioner here, the congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, is requesting amendments to its 1925 incorporating statute. These amendments include a change in the requirement that all members of the corporation be resident in the province of Alberta, and they want to change that to a requirement that all members be residents of Canada. The petitioner wants to include a French version of its corporate name. They also want to expand their objects and provide for the corporation to be able to carry out those objects outside Alberta. They would also like to include a section which provides the corporation with the powers of a natural person.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. McClelland, did you have a question?

MR. MCCLELLAND: No. I was just getting ready.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I guess we read your signals wrong. All right. Sorry, Ms Dean.

MS DEAN: That's all right. The petitioner is being represented by Mr. Gerard Amerongen, QC, who is a former Speaker of the Assembly, and I just point that out for the committee's information. In terms of the filing requirements under the Standing Orders, all the requirements have been met with one exception, and that is the requirement in the *Alberta Gazette*. Mr. Amerongen has asked that I request a waiver on his behalf. He has advised that the advertising will occur in the April 30 edition of the *Alberta Gazette*. He will provide proof of that fact to me within the next few days, but in the meantime he's asked that the committee consider granting a waiver with respect to that minor deficiency.

I don't know if there are any questions with respect to Bill Pr. 1. What I would propose is that we run through all the petitions, and where there are any noncomplying petitions, we would deal with them at the end of the review.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sounds reasonable.

MS DEAN: If there are no questions on Bill Pr. 1, I'll just move on to Bill Pr. 2. Mr. Lord has agreed to sponsor that. This is a repeal and replacement of the Burns Memorial Trust Act. The petitioner here is the Royal Trust Corporation of Canada, who is the trustee of the Burns Memorial Trust. The trust is currently governed by a 1956 statute, and under that act Royal Trust is required to distribute the net income of the trust to five charitable organizations, those being the Sisters of Charity of Providence of Calgary, the Burns Memorial Fire Fund, the Burns Memorial Police Fund, the Burns Memorial Children's Fund, and the Salvation Army.

Now, the petitioner is seeking to repeal and replace its original incorporating statute, and the petitioner advises that the substantive changes being proposed are the adoption of prudent investor guidelines for the investment of the property of the trusts. The petitioner has also advised that they'd like to change to a total return investment policy, whereby the assets of the trust are managed to maximize the overall return for a given level of risk without distinction between income, dividends, and capital gains, and the income from the trust would then be paid out in accordance with disbursement quotas for private foundations prescribed under the Income Tax Act. The petitioner is also proposing some additional changes to modernize the provisions regarding the management of the trust. The petitioner here has fully complied with all the requirements in the Standing Orders.

I don't know if there are any questions on Bill Pr. 2.

Moving to Bill Pr. 3, the petitioners here are the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company and National Trust Company. They are requesting a bill which would transfer the personal trusteeship and personal agency business of National Trust Company to Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company, and this would also provide for the Bank of Nova Scotia Trust Company to be appointed as a successor trustee in respect of most documents, deeds, and instruments to which National Trust Company is a party.

Just as background for the committee, I'd like to point out that there have been similar bills which have been approved by the Assembly in recent years, specifically in 1997. Also with respect to the Bank of Nova Scotia Company, they have applied in other jurisdictions for a similar private bill, namely in Ontario and Quebec, and both of those bills have passed.

With respect to the filing requirements, the petitioner here is in full compliance.

Are there any questions on Pr. 3?

9:25

Finally, the last petition we've received is Pr. 4, the ING Western Union Insurance Company Amendment Act, 2001. The petitioner here is ING Western Union Insurance Company, and they are requesting amendments to their incorporating statute, which is a 1940 private act. If these amendments are approved, it would allow for the petitioner to be continued under the federal insurance legislation.

You will note that your materials don't indicate any sponsor for this private bill. I did speak with the petitioner's lawyers yesterday, and they have yet to advise me of who their sponsor is. Hopefully that will be sorted out within the next few days, because I anticipate that these bills will be introduced early next week.

This petitioner has fully complied with all the requirements in the Standing Orders with one minor technical exception, and it relates to the advertising. They have advertised in the *National Post*. They have done it on two occasions, so it does meet that requirement. However, technically speaking, the *National Post* is not a paper published in Alberta. It is certainly circulated widely throughout Alberta. What I would suggest for the committee's consideration is

that they deem that advertising sufficient for the purposes of the requirements in the Standing Orders. Of course, if the committee does not want to do that, they can also grant a waiver which would require the petitioner to undertake additional advertising prior to the hearing.

Are there any questions with respect to Pr. 4?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Ms Dean. You did such an excellent job that no one has any questions. But we do need to deal with the matters raised by Ms Dean with respect to Pr. 4 and Pr. 1. On Pr. 4, the matter of whether or not we need to deem the advertising in the *National Post* as sufficient, any comments on that?

Ms Kryczka?

MS KRYCZKA: There are no comments. I'd be prepared to move.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Lord.

MR. LORD: I was going to ask: is this setting a precedent that others could then use? I mean, the standard advertising they did not follow. I'm curious as to why they didn't. Is there a reason? Secondly, if we allowed this, would it set a precedent, and what would the ramifications of that be?

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll let Ms Dean respond to that. Good question.

MS DEAN: I cannot recall a situation in recent years where the petitioner has only advertised in a national publication. Certainly there have been occasions where, for example, they've advertised in the *National Post* or the *Globe and Mail* and an Alberta paper. So this is the only occasion in recent years where only one type of advertising has occurred.

In terms of your question whether it would constitute a precedent, I would say no because the committee, I would imagine, is going to consider a resolution whereby it would deem this as sufficient, and of course it wouldn't necessarily constitute a precedent. If this were to occur on another occasion, the committee would once again have to consider that resolution. If the committee feels that it's inappropriate to deem this advertising as sufficient, the other option is, again, to require the petitioner to undertake additional advertising prior to the hearing.

In terms of your question as to why the petitioner has only advertised in the *National Post*, I can't respond to that.

MR. LORD: I guess the concern I'm raising is on this and other future bills coming forward. If people are expecting to see notices in a certain publication, there's no reason for them to be looking in the *National Post* or other publications. Therefore, they would miss the advertising because it's appearing in an unexpected publication, and that may have some negative consequences.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's certainly a consideration. Maybe before I go to Dr. Pannu, I'll just ask Ms Dean to further elaborate on the actual problem that is perceived to exist here.

MS DEAN: Sure. Technically speaking, our Standing Orders require that the petitioner advertise in a newspaper published in Alberta. Of course, the *National Post* isn't necessarily published in Alberta. It's certainly circulated in Alberta, so the notice of this particular private bill would have been circulated in a paper within Alberta. It's just the technical requirement of the paper actually being published in Alberta.

THE CHAIRMAN: Published meaning?

MS DEAN: A local Alberta paper. For example, when you open the inside cover or go to the editorial page, you see where the publisher is located.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Vandermeer.

MR. VANDERMEER: Just have them do more advertising before the hearing. Tell them it's a requirement, and tell them to do it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, that certainly is a possibility. Time is of the essence of course. This session will probably not extend much more than the beginning or middle of June, so that may mean this bill could not be dealt with within this session. That's something that I think we have to keep in mind, weighing the need for additional advertising against the content of the bill and who would be affected and this sort of thing.

I'll go to Dr. Pannu.

DR. PANNU: Madam Chairman, if the rationale for advertising in an Alberta-published paper is sound – and I haven't heard any comments on it having become redundant or unnecessary – I think we should require the Western Union Insurance Company in fact to advertise. Otherwise, I think we cast doubt on the rationale which underlies the requirement that's in place. So if it's all right, I would actually make that motion. I would be happy to so move that the insurance company be asked to abide by the requirement that's in place, which is to advertise in Alberta-published papers before proceeding.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Perhaps you could hold that motion pending other discussion into the matter. I'll just go to Mrs. Kryczka.

MS KRYCZKA: I guess personally I don't see this as a huge issue when you look at the overall process. The fact that the information has actually been circulated in Alberta – and I don't know when this rule was made up, but *National Post* I'm aware is read very widely, maybe not in all parts of Alberta but certainly in major communities, business communities in Alberta. I guess what I'm saying is: how big of a roadblock is this, really, so that overall this petition may not be able to come forward in this Legislature, weighing and balancing all of this?

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.  
Mr. McClelland.

MR. McCLELLAND: Well, I think there's merit to both arguments, except that the first argument, in my opinion, has to do with the fact that the rules that are established are clean, fair, and easily discernible, and if petitioners follow the instructions, they won't run into the problem. There's a big difference between being circulated in Alberta and being published in Alberta, and I suspect a person could circumvent that rule by publishing in a specific magazine or newspaper that appeals to a certain segment and that wouldn't be read by other segments. I think that the general distribution, you know, rang the same warning bell in my head that Mr. Lord cautioned us about. I think perhaps there might be reason to take it back because it might set a precedent for others. While this one may not have the same significance, there could be one in the future that could have far more significance, and this would be a precedent which would provide for them to advertise in some other publication that would have less general distribution than the *Post* and still be distributed here but not published here.

9:35

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not going to argue with you. A decision of this committee on one matter could certainly be argued in another, but I don't think that we are bound by every decision that we make, so it's not like we have locked ourselves in a corner.

This procedure in Private Bills is, you know, enabling of companies, individuals, and this sort of thing. I would just caution the committee not to stand on technical requirements excessively. When you look at who would be affected by this amending piece of legislation and what it is trying to achieve, I'm not so sure that when you look at the wide circulation of the *National Post*, we have to be that concerned about whether the newspaper is actually published in the province of Alberta when it is in fact printed and circulated widely.

MR. OUELLETTE: I just want to make a point. If our legal adviser Shannon has said that it's not setting a precedent, I think what we're doing here if we try to turn this over and delay it for another session and everything is exactly what all of our constituents and all of the general public have been saying for years: hey, our bureaucracy problem is that nobody has any common sense and they can't make a decision; they have to go identical by the book and follow that perfect line, and therefore we can't get anything done in business today whenever you apply for anything. I think that as a committee here we want to have more common sense than that, and if we're delaying somebody over one word but we feel that that word is okay, we're here to try and make things progress, not slow it down, is my opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Ouellette.  
Mr. Lord.

MR. LORD: Yes. I was going to say that there was a second issue, that this one did not have a sponsor. Is that correct? I'm wondering, you know, is that also necessary?

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be addressed. It's not something that we have to concern ourselves with in terms of a waiver today. It's just identifying an MLA to actually sponsor it by the time the bills are introduced in the Legislature.

MR. LORD: Right.

As a solution to the first issue, is it possible that we could make a motion that the *National Post* be added to the list of acceptable advertising publications?

MS DEAN: Certainly that could be entertained, but again this is a requirement in the Standing Orders. The committee would have no ability to change that requirement. It would be the Assembly that would require a resolution before the Standing Orders could be changed.

MR. LORD: But we could make a motion today to waive the requirement for an Alberta publication subject to the advertising in the *National Post* publication. We could word it very specifically so that it does allow this bill to go forward but makes it clear that it's not going to become a free-for-all in the future.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS KRYCZKA: I'd like to propose a motion. I'd like to move that with respect to Bill Pr. 4, ING Western Union Insurance Company Amendment Act, 2001, the committee deem the advertising

published in the *National Post* as sufficient for the purposes of meeting the requirements of Standing Order 86(1)(b).

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Kryczka. Basically, in effect this motion proposed by Ms Kryczka would deem the existing advertising to be good and sufficient for this particular case only.

Dr. Pannu.

DR. PANNU: On a point of order, Madam Chairman. I would like some advice from Parliamentary Counsel on this. Can this committee change the Standing Order, or if it's going to be a motion, should it be requesting that the Standing Order be changed rather than assuming that the Standing Order stands changed when this committee has no power to change that order?

THE CHAIRMAN: This committee by itself does not have the power to change the Standing Orders, as you know. We could certainly make recommendations, and that might be something that we would want to do after further reflection, perhaps at our deliberating meeting after our hearings. That's something we might want to keep in mind. I don't know that I would recommend that we make that decision today. I think it would require a bit more reflection to actually change the Standing Orders.

DR. PANNU: I quite concur with you on this. If we are not willing to do that, if we're not in a position to proceed with that today, then are we entitled to interpret "published" as "circulated"? That's the next question. You know, we obviously are, I think, substantively altering the Standing Order if we proceed with the motion before us, which says that circulating in Alberta means the same thing as being published in Alberta. That would be subverting the intent.

THE CHAIRMAN: The committee does have the ability to grant waivers on the Standing Orders and in my experience over the last four years certainly has done so on technical breaches. It's not uncommon.

MS DEAN: If I could just elaborate as well. What the committee is doing today is making some recommendations to the Assembly with respect to some of these noncompliant petitions, and by making these recommendations in a report, the Assembly is then asked to concur in the report. So the committee is certainly within its powers to make these recommendations. It's not modifying Standing Orders. It's merely making recommendations and asking the Assembly to concur in its report.

MR. OUELLETTE: Did I miss something at the start? I'm reading a different page here for Bill Pr. 4, and it says that they did advertise in the *Alberta Gazette*.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, they did do the *Alberta Gazette*. That's one time in the *Alberta Gazette*, but they're also required to publish two consecutive weeks in a newspaper published in Alberta. So there are the two requirements for advertising. The *Alberta Gazette* they did comply with, but the Alberta-published newspaper requirement is the one where there is the issue.

MR. SNELGROVE: Madam Chairman, on a topic like this the advertising in the *National Post* is probably very appropriate. If it were an environmental issue on Jasper or Banff, then maybe the *National Post* wouldn't be. So I don't think you want to jump around and change the whole parameter of the rules.

I think what Karen has said is that we would feel this is appropriate advertising for this particular bill, and let's not get

caught up in whether it's published or circulated in Alberta. If it's done the job it set out to do, that should be our concern. I would say let's not lose the right to be able to deal individually with these bills. When we see that one has made an attempt to comply or at least to introduce themselves to the appropriate people, we should accept that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

The last speaker, I believe, is Mr. Pham.

MR. PHAM: Thank you. I think that enough has been said about this subject already. The goal of that particular item is to ensure that the public is informed, that nobody can do anything in the dark without having people who may oppose the change having a chance to read it. For that purpose, I think advertising in the *National Post* achieves that already.

Secondly, waiving the Standing Order is totally different than changing the Standing Order. We do that from time to time in the Legislature. We as a committee can certainly make the recommendation. Remember that this committee will only recommend it to the House, and the whole Legislature will make the decision on the bill anyway at the end of the day. So I don't think that the concern of Dr. Pannu is a valid one.

Also, I agree with my colleague who earlier indicated that the public out there already has the perception of the wheels of justice turning very slowly, especially when it comes to private bills. The reason that it is in the Private Bills Committee is because it doesn't have a wide impact on the whole population. Also, it affects a particular group more than others. That's why they are encouraged to take the initiative themselves to bring it forward to us, and we should try to accommodate them more than trying to hinder them. For that very reason, I ask the hon. members of the committee to proceed without further delay on this issue.

9:45

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pham.

DR. PANNU: Madam Chairman, obviously you have now before you a motion, but I had proposed a motion before this motion was proposed. Could we dispose of my motion and then proceed with this to make a decision? I had informed you that I was making a motion. You asked me to hold off for a moment, which I agreed to. But what's the status of my proposed motion?

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we do have a motion on the floor now which I believe and on the advice of Parliamentary Counsel we do need to deal with. Then as a result of that, depending on the results of the vote on that, we can deal with your motion.

Unless there are any other comments, questions, or remarks, we have before us the motion of Ms Kryczka, which reads that

the committee deem the advertising published in the *National Post* as sufficient for the purposes of meeting the requirements of Standing Order 86(1)(b).

All members in favour of this motion, please say aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Members opposed, please say no.

DR. PANNU: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. The motion is carried. All right. That disposes, then, of Pr. 4.

I'll have you refer back to Pr. 1, and the issue there was that the

advertising in the *Alberta Gazette* apparently took place yesterday, and proof of that will be provided to us. To comply with the Standing Orders, the advertising should have taken place before April 25, which was the deadline for filing petitions with the Legislature. It is the advice of Parliamentary Counsel that the committee could certainly grant a waiver provided the proof of advertising is received by the Private Bills Committee in advance of the hearing into this matter.

Ms Kryczka.

MS KRYCZKA: Yes. I'd like to move that the committee waive Standing Order 89(1)(b) in connection with the advertising required in the *Alberta Gazette* subject to the condition that the advertising be completed before the committee hears the petition.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. So in effect that is waiving the technical requirement provided the proof of advertising is received before the hearing.

MR. SNELGROVE: Just a question. How much time, then, does that give? Might that put us in a spot where people may not have time to see the motion and prepare if they wanted to be an intervenor or something at the hearing? Is that advertising designed to give people enough time in between the advertisement and the hearing, and are we cutting that time short? If it should have been in the paper by the 25th, then they would have a couple of weeks' time. Depending on when they come out now, how much time do people have to put an objection forward if there were people that wished to do so?

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Dean will respond to that.

MS DEAN: If I can just comment on that, Mr. Snelgrove. The petitioner for Pr. 1 has completed the newspaper advertising, which has occurred two times, on two consecutive weeks. The only outstanding advertising that we're waiting for is that which appears in the *Alberta Gazette*. I understand that it took place in the edition of the *Alberta Gazette* which was published yesterday. I expect to receive a statutory declaration evidencing that fact within the next few days.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. The *Alberta Gazette* is the government publication in which regulations and public notices are published. I don't know if you have a subscription to *Alberta Gazette*, but probably it would not be the means by which it would come to the attention of the public. But a good question nevertheless.

Any other comments?

All right. All in favour of the motion proposed by Ms Kryczka to waive Standing Order 89(1)(b), please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

All right. That, then, deals with the petitions we have received.

I'd ask you now to look at the proposed schedule of hearings which you should have at the beginning of your binder. What we are proposing is that petitions Pr. 1 and Pr. 4 be heard Tuesday, May 15, that Pr. 2 and Pr. 3 be heard May 22, and that we meet on May 29, then, to deliberate and make our decision in each of these matters.

For those hearing dates on the 15th and the 22nd, meetings would

commence at 8:30 a.m. just to ensure that we have sufficient time to complete matters. The meeting on the 29th would start at 9 a.m.

Any questions or concerns? I'd be happy to entertain a motion to approve that schedule of hearings then.

MR. MASKELL: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: All right. Mr. Maskell has moved that the schedule of hearings as proposed be adopted. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

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

Is there any other business that the committee needs to deal with? Mr. Ouellette.

MR. OUELLETTE: Just the question: does this committee sit whether the House is in or not?

THE CHAIRMAN: No. This committee only sits during session.

MR. OUELLETTE: I just wanted to know if we should put it on our calendars that way or whatever.

MR. VANDERBURG: Madam Chairman, again, because 50 percent of the applications we dealt with today had deficiencies regarding advertising, could we not just include an insert or something that stresses the importance of the advertising to future applicants. You know, just a little insert that says papers such as the *Edmonton Journal*, our *Edmonton Sun*, our papers that we consider published in Alberta rather than *National Post*. Just to clear it up. And advertisements in the *Gazette* – you know, the dates we would expect them to be in by, just to make it clear for future applicants so we don't have to deal with these types of things. That's not changing; that's a friendly type of thing to do.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's a very proactive and positive suggestion. Why shouldn't others benefit from the mistakes of their predecessors, I guess.

MR. VANDERBURG: That's right.

THE CHAIRMAN: We'll pass that on to Parliamentary Counsel.

MR. VANDERBURG: I like friendly types of stuff rather than legislative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that suggestion.

Any other new business? If not, would someone care to move that the meeting be adjourned?

MR. OUELLETTE: I'll move that the meeting be adjourned.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour, please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any opposed? Our meeting is adjourned, and we'll look forward to seeing you, then, Tuesday, May 15, at 8:30 a.m. here in the Chamber.

[The committee adjourned at 9:55 a.m.]