

[Chairman: Mr. Evans]

[10:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We do have a quorum, and I'd like to call the committee to order, please. I'd like to welcome all of you here today. It's wonderful to have an all-party committee, and I'm very pleased to be the chairman of Private Bills. As you're well aware, I am a rookie here, and I'm certainly a rookie to chairmanship of Private Bills. So if you'll bear with me, with the able assistance of Michael Clegg, Parliamentary Counsel, and Noreen Jensen, secretary, I'm sure we'll do a fine job on behalf of those private citizens and groups in the province who have need to come before our committee.

With that brief introduction, I'd like to turn the Chair over to Michael for some comments and organizational matters.

MR. M. CLEGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll accept the floor, but I can't accept the Chair. I'm going to sit with my back towards you, which is not very polite, but *Hansard* tells me that if I swing around to face you, they don't pick up what I'm saying very clearly from the microphone.

The three purposes of the meeting today are, firstly, to enable me to very briefly describe the Private Bills procedure to members -- some of the members of this committee are already familiar with that, but many of the members are new to this committee -- secondly, to give you a brief overview of the petitions we have received and which the Chairman will be presenting to the Assembly today, and thirdly, to enable you as a committee to decide in which order you would like to deal with these. I will have some suggestions in that regard, partly constrained by our ability to have these Bills typed and typeset. As you may know, the typesetting of private Bills and private members' Bills has been an in-house operation for a couple of years, which saves a lot of money but does put a lot of work burden on our office. With a large number of private members' Bills and, in addition, 13 private Bills, we are going as fast as we can. We have taken on additional staff to do that.

The Chairman has introduced me. You know who I am. I'm the Parliamentary Counsel, and I act as counsel to this committee and also fulfill the role of Clerk of the committee while I'm here. Noreen Jensen has joined me recently as my administrative assistant, and one of her many duties is to be secretary to this committee and to assist with its administration. We hope we'll be able to ensure that your committee operation is a smooth one during the session.

The session may or may not be a long one. Many of us have hopes in that regard. With the anticipation that perhaps it will not proceed a long way into August or reach September, we want to make sure you have had a chance to consider all the Bills that have been received and will therefore be suggesting that we look at three Bills per meeting to start with, at least until we get into some which are a little more complicated.

What I would like to do now, Mr. Chairman, is just to read briefly through the report you have all received copies of, explain in very brief terms what the purpose of the Bill is so far as we know it at this stage, and indicate to you how difficult the consideration might be. At the outset, I would say that for the first time in several years we have slightly fewer Bills. In the past we've had about 20, and one year we had 27. We have 13 so far. We may have more that come in later, and I ask for your indulgence. We don't have any which seem to me at this point to be very controversial or very complex.

We don't know, in the case of adoption Bills, whether we

have a difficult situation until we hear more about the evidence. There have been many cases where the committee has felt they could grant the requested adoption of an adult without too much difficulty. We occasionally find that the facts do bring some controversy; for example, where the relationship has been rather short between the person to be adopted and the adopting parent. But it may well be that these are all relatively straightforward, and we'll know more when we hear the petitioners.

The first Bill is The Canadian Union College Amendment Act. They have a section in their Act which allows them to receive premiums and pay annuities as a kind of insurance scheme for the members of the college, and they really wish to amend that and to have a provision that it's not deemed to be insurance under the Insurance Act. Their solicitor will explain to us the reasons why they want that exemption. It has already been granted to a similar organization last year, and I don't think it will be controversial, but we'll expect them to explain to us and justify it.

The second one is extremely simple. They merely wish to change their name by adding the word "the" so it would then be "The General Hospital." They have to do this because the federal income tax authorities are complaining that there's some confusion about their exact title, and they've caused them some difficulties in their tax exemption status. That is such a simple Bill that I've given it a double A suggested rating, which means it is extremely noncontroversial and we might deal with it without even having the petitioners come here and go to the expense of presenting argument.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, because somebody in income tax has said, "Well, Grey Nuns doesn't sound right; it should be The Grey Nuns," they've got to go through all this rigmarole?

MR. M. CLEGG: Somebody has said: "Is it the same organization? Because we have one organization called The Grey Nuns and another organization called Grey Nuns. Prove that they're the same." It does seem to be a very narrow view to take. The Land Titles Office has not had any trouble with the difference, but the federal income tax authorities have made so much difficulty over this that they have gone to this expense indeed.

MR. HYLAND: Probably some little clerk in some little office in some little building somewhere that can't read more than three words at a time or something has put them through that.

MR. M. CLEGG: The only reason we can't deal with that immediately is because they haven't finished their advertising. I'll deal with that issue when I've gone through the Bills.

The third one: members who were here in the previous Legislature will remember that we granted tax exemption status, with the agreement of the local municipality and the city of Calgary and all parties, to certain lands and a number of improvements on Canada Olympic Park. We merely wish to add a new building, the Olympic Hall of Fame, to the tax-exempt properties. The municipal district has consented, and I will be making sure the city of Calgary doesn't have any objections to this. On the basis of no objections from any party and a fairly logical basis for the Bill, my suggestion to the committee would be that they might deal with this without calling Canada Olympic Park and their lawyers to come to Edmonton to deal with the Bill.

The next one, Pr.4, is a long and complex Bill but the issues

are not, I would imagine, controversial to the members, although the members will obviously be very interested in the foundation and what it's going to do. It revives the foundation with certain amendments to the original Act and provides for its constitution. We won't have the Bill ready for the committee for a couple of weeks, and when we do I would suggest that you might need some time, because it will be a very important foundation in the Edmonton community if it achieves its objectives as a kind of co-ordinating foundation.

Pr.5, the Misericordia Hospital Amendment Act, 1989, makes a number of changes in the constitution of the hospital relating to its general powers and the way it deals with its finances, and this list will explain to you why they need these changes. Having looked at the Bill, I don't think they will appear to the committee to be controversial, but I know members have a close interest in the hospital and may wish to ask questions about the way it's operating and its future.

Pr.6 is the Calgary Research and Development Authority Act, 1989. They need a large number of amendments to their original Act, and because of the fact that they've had some amendments in the past and are now seeking further amendments, which they will explain to the committee, they have asked if we could completely re-enact their basic legislation and give them a new Act so that they don't have to deal with an original Act plus about five or six amended statutes. There's no provision to provide office consolidations for private Acts as there is with public Acts, and they said it would be a lot simpler for them if we were to re-enact the whole thing from the very beginning. They will come here and explain what the changes are and why they want them for the committee. It's fairly detailed, but again one would hope the contents should not be controversial. Members will obviously wish to be asking questions. Particularly the Calgary members, I'm certain, will have a number of questions they wish to ask the proponents.

Pr.7, the Calgary Foundation Amendment Act, deals with the Calgary foundation legislation and makes a few relatively minor amendments to their legislation. Although it's a simple piece of legislation, I'm sure members might wish to ask questions and would like to have the petitioners here to explain the changes.

The next four Bills, Pr. 8, 9, 10, 11, and also 13 are all Bills to deal with the adoption of adults. Some of the provinces within Canada have legislation which permits adults to be adopted under the general public law. Alberta is one of several provinces that has a public policy that the process of adoption is available only to minors. There are various reasons for and against adult adoptions. The obvious reason which would give concern is the risk of undue influence. Therefore, if any adult wishes to be adopted by or any person wishes to adopt an adult in the province of Alberta, their only route is by private legislation.

There are many reasons why adoptions have been sought by adults. In the past one of them, and perhaps the easiest which the members had to deal with, was where a brother and sister had been fostered for many years, and then the parents later wanted to adopt them. One by that stage was 15, and the other was 19. The 15-year-old could be adopted, and the 19-year-old couldn't. The committee had no difficulty in considering that the two obviously should be in the same legal relationship to the parents. There have been many other cases where children had lived with parents for many years but never had gone through the stage of adoption until it was too late, perhaps not realizing that they couldn't achieve the adoptive status after the age of 18.

There have been one or two cases where stepfathers or stepmothers wish to adopt a stepchild after a certain number of years of a second marriage.

All these Bills here have slightly different backgrounds to them, which will be explained to you by the petitioners when they come. The first is a nephew. The natural father is in India and has been there all his life. The nephew has been here for very many years, living with the uncle who now wishes to adopt him, has the consent of the father, has had custody of the minor for about 10 years, has lived with him as if he was his father. Pr. 9 is for the adoption of a stepdaughter by a stepfather. Pr. 10 is for the adoption of an adult who has no living natural parents and has been a de facto part of the family for very many years. Pr. 11 is the adoption of a stepdaughter, and Pr. 13 is the adoption of a stepdaughter.

The circumstances and the length of the relationship will be issues the committee will wish to consider and will wish to look at when the presentations are made. At this point in time, I don't know whether we are going to be presented with any difficult decisions on these or whether they will be representing cases which can be assessed easily by the committee. In previous years we've had some difficult questions such as proposed adoptions of people who are not yet residents of Canada, which were declined.

The only one I haven't mentioned is Pr. 12, which deals with the service of articles by a student at law in Alberta. He has completed articles in Ontario but has not yet become a member of the Ontario Bar but will be sometime in the future. He wishes to be able to serve two separate three-month periods, for a total of six months' articles. The Law Society is sympathetic to his position but does not have the power to permit articles to be served in separate periods, because the Act only talks about a period of articles. We are currently looking at the text of the Bill, and before Mr. Kovacs comes before the committee, he hopes to have the consent of the Law Society to this. In other words, he will only be asking for legislation which would permit the Law Society to do something the Law Society considers reasonable. Therefore, I hope by that stage the Bill will be, at least from the point of view of the profession, a noncontroversial proposal. That Bill is the other one which has not yet completed its advertising and will also not be complete until July 15, so it can't be brought before the committee until that time.

So that is the list of Bills which we have for consideration. None of them appear at this point to be raising difficult questions of law. Only one or two of them are complicated Bills, because of their long and detailed provisions.

There is another matter which I'm bringing before the committee for their consideration, and that is a consequence of the very brief sitting we had in February, the calling of the election, and the resumption of the business of the Assembly a few weeks later. Many of these Bills were planned for the Fourth Session of the 21st Legislature, which was a one-day sitting in February. All the advertising was done in January and February, some in December. The bills were presented, the fees were paid, and then of course nothing happened because the Assembly never did any business. I felt that the committee would be willing to consider a motion that would allow the advertising that had been done for the previous session to be deemed to be good for this session and the fees paid which have not yet been refunded to be deemed to be fees paid for this session. It would seem to be a fair solution. The advertising has been recent, and the advertising in general terms merely referred to an application being

made to the 1989 session of the Alberta Legislature.

It would be my suggestion to the committee that if the committee allowed this advertising to be deemed good for this sitting, no member of the public would be disadvantaged by not having had notice, because the notices have already been published in the *Gazette* and in the local newspapers. I would think any member of the public would assume the Bill would be brought forward at this session. Of course, no proceedings were held, and therefore the fee should perhaps really be still available for this sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Likely we have some questions, so perhaps before you go on any further.

MR. BRASSARD: Well, it's premature, but in response to Mike, if it took a motion, I would move that we accept the requirements that had been complied with earlier in February as being valid and carried forward into this session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We prepared a resolution, and I believe Noreen has passed it out to everyone.

MR. M. CLEGG: It's just a very simple one, Mr. Chairman, and you might like to read it to the members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the committee recommend to the Legislative Assembly that advertising carried out for a private Bill pursuant to Standing Order 86 for the Fourth Session of the 21st Legislature be deemed to be good and sufficient advertising for the same private Bill presented to the current session. Do we require a seconder, Michael?

MR. M. CLEGG: No, no seconders are required in any proceedings of the Assembly or its committees except on a couple of formal occasions like the election of the Speaker and the throne speech debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour?

MRS. HEWES: I have a question, Mr. Chairman. To Mr. Clegg: does this apply to all Bills? I didn't get that impression from you. There are only some of them that were in the advanced stage. Could you tell us which is which?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, I believe I can remember. I will read the ones that I recall. This is to the best of my recollection. The ones that commenced their advertising for the winter session that we didn't have: Pr. 1, Pr. 3, Pr. 4, Pr. 5, Pr. 6, Pr. 7, Pr. 8, and Pr. 10. I think they commenced their advertising, but it hadn't been quite completed by the February 20 deadline. This is the difficulty I'm having. I know many of them commenced it. Many of them wouldn't have completed their advertising, but it has now been carried out. There have been two insertions in the *Gazette* and three in weekly newspapers. Pr. 11 was completed, and Pr. 13. So most of them in fact completed their advertising prior to the deadline that would have applied to the winter sitting.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you, Mr. Clegg.

Further to that, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have to be apprised of that -- what ones were in the advanced group -- and satisfy ourselves that no one would be disadvantaged by the

advertising not being done again. You're the only one that has seen the content of these Bills, and you are assuring us of that at this point, are you?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the committee that with the exception of Pr. 2 and Pr. 12, that have not yet completed their advertising, we'll have to deal with that as a separate issue. All the others completed their advertising aimed at the winter session. Two or three of them completed it a little late with respect to that session but nevertheless well before the deadline for this session. All of that advertising was commenced after the permitted commencement date. Our Standing Orders allow advertising to start any time from November 1 in the previous year, and all the advertising was started after that date, so it's good advertising from that point of view. It's my belief and my opinion that no member of the public should be prejudiced by the advertising not being repeated. I cannot imagine that anybody would believe that the Bills would not be brought forward in this session. In almost every case the advertising merely stated: at the 1989 session of the Alberta Legislature.

MRS. HEWES: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clegg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Tom Musgrove.

MR. MUSGROVE: I already got an answer to the question that I was going to ask. Thank you, Brian.

MRS. MIROSH: Well, Mr. Chairman, I see a number of adoption Acts on our agenda, and in previous years we've had the same occurrence. I'm just wondering if this is now becoming a mechanism or avenue for people to adopt adults over 18. If we're seeing so many of them on our agenda, I'm wondering why, and I'm wondering if there's something wrong with some of our statutes that they have to come through private member's Bills for this procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll try to answer that, and then certainly Mr. Clegg can continue that answer. There is no current Alberta legislation to deal with the adoption of adults, and that's the reason it does come before this committee. Whether or not any of the members here would deem it a requirement or expedient to introduce that kind of legislation remains with the members. Michael, do you have anything else?

MR. M. CLEGG: Not really, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that it's increased. People see it happening. I think that in the past, for example, a stepfather has just lived with the situation that he's not the lawful father of his stepdaughter. He is her stepfather, not her father. Maybe they have wished to do this but have seen that it wasn't provided for in the Child Welfare Act to adopt them or they had not bothered to do so. It is always possible that the government might wish to consider some windows in the Child Welfare Act that would allow an adult adoption in the case of a stepfather or allow an adult adoption in the case of siblings. But there are many cases which are unusual in different circumstances. As things stand at the moment, unless there is an initiative to change the public law, this committee will, I'm sure, continue to receive applications and will continue to have to make judicial decisions as to whether the circumstances are appropriate for adoption or not.

MRS. MIROSH: May I just have a supplementary. Why do we have to have adults being adopted at any rate, once they're adults? Are there specific reasons in each case?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, if I just may speak from experience. In most cases the petitioners have expressed only an emotional wish to put the adult person in the same position as other children in their family. We have never granted an adoption in a case where any of the family members objected to it. We haven't had any situations where there has been a legal barrier which they're trying to get over. It has essentially been for family building and to give them the emotional feeling of creating the family as closely within the law as they can do. Those really have been the arguments that have been presented to this committee in the past.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think, Dianne, with respect, we do have an opportunity to carefully review the rationale for any particular private Bill. We do have that opportunity to vote against it if we don't feel it is in the public interest.

I think there was one other hand. Yes, Marie?

MS M. LAING: In terms of your experience, in fact, are there many that are rejected or refused? I don't know how many adoptions occur in a year, but this seems like an insignificant number really. But I'm wondering, I guess, if in fact there are other jurisdictions where there are adult adoptions provided for.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there are indeed some jurisdictions in Canada where the law does allow adult adoptions. I can't offhand tell you which those are. However, this committee has only rejected one that I can recall, and that was because the putative adoptees were not yet Canadian residents. They were in South America, and they were nephews and nieces of the petitioners. The committee took the position that they didn't feel they should be attempting to create a filial relationship with people who are not yet Canadian residents. It appeared that the correct step would be for them to get immigrant status and then apply again. That was rejected.

We do get a number of inquiries. Both the petitioners and solicitors have discussed with me the possibility of getting adoption through this committee, and I have tried to outline what the history has been. There have been a couple of cases where the relationship between the adult to be adopted and the adopting parents was relatively short. Without wishing to put anybody off -- because I have no right or duty or power to say to people that they can't apply to the committee -- I have mentioned that one factor the committee would always consider is the length of the relationship. As a result, there have been two people that phoned me on a casual basis. I said, "You can certainly apply if you wish, but the committee might be a bit concerned," particularly in view of the fact that in one case the relationship was less than a year. "I might encourage you to come back after three or four years if the relationship is still strong and the family feeling is still strong." I've always made it very clear when I have these informal discussions that anybody can apply to the committee, and I don't wish to be a screen or in any way put people off, but the committee has always regarded length of the relationship as a factor.

The number of applications we have is slightly more this year than in the past, but I think the total number of adoptions that have been granted in the last 15 years I've been here has

been about 10. We may see an increase; that's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, committee members. Ready for the question? All in favour, please signify with yea or raise your hands. Opposed? Carried.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there's another matter which we may deal with at this meeting, or if the committee wishes, they may wish to think about it a little bit further and consider it at a later date. After that, of course, we should look at our agenda and determine which Bills we deal with next week.

There are, as I mentioned, two Bills which have not yet completed their advertising. One is the Grey Nuns, for the "the." The reason they haven't completed theirs is that they didn't finally run out of patience in arguing with the federal government about this point until fairly recently and came to the conclusion that, much to their irritation, they would have to seek this private Bill and, therefore, didn't start their advertising procedures until fairly recently. They won't finish until July 15 because it takes some time to arrange publication in the *Alberta Gazette*.

The other one is Mr. Kovacs' Bill. The solution to his problem and the planning of his legal articles training is one which was only commenced fairly recently. He only was able to conclude fairly recently, in discussion with the Law Society, that he needed private legislation and has therefore only started his advertising. It has started; it will be complete in two and a half weeks, July 15. But again, it will be complete about a month after the deadline.

Both of those petitioners have asked if the committee would recommend to the Assembly that the deadline be extended to allow their petitions to be dealt with once the advertising has been completed. There was some difficulty in establishing when this session would start and when the deadline would be, although petitioners have been free to advertise before the session was announced, of course. These two particular parties weren't aware that the solution to their legal problem was a private Bill until very recently, and in both cases I think it can be seen that a delay until next year would cause them administrative problems. The Grey Nuns hospital would have difficulty with the tax authorities, and Mr. Kovacs would not be able to continue his legal training the way he hopes and which I believe the Law Society sees as reasonable, so they have asked the committee's indulgence in this matter.

Now, the members may wish to consider this and deal with this resolution to recommend that the deadline be extended. They may wish to do that, say, next week when they've considered the matter further, or they may be ready to deal with it now, Mr. Chairman. I leave it to you to decide.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, to get it on the Table, I'll move that the deadline be extended for Pr. 2 and Pr. 12 to accommodate these applications during this session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BRASSARD: Mr. Chairman, could you tell us when the cutoff date for the petitions was and if you have any petitions pending other than those before us?

MR. M. CLEGG: The cutoff date, Mr. Chairman, was June 16. This is all we have. We haven't received any petitions after the deadline. We may do, of course, and if we do receive them, I

will bring them to the committee and the committee can determine their disposition.

These petitions were received, including Pr. 2 and Pr. 12, before the deadline, the only defect being that they hadn't completed the advertising. All the other documents were presented in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee, I'd like to make something known at the outset, and I believe that I will turn the Chair over to the vice-chairman for this particular issue. Pr. 12, the Jerry Dan Kovacs Bill is from a young fellow who is working in my office during the summer. He has completed his articles in Ontario, except insofar as taking his training, if you will, at the law school. He is working for us for a three-month period of time. If he's successful in completing his studies in Ontario and being admitted to the Bar in Ontario, he intends to come back to Alberta, to our firm, to complete his articles and then be admitted in the province of Alberta.

There is no pecuniary interest in this with respect to my position. However, out of an abundance of caution I think it's prudent for me to turn the Chair over to the vice-chairman, absent myself from this discussion, and then I will return once the matter is completed.

Thank you.

[Mr. Brassard in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on the motion that we extend the date to allow proper . . .

MR. MUSGROVE: Is the advertising going on right now?

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, the advertising is currently going on in both cases; in fact, it's been completed with respect to the newspapers for Grey Nuns but not quite with the *Gazette*. You have to give the *Gazette* quite a long lead time. If you want to publish in the *Gazette* for July 15, for example, you have to give them notice by the end of June. It's about 12 working days. It's quite a long deadline.

Mr. Kovacs has started his advertising. It hasn't been completed yet either. His notice will be published on July 1 and 15 in the *Gazette*, as will the Grey Nuns. He has started his newspaper advertising. I think there have been two publications out of three.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: For the committee, could you put a date to the completion?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman. In both cases they'll be completed by July 15; the second insertion in the *Gazette* will see them completed, which is about three weeks from now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion on this motion?

MRS. MIROSH: Mr. Chairman, are we talking specifically about Pr. 12?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two of them. Two motions, Pr. 2 and Pr. 12, I believe, in regard to the motion.

MRS. MIROSH: I don't have any problem with Pr. 2. But with

regards to Pr. 12, if we were to accept this, would it set some sort of precedent for others who want to reduce their articling time? [interjections] The advertising specifically? Oh, sorry; not the issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think your question is premature in that we're really not at that stage of making a decision. It's really simply a matter of extending the deadline . . .

MRS. MIROSH: The advertising deadline.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: . . . to comply with the regulations. Okay?

Mr. Hyland, you had a question?

MR. HYLAND: I was just going to say that if we allow him to extend the advertising, it doesn't mean we accept the principle of the Bill.

MRS. MIROSH: I see.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion, then, on this motion? Can we call for the question? All in favour of this motion? Any opposed? Motion carried.

[Mr. Evans in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, I believe you want to speak about a suggested order for presentation of the petitions.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I know that the committee would like to make progress on dealing with the Bills, and I will make a suggestion as to what Bills might be dealt with in the first two weeks: on June 28, which is next Wednesday, and July 5. One of the factors we have to consider is the . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: We'll not be in session July 5.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's not been determined, so I think we'll . . .

MR. M. CLEGG: Should there be an adjournment, of course, our suggestion would then extend to the following Wednesday, which is the 12th. Because of the very heavy load of Bills, one of the factors we have to consider is that we want to be sure we will have the Bills printed and available for the committee before the date of hearing. In addition, for those Bills where we're going to actually ask the petitioners to attend, we will have to contact them and make sure they can come on those dates.

My suggestion is that on June 28 we would deal with Pr. 3, which is the Canadian Olympic Park Property Tax Exemption Amendment Act, 1989. That is one of the ones which I suggested was very noncontroversial. If the committee were to agree today, we could deal with that without having the petitioners come. As I mentioned to you, the purpose of the Bill is merely to add one single building, the Olympic Hall of Fame, to the buildings which are exempted from property tax. The Act already exempts the jumps and the bobsled and luge runs and a maintenance building and several other buildings. This is an addition of one building. However, if any members would wish to speak to the petitioners, then we can always ask them to

come. There's been no contact with them yet which would suggest that they wouldn't have to come. So in that regard I'm in the committee's hands.

I'd also suggest we deal with Pr. 7, which is the Calgary Foundation Amendment Act, 1989, which is a very straightforward Bill. I'm sure the petitioners can explain why it is that they want the relatively minor administrative changes to their Bill.

The third one is Pr. 1, which is The Canadian Union College Amendment Act, 1989. Members will recall that that Bill was one where they're going to amend their section which permits them to have some kind of in-house insurance program, which they will explain to us.

I would suggest that we might deal with those three Bills on June 28, which wouldn't be a particularly heavy program. We can certainly get those Bills typeset and introduced in the House and ready for the committee's consideration by that date.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Could we have someone move? Marie Laing. Any discussion?

MR. BRASSARD: As much as I can respect the unnecessary inconvenience of people coming forward all the way to Edmonton to present the Bill, when we haven't had any prior information about any of these Bills, I really do feel it's incumbent that we do meet with the presenter, particularly in Pr. 3. It seems that some of these are so insidious that they're almost incidental, but we've been trapped in that kind of situation before. Without any prior information about that Bill, I personally would like to at least have the opportunity to discuss it with the presenter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Roy; I think particularly Bill Pr. 3. It seems like we've got a whole bunch of Bills where we gave them tax exemptions. Some of them initially have been supported by the municipalities. Now they're coming back, and we're getting questions every day: what is the government going to do to replace the tax dollar to the municipalities they're taking possible tax dollars away from? I think we have to have these people come -- it maybe seems like a simple Bill -- and explain to us why it should be done. Does that mean every time they add another building on that site, they have to have a private member's motion to exempt it? You know, we could go on for ever and ever, and then somebody else comes along and wants exemption. What about all the community halls and that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's really an initiative of the taxing authority. Without the approval of that taxing authority, we wouldn't be dealing with that kind of proposal. However . . .

MR. HYLAND: In one case we did. It may or may not have

been the right thing to do, but in one case we did. That brought a lot of others out. Sometimes the taxing authorities change after elections, and the new council gets a different view and they're tied in. Whereas the Olympic Park even without this Bill can still go to the city council every year and get the taxes on this building removed or refunded. According to the Municipal Government Act, the municipality has full authority to do that. They're just shifting it onto somebody else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's my understanding that the motion we're debating right now is really the order of presentation of the Bills. I believe that if we want to make any change to the norm, which is that the presenters would be here, we would do that by motion. I'm getting the impression that that's not the feeling of this committee.

Are there any further comments on the motion with respect to the order of the presentation of the Bills? Call for the question then.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour: Pr. 3, Pr. 7, and Pr. 1? Opposed? That's carried.

Thank you.

MR. M. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the next meeting, whether it's the 5th or the 12th, I would suggest that on that day we might deal with the Misericordia Hospital Amendment Act. We'll have that one typeset by then, particularly if the House adjourns for a few days. We'll catch up. Pr. 8 and Pr. 9 are the first two of the adoptions Bills: the Omprakash Panjwani Adoption Act and the Claudia Elizabeth Becker Adoption Act. That is a fairly arbitrary selection of the the first two adoption Acts, and I feel that handling those three Bills on that day would not give us too heavy a load. If we deal with those on July 12, it means that we could probably deal with the balance of the Bills on the following three Wednesdays, which would avoid us risking coming too close to the end of the sitting with private Bills.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the next meeting, whether it be July 5 or 12, do we have someone to move the order as indicated?

MR. BRASSARD: I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Roy. Any further discussion on it? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

I think that's everything we had on the agenda, committee, for today. That being the case, a motion to adjourn. It's unanimous. Pat Black. And we will meet next Wednesday. Thank you very much.

[The committee adjourned at 10:49 a.m.]