

Title: Tuesday, April 15, 2003 Private Bills Committee

Date: 03/04/15

[Ms Graham in the chair]

The Chair: Well, I think that I will call this meeting of the Private Bills Committee officially to order. I will look for a motion to approve our agenda. Of course, this morning we are here to deliberate on the two bills that we have conducted hearings into. Dr. Pannu moves that we approve the agenda as circulated. All in favour, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Chair: Any opposed, please say no. Then our agenda is approved.

You also had circulated to you the minutes of the last meeting, of April 8, 2003. I would entertain a motion relative to the approval of those minutes. Mr. Maskell so moves. All in favour, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Chair: Any opposed, please say no. Those minutes are approved then.

Well, moving on to the main purpose of this meeting today, then, we are going to with any luck deliberate and make a decision relative to the two bills that we've heard evidence on in the respective hearings. Of course, we have before us both documentary evidence and the sworn testimony that we received at the hearing given in support of each bill, and it is our role to consider this evidence, to weigh it, and then determine what we will recommend to the Legislature in our report with respect to each bill. As you know, because I think I say it every meeting, our options are to direct or to recommend that the bill proceed as presented, alternatively to recommend that the bill proceed with amendment, or lastly to recommend that the bill not proceed.

In our deliberations we are assisted by the Parliamentary Counsel report, which sets out the legal and factual considerations that we should direct our minds to. Once we've deliberated and made our decisions, then a report will be made to the Legislature by myself or by a member of the committee containing our recommendations. If bills are recommended to proceed, then of course they go through the normal stages of a bill in the Legislature.

I would propose, then, to deal with Bill Pr. 1 initially, that being the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Province of Alberta Statutes Repeal Act, sponsored by Mr. Griffiths. As you will recall at the hearing, Sister Slavik, the petitioner on behalf of the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Diocese of London, Ontario, requests the repeal of the two private acts that relate to the Sisters of St. Joseph of the province of Alberta. Those acts are An Act to Incorporate The Sisters of St. Joseph of the Province of Alberta, *Statutes of Alberta*, 1927, chapter 82, and, secondly, An Act to Provide for the Exemption of Certain Land which is the Property of The Sisters of St. Joseph, Edmonton, Alberta, from Assessment and Taxation, *Statutes of Alberta*, 1964, chapter 147. That first act, the 1927 act, basically established the Sisters of St. Joseph in the province of Alberta and set out its various objects and powers, et cetera. The 1964 act provided for certain property located in the city of Edmonton to be exempt from assessment and taxation.

So as was pointed out in the report of Parliamentary Counsel, what we need to be concerned about is whether there are any outstanding lawsuits or proceedings, whether there are any debts or liabilities

outstanding. As we heard, all assets of the Alberta Sisters of St. Joseph have been transferred, and the Ontario corporation has undertaken to be responsible for all debts and liabilities. The evidence we heard supported the fact that there were no outstanding claims or proceedings or debts or liabilities at this time, and the Department of Health and Wellness and the Department of Infrastructure, which were consulted, both indicated in writing that they had no concerns and that there was no one who opposed the petition of Sister Slavik. So that in a nutshell was the evidence as I recall.

At this time I would ask for a motion, if anyone is prepared to so move. Mr. Rathgeber.

Mr. Rathgeber: Thank you, Madam Chair. I move that this committee recommend to the Alberta Legislature that Bill Pr. 1, the Sisters of St. Joseph of the Province of Alberta Statutes Repeal Act, proceed without amendment, as proposed by Mr. Griffiths.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on that motion?

An Hon. Member: Question.

The Chair: Being that there's no discussion and the question has been called, all in favour of the motion by Mr. Rathgeber, please say aye.

Hon. Members: Aye.

The Chair: Anyone opposed, please say no. All right. That motion is approved, and Bill Pr. 1 will be recommended to the Legislature to proceed.

All right. That takes us to Bill Pr. 2, Forest Lawn Bible College Act, sponsored by Mr. Pham.

Rev. Abbott, you wanted to make a motion; did you?

9:10

Rev. Abbott: Yeah. I move that we have discussion on this bill in camera.

The Chair: All right. Just for those that aren't familiar with that technical term, Rev. Abbott is recommending that we go off the record to have our discussions. Would there be support for that motion? Please say aye if you are.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

The Chair: Any opposed, please say no.

Dr. Pannu: No.

The Chair: All right. The motion is carried, and we will now go in camera.

[The committee met in camera from 9:11 a.m. to 10 a.m.]

The Chair: The committee is now out of camera and back on the record. I will call on Mr. Pham as the first speaker.

Mr. Pham: Thank you, Madam Chair. As the sponsor of Bill Pr. 2 I would like to put on record the road that has led myself and the bill to this point. Around October of last year I was approached by Pastor Nguyen. He was a member of the Eastside City Church in the

past, and he recalled that in 1996 I did help the Eastside City Church to put forward a private bill to sponsor the creation of the Evangel Bible College at that time, and he asked if I could do the same thing for him. Having done this once before, I said yes, because he is one of my constituents.

Everything went smoothly until April 4, the Friday before April 8. At that time, I got a letter from Pastor Ron Leech, the senior pastor of Eastside City Church, opposing this bill. This put me in a very difficult position because both Pastor Ron Leech and Pastor Nguyen I have known for many years, and both of them are very well respected within my community. I feel that this is a very important issue for both sides, and I am torn because no matter what I do, I will probably upset a large group of constituents in my own riding.

Having said that, I think we have ample opportunities from the presentation and also from the material in front of us, and I trust that the members of the committee will be able to make their decision based on this information.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Pham.
Rev. Abbott.

Rev. Abbott: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to make a comment regarding the letter from Ron Leech, where one line says, "Thank used to be a part of our organization until we discovered that he was teaching doctrine contrary to Scripture." Being an ordained minister myself and, you know, having a fair bit of experience in this, I've found that there are a lot of doctrinal disputes from church to church, sometimes even within churches. In fact, sometimes even within families there are doctrinal disputes that will go on, and sometimes people will claim that another person is teaching doctrine that is contrary to scripture. That's a pretty strong accusation, but I think it's important that we realize that there are many different ways of looking at the scriptures and that one person's doctrine or teaching or understanding of the scripture may be different than another's, and to me that's perfectly fine. In fact, I don't know that that's any of the government's business. I think we should be staying out of what the correct doctrine or teaching of scripture is. That's not something that the government needs to be regulating or legislating by any means.

Also with regard to this Bible college I think that because it is clearly going to be an unaccredited Bible college – there are other Bible colleges in Canada that are certainly accredited, and they have to go through all of the various accreditation agencies. They have to have certain degrees for their staff, they have to have certain sizes of libraries, and they have to have certain requirements that they meet under national and provincial guidelines to be accredited. This Bible college is going to be unaccredited, and therefore I think that their degrees will be very, very limited in scope and in where they can use them. Therefore, my personal view is that as long as the legislation itself is sound and it meets past precedents of this Assembly, then I think that we should go ahead and grant them this application to form an unaccredited Bible college.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Rev. Abbott.
Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Jacobs: Thank you, Madam Chair. A very interesting discussion and interesting debate. To me the question here is: what good will this college be able to do if they receive the empowerment they're asking for versus what harm will happen if they don't receive it? I was interested in some of the comments made by Pastor Joseph

Alexander as contained in the minutes of the last meeting on page 9. Maybe I could just again put those on the record. He explained his involvement with the Forest Lawn Bible College, stating his belief that a Bible college should represent many cultural groups. He stated that it would be most beneficial for the multicultural communities to have this bill passed in order that people from diverse backgrounds could attend Forest Lawn Bible College.

Listening to the hon. Member for Calgary-Montrose, the sponsor of this bill, I got the impression that for people from other countries who would want to come here to study their beliefs and become educated in a way that they could go back to their people and teach, in order to get a visa they need to attend a college that has certain criteria and a certain level of accreditation. So I guess the only question I still have in my mind that would preclude me from supporting this bill – because I am leaning to support this bill – is that I'd still like to clarify for sure just exactly what we would grant this college and what it would do to them in terms of their applicants from other countries who want to come here. Could they come here if this college was incorporated, or does it have to receive the status of a private bill? We referred to that earlier in our discussion, Madam Chair, and I think it would be helpful if we could clarify that a definite one way or the other.

The Chair: Just so I'm clear on your question, it is whether foreign students would be permitted to attend this college if it is incorporated by private bill.

Mr. Jacobs: Would they be able to get a visa to come here to attend the college from the country they want to come from?

The Chair: If it is incorporated by private bill.

Mr. Jacobs: Yeah. Would incorporation allow that, or do they have to receive the status of the private bill?

The Chair: Well, I'll call on Mr. Pham on this point. He's already told us that it won't.

Mr. Pham: I am no lawyer, but based on my experience in dealing with the Canadian embassy in Bangkok, a student from southeast Asia, from a country like Vietnam, who wants to come to Canada to study would only be issued a student visa if they take a full-time program with an accredited institution. In this case, if this Bible college is granted by our committee, the Bible college is still nonaccredited. Therefore, if a foreign student wants to study at this college, first they have to go to a different accredited institution to take another program, ESL for example. Then only after that they can apply to go to this college, once they are here in Canada.

Mr. Jacobs: If I may, Madam Chair. Then if they receive the application they are seeking here, that would be the starting point for them to move on towards accreditation, Mr. Pham?

Mr. Pham: Most of the Bible colleges have the dream that some day they will become accredited, and some of them have already gotten to that point, like King's College, for example. But the chance of one becoming accredited is very difficult, and it requires a lot of scrutiny from the Ministry of Learning, so I don't know how successful this will be.

Mr. Jacobs: So then even if we confer this status upon them, they still will not be able to get the immigration status from the country they're wanting to come to.

Mr. Pham: My understanding is that that is correct. The Evangel Bible College, for example, was set up in 1996, and it has been in operation very well since then. But as far as I know, it's still nonaccredited today.

10:10

Mr. Jacobs: So I guess the final question is: what, then, is the advantage of the Forest Lawn Bible College receiving the status they're seeking?

Mr. Pham: As I said before, the reason that they go through this committee is because in the past we did grant the right to the Evangel Bible College, and they just followed the same path. By passing the bill, we do not grant them the power to take in foreign students. The students still have to meet immigration requirements set out by the federal government, and that is something beyond our control. All we do is we give them the right to operate, and they certainly can do the same thing by incorporation.

Mr. Jacobs: Okay.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Pham.

Just to clarify that, that would be incorporation under the Business Corporations Act of Alberta or as a nonprofit under the Societies Act. There are other methods of becoming a legal entity, but as was mentioned in our previous discussion, certainly incorporation by private bill of the Legislature of Alberta, I would suggest, carries with it a certain legitimacy perhaps or suggestion of legitimacy.

Mr. Vandermeer: A number of weeks ago I gave a member's statement in the Legislature, and in that member's statement I spoke about freedom of speech. Another member came behind me and said: what are you doing talking about freedom of speech for that group? I said: if I don't stand up for freedom of speech for any kind of a group, then it will soon be the case that my freedom of speech will be taken away.

In this country we have freedom of religion, and if these people want to set up an institution or a college or a church, then that is fully their right. There are different ways that they could do it; this is the way that they chose to go about setting up their college. So I have to say that I will be supporting this bill. We have done it in the past for other groups, and I see no reason why we should not allow this group to have the status that they're looking for.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vandermeer. When you say "we," this particular committee on Private Bills has not approved private colleges. Other previous standing committees have, but this particular one in this Legislature has not. Just so that's clear to you.

Ms Kryczka: Well, there were some points I wanted to make. I think I still will make them despite the fact that I agree with the basic argument that was just stated so well by my colleague from Edmonton-Manning. I think that through this whole process, perhaps, we did certainly discuss aspects way more than we needed to, but I learned a lot from my colleague from Calgary-Montrose. I think we owe it to ourselves to learn as much as we can about what happens in other parts of the world from a religious aspect and also to learn to appreciate that freedom of religion is not allowed and learn about why people come here. I'm sure there are many reasons, but I just appreciate what he was saying as a motivation for people to want to attend and learn from this Bible college. That was more just for information. I don't think it has anything to really do with us approving or not approving.

I appreciate also the question about the immigration status, granting a visa to students, that if approved they still will have to attend another institution and then eventually, if that's still their goal, attend the Bible college, probably the main reason that they came to the country in the first place. But that's okay.

I appreciate the precedents, and I have only one little question other than to say that I support approval of this bill. I'm just wondering: is there any advantage at all other than optics to becoming accredited if this bill is passed? That would be my question, even though it's something we can't measure at this point.

That's my question, but I do want to make a comment about the letter from Pastor Ron Leech, that I think the accusations are very generalized, and I don't accept the validity of the generalization. You can do that easily, but it doesn't carry any weight.

So those are my comments, but I do support the private bill.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Kryczka.

Dr. Pannu.

Dr. Pannu: Thank you, Madam Chair. I missed the last meeting, at which I think some very tough questions were asked by the committee and appropriately so. Having listened to the discussion here both in camera and out of camera, I still have serious reservations with respect to my support for this bill. Some facts I think need to be reiterated. Incorporation means other than through this private bill are available to this applicant and to this institution. I want to underline that.

The college is not accredited at the moment, so for us to deem it as a credible educational institution as the basis on which we lend our support for the bill is weak. If immigration laws of this country deem accreditation of an educational institution as a critical factor in their decision to issue student visas, then I think that before we proceed with this bill, we want to make sure that in what we do, we do not either directly or indirectly circumvent the requirements of the Immigration Act, which was passed by another sister institution and should apply, and we should be respectful of it unless we have very serious reservations about the integrity of that act. In my view, it would be a sort of circumvention if we proceeded to recommend to the Legislature that this legislation be passed.

Past precedent. Again, I think we are not bound by it. I was listening to my colleague Hung Pham very carefully, and his argument primarily is that since another standing committee had done this before, therefore we are to do this if we are to remain consistent. I think the argument of consistency does not apply here.

The question raised by Bob Maskell I think is an important one. We don't want to be aiding and abetting practices which may be questionable. Not only do we not want to be aiding and abetting them; we certainly don't want to be perceived to be doing that. We need to be stringent, I think, in our demands with respect to what criteria ought to be met for this committee to lend support to this, and all the criteria that I've been trying to look at in my view are short of being met and seriously so.

10:20

The last point I want to make. The letter from Pastor Leech has several parts to it. I agree with Rev. Abbott and my colleague from Edmonton-Manning as to the implications that the letter has with respect to the freedom of practice of religion, our interpretation of it. I think we should not be a body that makes judgments on it.

However, there are other parts of the letter, I think, which are germane to our consideration, and they have to do with that one paragraph there. If the paragraph contains information that's factually true, then I think we need to pay attention to that paragraph.

That paragraph is the one which refers to the current investigation that the Canada immigration and passports department has under way dealing with the misrepresentation of the applicant for this bill to the Victory churches and the issue of taking money under false pretenses. The immigration department, as far as I know, takes these matters very seriously, and they would not have proceeded with an investigation unless they found that there were prima facie reasons to do so. Now, I'm not sure if it is indeed a fact that that investigation is under way. I think that as a committee we ought to assure ourselves if that's the case, and then that fact should be taken into consideration in the making of our decision. So that would be my last point.

I won't be able to support this request before us for the reasons that I've given.

The Chair: I understand you to say that one of the reasons is that you don't feel that there's been enough information thus far on the alleged investigation by immigration authorities.

Dr. Pannu: Yes. I think that's a critical piece as well as the other matters that we dealt with.

The Chair: Mr. Rathgeber.

Mr. Rathgeber: Thank you, Madam Chair. I find myself in the strange position that I'm in complete agreement with the hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona, and I think that might be the first time ever.

Before I indicate why, I too support my friend from Edmonton-Manning and his belief in freedom of religion. I too subscribe to that, and I believe that we ought not pass or not pass or recommend or not recommend passing of this bill based on the doctrine that this group subscribes to and teaches. I think that goes without saying. That being said, I think there are enough other reasons why we should scrutinize this application very carefully. This group has other mechanisms available to it under the Societies Act and under the Business Corporations Act, and I question why they are petitioning the Legislature for a private bill as opposed to proceeding under the more conventional ways to incorporate either a nonprofit corporation or a for-profit corporation.

I also agree with Dr. Pannu that there are a number of allegations regarding this organization and regarding the members of this organization, and I use the word "allegations" deliberately because in my view they are only that. However, in my mind they raise enough alarm bells that this application requires extraordinary scrutiny, because as I indicated in camera, it is an extraordinary application. The number of alarm bells that I have currently regarding what I've heard and the questions that I asked last week and the answers or lack thereof that I received in response to those questions cause me to be unable to support this application, and I will be voting in favour of this committee recommending that this bill do not proceed.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Rathgeber.
Mr. Maskell.

Mr. Maskell: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I'm certainly not going to paraphrase the members from Edmonton-Strathcona and Edmonton-Calder; they've said it so well. The alarm bells have been ringing for me also since the presentation that was made by Forest Lawn Bible College last week. Based on that and information provided to us since then, I too cannot support this act.

The Chair: Are there any other members that wish to be heard on this matter? Yes, Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Jacobs: Thank you. You know, I absolutely do not want to deny anyone the right to worship according to their conscience and their belief. I don't want to get involved in a discussion of interpretation of scripture as to whether it's right or wrong. I don't even want to go there because I realize that everyone could have a different view on that subject, so I don't even think it's relevant. I certainly think it's relevant that we make sure everyone has the right to worship and initiate whatever form of educational learning they want to. I absolutely, totally agree with that.

I have a question in my mind, though, that I can't quite get around. By not granting this petition, I don't understand how we would be limiting someone's right to worship or carry on with their desire to commence a Bible college. If that's wrong, somebody please point it out to me, but from what I hear, they could still carry on, they could still have a Bible college, and they could still teach. They have just as much ability to bring in other students with or without this petition. So, you know, I do need some clarification on that if I'm seeing this wrongly, Madam Chair. It's important to me because I don't want to take away someone's right to worship, but I don't see how granting this petition would enhance their right to worship.

The Chair: Well, I'll call on Parliamentary Counsel to comment, but I agree with your conclusion that, no, it certainly doesn't prevent what is already going on if this committee does not agree to the incorporation by private bill, because there are other methods of becoming a legal entity. But as I have suggested before, what it may do and why it may be before us is that it certainly may enhance the stature of an organization to have the Legislature of Alberta granting an incorporation and what could then be concluded from that by the outside world, by the public: optics.

Mr. Jacobs: Thank you.

The Chair: Parliamentary Counsel.

Ms Dean: Thank you, Madam Chair. In response to the question about freedom of religion what I would say is that the bill is simply a means by which an entity will have status. It will have rules under which it will operate, and it sets out the objects and powers. That is simply what it does. And as has been noted by a number of members of the committee, this is one means by which an entity can be created, but there are other means; for example, under the Societies Act or under the Business Corporations Act in Alberta.

If I may, Madam Chair, just comment briefly because there have been a number of members that have pointed out that they may want more information or confirmation on the issue as to whether foreign students are granted visas and their connection with an accredited versus a nonaccredited institution. Now, the committee is scheduled to deliberate on this bill today, but if there is a desire for me to go out and contact the appropriate officials with the federal government and get confirmation in writing with respect to the answer to that question, I can certainly do that. But it'll be up to the committee to determine whether they would like to postpone the decision on this matter.

10:30

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Dean.
Mr. Pham.

Mr. Pham: Thank you, Madam Chair. As the sponsor of the bill I will have to vote for the bill, because it doesn't make any sense for the sponsor not to vote for the bill. However, I do treat the concern of Pastor Ron Leech very seriously, and I will pay close attention to this Bible college if we do grant them the status today.

There were a few questions from my colleagues, from Dr. Pannu. First of all, he talked about the need to base our support on an accredited college. Let me re-emphasize the fact that it is not an accredited college. If it is an accreditation evaluation that we are talking about, then that is the job of the Ministry of Learning.

He also talked to us about the need not to aid and abet these people so that they can circumvent the Immigration Act. As we know, immigration law is federal law, and immigration is a matter controlled by the federal government. In my experience dealing with our embassy in Bangkok, a student visa is only issued to a student who attends an accredited institution. Therefore, by passing this legislation, I think we are hardly aiding and abetting them to circumvent any immigration act.

On top of that, because Pastor Nguyen is my constituent and he is a respectable member of the community, I would put on record that this man is an honourable member of society. His intentions can be questioned by other people because they may have different opinions, but I sincerely believe that he is a good citizen. Initiating this act is his right, and I don't think we should go further into that and give him false motives that he may have never had.

Thank you.

Mr. Snelgrove: Madam Chair, I think the point that you made about position or stature is exactly true, and it can work both ways. If you've granted a group a position or stature and that group then decides to split, if you don't grant the splitting side the same stature, you have in effect granted them a negative stature. So where it's completely true to say that you may be giving them a position to be equal to the other college, you're giving them no more than that. So, yes, your point is correct that there may be stature. There also may be a derogatory stature applied if you don't treat them equally.

Dr. Pannu: Madam Chair, I just want to say that the issue of immigration was something that the Member for Calgary-Montrose brought up and therefore becomes our main consideration. If this matter had not been brought in as part of the argument why we should perhaps favourably treat this matter before us, it would be less of an issue. It would be irrelevant actually. Because of immigration law the accreditation issue becomes important. If it's a question of bringing students in – and that's a part of the reason why the application is before us, so that such people could be brought in given their difficulties over there, back home; they can't get this training there, so we have to bring them here – I think the issue of accreditation is important. The credibility of this institution of which we're a part in a sense is at stake to the extent that, as you said, our decision would lend it some credibility. That credibility, in my view, should come from an educational institution. First and foremost, it should come from their peers' judgment about the creditworthiness of an educational institution. That's why accreditation standards are in place. That's why educational institutions bend over backwards to get their stamp of, in a sense, credibility from their peer institutions.

So the two matters are sort of entangled, accreditation and immigration, in the issue of the status of this institution, which could get the incorporation by other ways, you know. Clearly, the request is here before us rather than it having taken a different route, because our decision, if it's in the affirmative, would not only give stature and status to the college, but it may also be treated as a proxy for accreditation, and that's where my concerns lie. If it's an

educational institution, then it should be treated according to certain other norms, and we shouldn't be the ones who make that decision.

Ms Kryczka: Well, I guess I need to somewhat respond first, before the question, to Dr. Pannu, who I know has probably had many, many years of professional association in accredited institutions, and I don't think that's the issue on this table here. I think we had a clarification on that at the last meeting, which he missed. I feel that there is nothing now in legislation and regulation regarding divinity and the courses and certificates, et cetera, thereby issued by those institutions, so I think accreditation is not the issue, nor is immigration. It's just a fact that came out in the discussions, which we all find very interesting. We all know that in many governments at many levels there are so-called rules and that people deal with rules in different ways.

Anyway, I would like to move that the Standing Committee on Private Bills recommend to the Legislative Assembly that Bill Pr. 2, Forest Lawn Bible College Act, proceed.

An Hon. Member: With the following amendment?

The Chair: Do you want the amendment? Maybe I'll just call on Parliamentary Counsel on that amendment.

Ms Dean: Just for clarification, there's a motion that's been put forward Ms Kryczka, but committee members may recall that the Department of Learning proposed a minor amendment, and perhaps Ms Kryczka may want to rephrase her motion.

Ms Kryczka: Yes, I'd be happy to do that. I would move that the Standing Committee on Private Bills recommend to the Legislative Assembly that Bill Pr. 2, Forest Lawn Bible College Act, proceed with the following amendment: in section 3(a) by striking out "in such fields as the Board may from time to time determine" and substituting "in the fields outlined in section 5(1)(a)."

The Chair: We have that motion on the floor by Ms Kryczka. Is there any further discussion? All right. All in favour of the motion, please say aye.

Some Hon. Members: Aye.

The Chair: Those opposed, please say no.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Chair: The motion is carried. Bill Pr. 2 will then be recommended by this committee to the Legislature with the amendment as outlined.

Dr. Pannu: Madam Chair, is it appropriate to request that the vote be recorded?

The Chair: Yes, it is appropriate.

Dr. Pannu: That certainly would be my wish.

An Hon. Member: Stand up, Raj.

Dr. Pannu: I don't think it's required. That's why I'm seeking guidance from the chair on this.

The Chair: All right. What I'm going to do, then, is ask you again to vote, and then I will identify you.

Mr. Snelgrove: This is normal, for committees to record votes?

The Chair: Upon request, yes. It's certainly legitimate. It's like a standing vote, I guess, in the Chamber.

All those in favour of the motion by Ms Kryczka to recommend Bill Pr. 2 with amendment, raise your hands. We have Rev. Abbott, Mr. Jacobs, Mr. Snelgrove, Ms Kryczka, Mr. Pham, and Mr. Vandermeer. All those opposed to the motion, please raise your hands. Dr. Pannu, Mr. Rathgeber, and Mr. Maskell.

10:40

Well, unless there is any other business, I'd look to adjourn, but before doing that, I'd like to thank you all for attending these meetings. We only had two bills, but one of them has certainly kept us occupied for the better part of a couple of meetings. So thank you

for your participation and your attention to the issues at hand, and I guess we will see you next session.

Mr. Pham, you are moving that we adjourn?

Mr. Pham: Yes, ma'am.

The Chair: All in favour?

Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chair: We are adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 10:41 a.m.]