

[Chairman: Mrs. Black]

[10:04 a.m.]

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the Private Bills Committee. I'd like to welcome the new members of the committee for this session: Mr. McEachern, Rev. Roberts, and Mr. Tannas. I'm sure you'll enjoy this; it's quite an interesting committee. We have 21 members from all three parties that join together to discuss private Bills.

Today our meeting will be in the form of an organizational meeting. As you've probably noticed, in the last couple of days I entered the petitions in the Assembly, and they have been duly received. That allows us to proceed with our work. We will be making one more notice today in the Assembly. I assume you have all received the agenda for today, and I'd like to have a motion to approve the agenda as circulated. Thank you.

I'd like to welcome again this session Mr. Clegg, who is our legal counsel - thank you for your patience and the time you put in with this committee - and Noreen Jensen, who is our recording secretary and assistant. She's the one that will be sending out the notices and keeping us informed on meetings.

This term we're going to be providing each of you with a binder that will have information on the Bills as they come in. We'd ask you to keep your own binder, and as the information comes from the petitioners, insert it in your binder and bring it to each of the meetings. We'll try and get information out to you as quickly as possible as we receive it so you can be briefed on the petitioner and the Act itself before you come to the meeting. Certainly if you have any questions, please don't hesitate to contact Mr. Clegg or Noreen and they can try and help you gather some more information.

At this point I'd like to ask Mr. Clegg to give us a review of the petitions we have received to date.

MR. M. CLEGG: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I will review the petitions we have received and give a brief description of the apparent purpose of the legislation. The time span between the deadline for receiving petitions and the commencement of the committee's work is relatively short; it's a matter of only about three weeks. As a result, it's only very recently that we managed to get together the basic information. Otherwise, we might have got all this to you a little earlier. However, we do have a number of petitions, and I'll just describe them to you.

The first one, Pr. 1 . . . Mr. Tannas has a question.

MR. TANNAS: Could I ask if everyone has received a copy of the agenda and a copy of the private Bills summary? Is there anyone who has not?

MADAM CHAIRMAN: I think that was circulated about two days ago.

MR. TANNAS: I know, but somebody came a minute ago - I thought it was Dr. Elliott - and said do I have it, and I said yes. Then he went. Sorry.

MR. M. CLEGG: The first one is Dr. Elliott's Bill actually, the Sisters of Charity of Providence of High Prairie Amendment Act, 1990. This is a fairly simple amendment to the original Act of incorporation, which changes the location of the office from High Prairie to Edmonton. I've suggested that this has got a very simple aspect to it.

In a column on this chart we've put "Degree of Complexity," which was a technique we developed about 10 years ago when

the committee kind of suggested we would discuss the apparent complexity so it would assist us to plan the amount of time we need for the Bill, and A is a very, very simple Bill. In some cases the Bill has been so simple that the committee has even waived appearance by the petitioners. In some cases an appearance by the petitioners is quite an expensive matter for them because they may have to travel and bring counsel. So that is something the committee might consider in cases of Bills which are categorized as A, where the purpose is extremely simple and very, very straightforward. B are Bills which appear to be fairly straightforward but are a little bit more complex. C Bills are ones which are either fairly complicated in their structure or have an appearance of some degree of controversy about them, and D are Bills which I perceive as being extremely difficult to deal with and which might require more than one hearing date because the evidence might be difficult to assess.

The second Bill is the Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority Amendment Act, 1990, sponsored by Mr. Zarusky. It makes some minor drafting amendments to the Act but makes significant changes to the composition and tenure of the authority members, the membership of the authority and the time for which they're appointed. I've suggested that's a B.

The third is the Nechi Community College Act, which incorporates the college and provides for its objects and powers and constitutional provisions. As this is a new organization, I'm sure the members will be interested in finding out how it's going to operate. It certainly would have a B categorization, although I haven't seen anything in the documents which would indicate it would be controversial.

The fourth one is the Canada West Insurance Company Amendment Act, 1990, Mr. Mitchell's Bill. The present Bill has a limit of \$2 million on the capital stock. This will remove the limit on the capital stock and provide a minimum of \$2 million. It also broadens the application of the Business Corporations Act to the company. In the past there have been many cases when corporations have been incorporated by a private Act and for some reason they have been able to secure very, very wide exemptions from the provisions of the Companies Act and, now, from the Business Corporations Act. This corporation is saying that it sees no reason why it should have these wide exemptions and is quite happy to be bound by the relevant provisions of the Business Corporations Act, which seems to be a constructive proposal.

The capitalization and the reserves of an insurance company are governed by the Insurance Act and are administered by the superintendent of insurance. For that reason, the fiscal control of the operation of an insurance company is really a bureaucratic operation. This can be seen in a way as a facilitation for the corporation to increase its capital stock, and because of that and because of further bureaucratic scrutiny by the experts in the insurance branch, I feel this is an A or possibly a B but certainly not a matter of great complexity.

Bill Pr. 5 is The Calgary Jewish Academy Amendment Act, 1990, Mrs. Mirosh's Bill. At present the Act exempts from municipal taxes some specified property they have in Calgary. The academy wishes to have the Act amended to exempt all the property which they use for the operation of the academy. The city of Calgary has said they have no objection to this; they would find it a more convenient solution to the problem than having to consider an exemption every year. Because the municipality is not objecting to this exemption, I've given it a category B. I have not yet assessed what additional land is covered by the exemption.

Pr. 6 is an Alberta Wheat Pool Amendment Act, sponsored by Dr. Elliott. As members will know, any amendment to the Wheat Pool Act usually provokes some commentary and some opposition from farmers, and it's not uncommon for us to receive opponents attending when this Act is being amended. We haven't had official notice yet that anybody would wish to come, but that may happen. The Bill is fairly complicated and changes the way in which the pool would deal with its reserves and transfers a lot of the control on the use of reserves and earnings from being governed by the Act to being governed by the bylaws. This is obviously a matter which members will wish to be very carefully briefed on by the petitioner. I think it may be a complicated matter, and I've therefore given it a C categorization.

The seventh Bill is the St. Therese Hospital (Grey Nuns) of St. Paul Amendment Act. It's a very, very simple amendment. The Bill, under the sponsorship of Mr. Drobot, changes the name of the corporation from "St. Paul" to "Edmonton" and alters the location of their head office to Edmonton. This is because of a change in the way in which they operate their order. It is, I would suggest, hopefully a very simple matter, and I gave it an A.

The next, Bill Pr. 8, under the sponsorship again of Mr. Drobot, is the Satnam Parmar Adoption Termination Act. Mr. Parmar was adopted by his uncle when he was a child. He is now an adult and wishes to cancel that adoption because he wishes his natural father to have the relationship re-established. We do have consents of the adopting parents and the natural parents on file. Although the natural parents are still in India, his legal parents, his adopting parents, are and have been for some time residents and, I understand, citizens of Canada. This Bill might have wider implications which can only become evident when the evidence is heard, and I have tentatively given it a B.

The space for Pr. 9 may be given to another Bill if it completes its advertising to the satisfaction of the committee.

Pr. 10, under Mr. Zarusky's sponsorship, is La Societe de Bienfaisance Chareve Tax Exemption Act. This organization is already a society registered under the Societies Act. They wish to have certain properties exempted from property taxation. It is not quite clear yet whether the village who is the taxing municipality is going to consent or is to appear. I will clarify this as soon as it's absolutely certain. I would just ask the recording secretary whether we've received anything in the last couple of days. No, that has not yet been received. So it would be a B. We hope we don't have a controversy. If we do, it might be more difficult for the committee to determine.

Pr. 11 is the Campbell McLauren Foundation for Hearing Deficiencies Amendment Act, 1990, under Mrs. Black's sponsorship. This Bill slightly amends and clarifies the objects of the foundation by setting a priority for the application of its funds. Although it might be a very simple matter, I've given it a B categorization.

We have another active petition. The petition has been received from the Young Mens Christian Association of Edmonton for an amendment to the tax exemption provisions of their present Act, which has been in place for some years. The reason is that the properties are specifically described in the old Act. Since that time they have sold one property and have acquired another property. They want to have the Act amended so the exemption applies to the new property they have acquired. I understand the city of Edmonton is not likely to be opposed to this. We are asking that some documentation saying

they have no objection be filed. We have actually on file, I believe, a letter from ex-mayor Cavanagh suggesting this process and saying there would be no objection. So it appears it would be noncontroversial. Because of the fact that they weren't certain about the process they would have to go through to get this done, they have only just recently started their advertising. The rest of the documents have been received, although they were received after the deadline. We have a letter addressed to the chairman, which we'll deal with under another item, which will be requesting an extension of the deadline.

Those are the 11 petitions, nine of which had completed their advertising in time. Pr. 10, I see, had not finished its advertising in the *Gazette* until March 31, so in fact it was . . . That's La Societe de Bienfaisance Chareve. Their last insertion in the *Gazette* was March 31, so they were a week late. Petitioners who have not experienced this process before sometimes wait until the date of the session is announced before they commence their advertising, which unfortunately is a mistake because it's usually impossible to complete it between the announcement of the sessional date and the deadline. Those who are more experienced or who are lucky to work with lawyers who've done private Bills before – and there are not many of those – know that they can start earlier. So the committee in the past has not regarded it as a very blameful thing to be a week or so late with the advertising. But all the other petitioners completed their advertising in time.

So that is my report on the petitions we've received, Madam Chairman. There is another petition which I'll mention to you which I took off the latest copy, and I should mention the petition of the Victory Bible college. We had some correspondence from them which led us to expect that we would receive a petition from them, although it was obvious at a certain stage that it would be late. But it has still not arrived despite my correspondence with them about the text of their Bill. We don't have the petitions, and I suggest that we wait until we have the petitions from them, which are the formal documents which say, "Yes, we wish to go ahead." I am in discussion with them about the text of their Bills. I believe they're serious, but for some reason they still haven't sent the petitions. I will bring this to the chairman's attention as soon as they are received. For that reason I'm not suggesting we should deal with or recognize that particular petition today because it's not yet a formal petition, whereas Young Mens Christian Association have filed their petition, although it was late.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Clegg.
Are there any questions? Yes, Rev. Roberts.

REV. ROBERTS: Yes. What about the synod of the diocese of Calgary? I think that's the Anglican diocese.

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes. They again discussed with us their anticipated possible need for a private Bill, but we have not received any further documentation. We have not received a petition from them, nor have we even had any correspondence with them about the exact nature of the Bill. That, in fact, is even further away from being a formal petition than Victory Bible college, and it may be that they will not come forward with one at all. At this point it's hardly an active file.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Are there any other questions? Yes, Mr. McEachern.

MR. McEACHERN: I was wondering who's riding the Young Mens Christian Association of Edmonton is now in. That would be Edmonton-Jasper Place, would it?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, I'm not certain of the exact location. I have the legal description, but I can certainly find out which riding it's in. I may be able to give you some information from the file which will clarify that. The property they wish to include for exemption is called the Jamie Platz Family YMCA Building. It is related to a land plan. Because I'm not very much up to date with the real estate business in Edmonton, it gives me no indication of where in the city it is, but I will find out and let you know.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Thank you very much, Mr. Clegg. That was a very thorough review.

Now, do we have to make a ruling on La Societe de Bien-faisance Chareve on the late advertising?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, what we would have to do if they are to proceed is consider a motion that we would recommend to the Assembly that the petition be received and dealt with notwithstanding that they did not finish their advertising by the deadline but recognizing they have finished it as of March 31.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Clegg, is it usual? Is there a precedent for extending deadlines?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, we've had a number of cases where we've extended deadlines in the past. In fact, the general policy of the committee has been not to deny access to the committee and to the Assembly because of missing a deadline, particularly when it was such a short margin.

The deadline's major purpose appears to be to enable the committee to organize its business, because if petitions are being received as late as, say, June during a session, the committee would not have time to make proper consideration. We have regularly in each year generally recommended an extension for three or four out of the 15 or 20 petitions.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on that point?

I guess we would have to make consideration for the Young Mens Christian Association of Edmonton as well, that they would be allowed to proceed with their advertising and filing.

MR. M. CLEGG: The motion would be that we would recommend to the Assembly that the petition be dealt with once the advertising has been completed and the deadline be extended for that purpose.

MR. G. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, I would so make that motion that we agree to let them finish their advertising and then deal with their Bill at that time.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. McEACHERN: Could I suggest that we vote on the two separately? It seems they're not at the same stage and that perhaps we might want to delay a decision on the second one

until we see what they actually have done or are prepared to do. We don't have any indication of when they advertised as yet.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, do we have any indication as to what stage they're at?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, they are, in fact, at slightly different stages, because the Société de Bienfaisance have completed their advertising as of March 31. I've been advised by the Young Mens Christian Association that they have commenced their advertising and would expect to have it finished May 15.

MR. McEACHERN: What I was suggesting, then, was that we delay the decision on the Young Mens Christian Association for the moment, until we have more details on who's sponsoring the Bill, you know, where it is and what their advertising is and what difficulty level it is and that sort of thing.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: One caution I would give is that we must schedule the presentations by the petitioners, and if we're going to schedule them within the time frame we do have, we somehow have to make a decision today as to who will be coming on what day so we can give them notice of their appearance. So I would caution you on that if we delay that.

MR. SEVERTSON: Madam Chairman, the only concern I have, too, is if the advertising won't be completed to May 15. I don't think they should be on the schedule till we - you know, if you schedule for May 24, or whatever Wednesday it falls on, I'd hate to see the schedule then, before they've completed their advertising, on that one.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Is there . . . Mr. Tannas?

MR. TANNAS: One more thought, and that is that we are pretty well assured we're going to have a fall session, so the opportunity for these people to comply fully with all the regulations is there in terms of time. We've got lots of time.

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, I'd like to point out that the deadline is fixed for the whole year, and there is not another deadline set for the fall sitting. It is all one session, and the Standing Orders provide that the documents have to be filed within 15 days of the commencement of the annual session. So whereas the committee will have the opportunity to consider the petitions in the fall if it wishes to, it will still need to have an extension of the deadline if the petition is to be received at all. But it might be helpful to the committee to deal with the two separately because they're in different situations.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Clegg, we have a motion on the floor to extend the deadlines. Do you want to have that for both petitioners or for one at a time?

MR. G. CLEGG: Well, Madam Chairman, the reason I did it, of course, is because I don't think that we would want to sit around here and deny anybody a right just because they're a little bit late for one reason or another, and if we are in session, it doesn't commit us to, in fact, complete the hearings or the whole procedure to get the Bills into the House. But I would hate to be a member here and say to somebody that they can't

bring it in. So I will let my motion stand. If it's defeated, I will accept that too.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: On the motion, Mr. McEachern.

MR. McEACHERN: I would suggest that there's enough difference in the two. At this stage we don't know that the Young Mens Christian Association is, in fact, going to follow through and complete this. We don't have enough stuff to know that. The two situations are different enough that I would suggest we defeat this motion, then, and start again one at a time, treat them differently.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any other questions?

MRS. GAGNON: Yes. In favour of the motion, I don't see any difference at all. All we're dealing with is the deadline being extended to two parties, and I would urge that we go ahead and do that.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

All in favour of the motion. Thank you. The motion's carried.

All right, Mr. Clegg, I guess we will draw upon your expertise and experience again. Could you make some recommendations as to the scheduling of the petitions?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, what I have done is to suggest that we deal with two of the most simple Bills at the first meeting and perhaps one slightly less simple one to enable the committee to get into the process of dealing with the Bills. Bill Pr. 1, which is extremely simple, merely changing a name and a location of a head office from High Prairie to Edmonton, is one we could deal with, and also Bill Pr. 7, which, again, only changes the name St. Paul to Edmonton in the title of the organization. The committee might consider whether or not we would even wish the petitioners to attend to give evidence. The committee, of course, may well wish to ask questions about the operation of these corporations at the same time that the Bill is forward. It's for the committee to decide whether they would wish to do that.

The third Bill which I think we might consider on that date would be the Edmonton Research and Development Park Authority Amendment Act, which is one which has . . .

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Pr. 2.

MR. M. CLEGG: Pr. 2, which has some significant changes to the composition of the authority. My feeling is that Pr. 1 and Pr. 7 might only take a very, very short time; therefore, we could easily deal with a third Bill on that date. I would suggest that would be April 25, which is the Wednesday following our return from the adjournment over Easter.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: And then after that?

MR. M. CLEGG: Following that, the next date would be May 2. My suggestion would be that we deal with Pr. 3 and Pr. 4, one of which is a B and one of which is an A; on the following week, May 9, to deal with Pr. 5, the Jewish Academy amendment on taxes, and also Pr. 11, the Campbell McLauren Foundation, both of which are Calgary petitioners. On May 16 I'd suggest that we deal with the Wheat Pool amendment and that we reserve a full morning for that. If it turns out that there are no

opponents to the Bill, members may always later feel that we could advance another Bill into that slot as well. But traditionally there has been some discussion on these Bills, and it is a fairly significant change to the structure of the Wheat Pool in financial matters. My suggestion is that we should finish off Bills Pr. 8, Satnam Parmar Adoption Termination Act, and Pr. 10, La Societe de Bienfaisance Chareve, on May 23. If the Young Mens Christian Association have finished their advertising, which they should have done, we could also deal with them on that date or on May 30.

Now, there is some possibility of putting a little more business earlier if the committee wished and particularly if members feel there's a possibility of the House rising before May 30. That's very, very difficult to assess at this stage; it's obviously within the realms of possibility. If members are concerned about that, then we should perhaps add another Bill to the May 2 date and to the May 9 date. But it might be valuable to receive members' suggestions on these points.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Yes. Are there any comments on the scheduling?

MR. McEACHERN: I don't think there's much chance that the House would be breaking up before then, but I guess I'm not really in control of the agenda. What I'm wondering: what if we run into a certain amount of trouble on, say, Pr. 6 and have a session at it and can't make up our minds or haven't decided? Of course, we will have . . .

MADAM CHAIRMAN: In the past, Mr. McEachern, if the committee has deemed necessary, we have asked the petitioners to come back a second time.

MR. McEACHERN: Could we do that? This is what I wanted to ask. Even if the session did end, are we allowed to meet after session?

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, yes, we can certainly do that. The only minor problem then is that we wouldn't be able to report until the sitting's reconvened in the fall. But as it appears that there will be a fall sitting - there has been discussion of that - that would not have any more problem than delaying the commencement of the legislation. In addition, if we did run into a time problem, we could schedule meetings other than on a Wednesday. We can meet more frequently. It puts pressure on members, but there have been occasions when we have met at 5:45, between an afternoon and an evening sitting.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Clegg.

MR. G. CLEGG: Well, thanks again. My brother there took my point, but certainly I know - I think it was last year or the year before when we had the Wheat Pool amendment - we spent a full morning in one of the other rooms because of the Public Accounts meeting needing this space. I think we met for four hours, so that certainly is a possibility.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Is there any other discussion? Could I have a motion, then, to the effect that we tentatively accept the schedule as presented, and if adjustments have to be made, we deal with them at the time? Could we have that?

DR. ELLIOTT: I would so move.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Dr. Elliott.

Is there any other discussion? Mr. Clegg?

MR. G. CLEGG: Question.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Question. All in favour? Motion carried. Thank you very much.

Okay. Well, I guess, Mr. Clegg, if you could notify the petitioners of the scheduling, then we can start our first Bill on April 25 when we reconvene after the break.

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, what we will have to do now: we will contact the petitioners immediately and ask if these dates are feasible for them. Next, the other thing is that we will be putting all the Bills that have completed their advertising on notice for introduction. If your Chairman reports your recommendation on the two Bills that are late to the Assembly this afternoon and if the Assembly concurs in that recommendation, those Bills can be placed on notice when they have completed their advertising, which means that Bienfaisance Charève can go on notice straightaway for introduction. It's only the Young Mens Christian Association which will have to wait in the wings. We can then have the Bills on notice today if we're able to get all the introduction slips signed. Noreen Jensen will be seeking out sponsors to do that so the Bills can be introduced on April 24, the day after we return, because the notice of the Bill will appear in the Votes and Proceedings for today, which will be published and available to members on April 23. So we will then hope that all members will be able to introduce their Bills on that date so they're all available for the committee to deal with on the 25th.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Are there any other items to come before the committee? Yes, Dr. Elliott.

DR. ELLIOTT: What is the situation with respect to certain members of the committee having membership or close association with any of these organizations that are bringing Bills before us? For example, could we have rural members that will be members of the Alberta Wheat Pool, and what would their position be, sitting on this committee?

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Well, I think the tradition has been – I know I have a Bill that I'm sponsoring as well, and I would certainly leave the Chair and ask someone to take over the Chair. But I think from what we saw last year, the petitioners presented their argument and the sponsor stayed neutral and allowed the other committee members to question the petitioner. I think that's a normal way of doing it. Mr. Clegg, if you have something else to add.

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, the sponsor can really take whatever position she chooses on a Bill, whether to remain neutral or to be an active supporter of the Bill, or they're quite entitled to oppose it, because the sponsorship of a private Bill is merely that a member says, "This is a proper matter to come before the Assembly as a private Bill, and it's from my riding or from an area which affects me."

With respect to Dr. Elliott's question about members who might have a conflict, there is one particular Bill here where

there might possibly be a conflict for members, and that is the Wheat Pool amendments. If the effect of the amendments appears that it might in some way benefit a member of the Wheat Pool – and I'm not at all certain about that. I'd be glad to discuss that with any concerned member, because it appears to me that it is changing the manner of control over reserves. It will not necessarily bring any more or any less money to any one member of the Wheat Pool. But it is a fact which we should consider. If that is the case, then such members might have to refrain from voting on that Bill. It's always best to be very, very cautious in these matters, as members will appreciate. Because our quorum is only one-third of our total membership, even if we have a lot of rural members, we shouldn't have a quorum problem as a result of a number withdrawing. In the past a number of members have withdrawn from voting on Wheat Pool Bills.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lund.

MR. LUND: Thanks, Madam Chairman. That was really my point and concern. I would like to see counsel really come out with a decision on this, because I'd hate to get caught in a situation where I participated in the debate on the Wheat Pool. I know it's not the case of allocating funds; it's simply a case of changing the method whereby they are governed. So I hope we get clear direction on that before we proceed with it.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg, could you advise the members before the Bill comes forward of the nature of the Bill and if there would be any potential conflict?

MR. M. CLEGG: Yes, Madam Chairman, I will give an opinion to all committee members on this, and those who are concerned can consider that opinion.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Clegg.

MR. G. CLEGG: I'm just fouled up a little bit. I would almost believe that we wouldn't even have a quorum in this House if we were talking about the Wheat Pool, because I believe just about every rural MLA in the province is a member; regardless of whether they do business with them, they're probably a member over the last 40 years. So I wait for the decision.

MR. McEACHERN: Well, on that last point I don't think past membership could be considered a conflict of interest, but present membership might be something else.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: How be if we leave it and have Mr. Clegg develop an opinion for us as to the nature of the Bill and then advise the committee as a whole? How would that be? And then we'll deal with it as it comes closer.

MR. McEACHERN: My point was really a slightly different one that I wanted to get into, and I just tagged that on because of his statements since I'd put my hand up.

It would seem to me that in terms of – just to pick an example, Pr. 11, Mrs. Black being the sponsor. While she might not want to be in the Chair on it, the question – there's obviously no conflict of interest; she's just sponsoring this because it's from her area. If she is not a member of the Campbell McLauren Foundation for Hearing Deficiencies, then

she cannot have a conflict of interest particularly and has a right to an opinion on this, the same as any other member of this committee. That might be a good reason for leaving the Chair, so that you could in fact lobby for or against it just like any of the rest of us could. It's not a conflict of interest.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Point well taken.

Okay. Can we leave it that Mr. Clegg will give us a legal opinion on it and counsel the committee, maybe at our next meeting?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any other business to come before the committee?

MR. TANNAS: I don't know if it's business. I would like to know when we can receive copies of these proposed Bills.

MR. M. CLEGG: Madam Chairman, we are in the process of finalizing the wording in a few cases. Some of the petitioners are extremely efficient and very co-operative in getting back to me when I make suggestions. Some still don't quite understand the reason why I like to get a very rapid response. But we are almost at the printing stage with almost all the Bills. We could send committee members copies of the latest drafts, which might be a good thing. Particularly with the Bills we're going to be debating at the first meeting, we will in fact send you immediately copies of the latest drafts, and it may indeed be that those are in Bill form already. They will be finalized and printed during the time when the Assembly is recessed for Easter. That will be our number one priority during that time period.

Can I just ask the recording secretary: Pr. 1, Pr. 2, and Pr. 7; do we now have camera-ready Bills? In that case, Madam Chairman, we can undertake to distribute copies to all members today so that if they're away from the city during the Easter recess, they can take them with them.

MR. TANNAS: I would particularly like Pr. 6, the Wheat Pool. It gives me an opportunity to discuss it with Wheat Pool members in my area.

MR. M. CLEGG: Indeed, Madam Chairman, we can do that, and we'll distribute that to all members. We'll have them sent into the House this afternoon.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Actually, as soon as the Bills are ready, if we could have them all distributed, I think all members would appreciate that.

MR. M. CLEGG: We will do that. Yes.

MADAM CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Okay. I think we're ready to call for an adjournment. Could we have a motion? Mr. Lund. Thank you very much.

MR. McEACHERN: Do you think I could have two copies of each Bill instead of just one?

MADAM CHAIRMAN: If you wish.

We'll see you back in the Chamber on April 25, and have a happy Easter.

[The committee adjourned at 10:42 a.m.]