

Standing Committee on Private Bills

8:39 a.m.

[Chairman: Mr. Renner]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call this meeting to order. This is the meeting of the Standing Committee on Private Bills.

The first item of business is approval of the agenda. Before we have that agenda approval, I would like to point out to the committee that it will be necessary to amend the agenda by deleting discussion of Pr. 13. There is a copy of a letter from the lawyers representing TD Trust indicating that they would like to delay discussion of this until the fall session. So I guess if I could have an amendment to that effect. Mr. Van Binsbergen.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the agenda be amended by deleting Pr. 13.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Exactly. You took the words out of my mouth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The motion then is to approve the agenda as amended. Have we got a mover? Mr. Amery. Any further discussion? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Next is item 3, approval of the minutes. These are the minutes from Tuesday, April 26, 1994. These are fairly lengthy minutes. I hope everyone has had a chance to look at them. Yesterday they were distributed. If everyone has had a chance -- that was a rather long meeting we had last week. If I could have a motion, then, to approve the minutes as distributed. Mrs. Laing. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, all in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion is carried.

We'll move, then, to item 4. We have one petitioner to hear from this morning. This will be with regard to Pr. 4, Concordia College Amendment Act, 1994.

Mr. Reynolds, if you could ask the petitioners to come in.

[Mr. Braul and Dr. Kraemer were sworn in.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome, gentlemen. We had an opportunity to very briefly discuss the procedure next door in the Confederation Room, but I'll just go over it one more time very briefly. You have petitioned the Legislature to pass a Bill on your behalf. At this point that Bill has had first reading in the Legislature. It is the job of this committee to discuss the Bill with you, ask any questions that may be pertinent, and then recommend to the Legislature whether or not it should proceed to second reading. So that's the purpose of our meeting this morning.

This is an all-party committee of the Legislature. We have both opposition and government members. Just before we get started, I would like to have self introductions of committee members. We'll start with Mr. Wickman.

MR. WICKMAN: Percy Wickman, Edmonton-Rutherford. Good morning.

MR. PHAM: Good morning. Hung Pham, Calgary-Montrose.

MRS. LAING: Bonnie Laing, Calgary-Bow.

MR. AMERY: Moe Amery, Calgary-East.

MR. BENIUK: Andrew Beniuk, Edmonton-Norwood. Good morning.

MRS. SOETAERT: Good morning. Colleen Soetaert, Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Duco Van Binsbergen, West Yellowhead. Good morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And my name is Rob Renner, MLA for Medicine Hat. Also at the table is Rob Reynolds, our Parliamentary Counsel, and Florence Marston, who is administrative assistant for the committee. You've probably had contact with both of them.

We'll start off by giving you an opportunity to explain to the committee why you feel it's necessary for this Bill to be passed and how it will affect your college.

MR. BRAUL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen. I wonder if I could make quick reference to the summary document I've prepared and had distributed to all of you. Concordia College is an institution which originally was established in Edmonton in 1921 and moved to its permanent facilities where it's presently located in 1923. We refer to 1930 in the documentation; it should be changed to 1923. Its mission was to serve as a high school and college under the auspices of the Missouri synod of the Lutheran Church. In 1978 the college was incorporated by a private Act, and the Act was assented to in May 1978. Currently Concordia is a degree granting college and high school. It received university degree granting status in 1987, and in 1994 there will be 80 students graduating with a university degree. Approximately 1,455 full-time students are enrolled in university level classes, and 190 students are enrolled in the high school. Concordia also offers substantial continuing education courses, with more than 450 students enrolled annually in various program offerings. I'm giving you this as a background so it will help to fix the environment or background in which we're considering this particular institution.

Under the Concordia College Act, the number of members of the board of regents was established to be 12. In other words, we have a statutory provision for the number of directors to be part of the board. The manner in which the 12 are to be elected is established by the bylaws of the corporation. One-half of the current members are currently elected by Lutheran Church Canada in its national conventions, and the remaining members are elected as representatives of regions or institutions of Concordia.

Concordia College does not want to reduce the number of representatives which currently connect the college to its various constituent parts. On the other hand, Concordia has been growing at a rapid pace. Its university program enrollment increased from 694 in 1985 to the current enrollment of 1,455. The college has in fact become an increasingly important postsecondary institution to the people of Alberta. Its enrollment is open, of course, to all Albertans. It is desired to make Concordia have more of a reflection of the Alberta scene on its board of regents.

In order to assist in responding to the growing needs of the college and the Alberta community, it was considered necessary to strengthen the base of representation from Alberta. It is the intention of Concordia, following approval of this amendment, to change its bylaws to permit the appointment of three additional members from the Alberta community and, most likely, the Edmonton community. This will assist in providing a stronger Alberta base of representation to Concordia College.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is essentially the intention, the situation in which Concordia finds itself. President Kraemer and myself would be happy to respond to any questions you might have relative to Concordia College and this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

I have Mr. Amery who wishes to ask a question. Any one else who wishes to ask a question, indicate to me and I'll get your name on the list.

Mr. Amery, go right ahead.

8:49

MR. AMERY: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have one brief question. I would like to know: how would the increase in the number of members on the board make life easier for you, and what are the strategic reasons for that?

MR. BRAUL: Currently we have representation from all across Canada on the board of regents. The degree to which there is an understanding on the board of regents of the Alberta situation is not as complete as it might be if we had additional representation from Alberta. By having additional representation on the board from Alberta, there will be a greater sense of connecting Concordia College to the Alberta educational scene, to the Alberta scene generally. So the strategic purpose, of course, is to make Concordia an ever increasing presence in the education scene in the province. One of the ways to do that, I think, sir, is to increase the representation from Alberta on the board of regents.

MR. AMERY: Just to follow up, you said you now have 12 members?

MR. BRAUL: That is correct, sir.

MR. AMERY: How many people would you like to see on the board? How much are you going to increase it by?

MR. BRAUL: Well, currently we want to increase it by three. But we also want to take the question of the number of members of the board of regents out of the Act and put it into the bylaws of the association. In other words, the Act currently calls for 12 members. We think we want to keep a provision in the Act that there will always be 12 members on the board of regents, but we want to have the opportunity to increase that number to more than 12. It is the current wish of the board of regents to increase that number to 15, but that may change. There may be a need for further representation on the board of regents at some time in the future, and when that happens, they want to have the flexibility to make that decision within their organization rather than coming to the Legislature to ask for permission to make that change at some time in the future.

MR. AMERY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Amery.
Mrs. Laing.

MRS. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How many Albertan representatives do you have right now? Secondly, by putting it in the bylaws, would this then allow you to maybe cut back on outside representation like national representation?

DR. KRAEMER: We currently have five members on the board from Alberta. We have four from Saskatchewan, one from Ontario, and two from British Columbia. These happened by way of election

in the different conventions of the church. This change will allow us by the board's own appointment to expand the membership from Alberta. Presumably it could then be an Alberta majority. It is not the intention to cut back, because the college has a nationwide constituency and has support from across the country and we want to maintain that.

MRS. LAING: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Wickman, then Mr. Van Binsbergen.

MR. WICKMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, it's my understanding now that probably 99.9 percent of nonprofit organizations, foundations, and that have the right through their bylaws to amend the number of directors and such that they would have. The only reason you're here is because of the private member's Bill that was passed some time ago. This is nothing unusual.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Would you care to comment, Mr. Reynolds, on Mr. Wickman's comment that this is pretty much standard fare, that organizations normally would not have the number of directors set in a bylaw?

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, typically if you were dealing with a corporation that was established under the Business Corporations Act or the Societies Act, it would all be in their bylaws or articles of incorporation, which they could amend quite easily. In this case obviously it's done by statute, so they have to come back here to do it. It appears to me that what they're doing is saying the minimum number, as Mr. Braul said, and then allowing their bylaws to stipulate with respect to how many more they could have. So there's nothing unusual with respect to corporate entities with respect to doing that.

MR. BRAUL: If I could just add to that a little, most of the corporations we create today would say in the articles of incorporation that the directors will be anywhere from three to 12 at the choice of the annual meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Van Binsbergen.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: I'm curious about whether these board members are elected or appointed or what. Also, I'd like to get an answer to the question as to whether indeed the board can determine how it appoints its own members -- additions, that is -- and how long they will serve and so on. Am I right in drawing that conclusion?

MR. BRAUL: Well, there are two parts to the question. The bylaws are the determining method of establishing how elections will take place and who will have representation. Under the current Act the bylaws determine the method of election, the representativeness of those electors. The bylaws are within the jurisdiction of the board of regents. Of course, as an extension of Lutheran Church Canada, the Lutheran Church has strong input into what these bylaws will say and how people will be elected. It becomes a matter of policy as to how they wish to create a representativeness for their organization in terms of the governance of the college. We are proposing to add to the power of the board of regents under the bylaws by giving the constituent members authority to expand what they can do in terms of the number of regents greater than 12.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that answer your question?

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Yes, in the sense that when it says the board, that's the same as the board of regents; right? Yes. So the board can in fact determine how many members it will have if this passes and how they are appointed or elected and how long they will stay on; right?

MR. BRAUL: The board can't make that decision without passing amendments to its bylaws. The process of amending the bylaws is established in the bylaws themselves, so the board cannot necessarily by unilateral action decide at a meeting to change its bylaws. They would have to go through the process established in the bylaws before they could make those changes. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I would think the bylaws of Concordia College would not be changeable until approved by some of the constituent representatives who are connected to Concordia College.

Maybe you should add to that. I don't know the . . .

DR. KRAEMER: By bylaw the board itself can amend its bylaws. There's not a difficulty there. In fact, just in reference to the question of appointed or elected, for a period of time within the number of 12 that we had on the board, the board itself had determined to appoint as many as two representatives during a period of its history. Then it became 12 totally elected. There is a sense to revert again to the appointment approach to have the appropriate expansion in number to effectively represent the constituency of the college.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pham, then Mr. Yankowsky.

MR. PHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do members of the board get paid?

DR. KRAEMER: They are given travel expenses if they're from out of the city, but there's no payment for membership on the board. They serve voluntarily. It helps the budget.

8:59

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Yankowsky.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a question regarding the process for choosing these board members. Are they nominated from certain areas, or is there some other process that takes place, and then, of course, the elections take place? Is that the way it's done?

DR. KRAEMER: Primarily because of the location of Concordia College in western Canada, there has been a preference to have elected representatives from the western districts of the church body. So the Alberta/British Columbia district in its convention elects through a nominating process a certain number of representatives on the board. The central district, which involves Manitoba and Saskatchewan, also has the authority to nominate and then to elect at its convention. There is a national convention that happens every three years -- and by the way, the terms are three years for board members -- at which the national nominating committee may nominate and then elect in convention six members to the board. Those are not limited by region, except that there must be at least one of those six from each of the three main districts or regions of the church body. It so happens it has tended to be only one from Ontario and the majority coming from, again, the constituency of the west which is the strongest for the college.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no further people on my list. Is there anyone else?

I'll ask Mr. Reynolds if he could point out any clarifications we might need.

MR. REYNOLDS: Well, two points. One is that all the requirements of the Standing Orders have been met with respect to this petition. Secondly, I received notice in the form of a telephone message from advanced education yesterday. I'd been trying to reach them. We wrote them early on with respect to this Bill, whether they have any concerns, and they don't have any concerns with respect to the Bill, unless Mr. Braul or Dr. Kraemer have heard differently.

DR. KRAEMER: As a matter of fact, the minister has often asked me from time to time: how many do you have from Alberta? So I would assume he's most favourable.

MR. REYNOLDS: Those are my points, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Well, seeing no further questions, I'll give either of you gentlemen an opportunity to wrap up and sum up. Then I think it's time that we get on with our decision.

DR. KRAEMER: Thank you. We at Concordia College truly are serving and wish to continue to strengthen our service to the people of Alberta. We thank you for your consideration of this Bill and, of course, hope for your approval.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you for coming this morning.

Just a little bit of information on process. The committee will not be making a decision this morning as to whether or not this Bill should proceed. We will be making that decision more than likely next week, possibly the week after. As soon as that decision has been made, Parliamentary Counsel will advise you of our decision. Should we decide that it proceed, it will go back to the full Legislature and receive second reading and debate if any, Committee of the Whole, and third reading. If everything goes according to plan, we hope to have all the private Bills that the committee has recommended should proceed passed during this spring session of the Legislature.

DR. KRAEMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee members, with the absence of Pr. 13, TD Trust, this morning, we have a little bit of time. While I don't want to begin the discussion with respect to the Gimbel foundation this morning, I do want to assure myself and make sure everyone on the committee is assured that we have sufficient information to have that discussion a week from today. We have passed out to each member packages of submissions that came from a number of the individuals and groups that appeared before the committee last Tuesday. As well, there are some additional submissions from individuals and groups that were not necessarily present for the meeting last Tuesday. We're advised that the attorney for Dr. Gimbel has prepared the documents the committee requested and will be delivering them at approximately 9 o'clock today. Hopefully, committee members will have access to those documents as well, so you can study them during the next week.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, do you remember specifically what those documents were?

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was the response from Mr. Chipeur to the questions of the committee. In fact, he indicated that he would be preparing written responses to the committee's questions as well as to some of the concerns raised by the intervenors.

Mr. Wickman, Mr. Herard, and then Mrs. Laing.

MR. WICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe we had a great deal of information and many presentations that were very meaningful. I think everybody got a very clear direction that they had the opportunity to provide written submissions. Based on what I've seen, what I've talked about with people and that, I have enough that I can formulate a decision in my mind. To start calling people back for that type of thing, I think would just compound a difficult situation. I think that next week we should proceed on the basis of what we have and make a recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Herard.

MR. HERARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like some advice from Parliamentary Counsel with respect to the view that private Bills are intended to affect a few people and not the population as a whole. I'd like to have some opinion from Parliamentary Counsel as to whether or not there is an argument there with respect to the scope of what private Bills can in fact deal with. Hopefully, we could have some opinion by next week.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Mr. Reynolds, would you prepare some comments for us for next week?

MR. REYNOLDS: Certainly that won't be a problem at all. I should say with respect to this that there are two stages. We cannot stop people from petitioning the Legislature for a private Bill, unless it's clearly out of the Legislature's jurisdiction and then the Bill wouldn't be drafted. This would be a sort of area where the Bill is, I believe, properly drafted and before the committee and it's a matter of what the committee deems to be in the public interest. Yes, Mr. Herard, I certainly will draft up a little something for you for next week.

MR. HERARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Laing.

MRS. LAING: Mine was covered by Percy. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. SEKULIC: My question is: how are amendments handled if the Gimbel Bill should be approved at this level and goes back to the Legislature and is debated there? How are amendments handled?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are two ways amendments can be introduced. The petitioners have already indicated that they wish some amendments introduced, so should the committee decide the Bill should proceed, the recommendation from this committee would be that the Bill proceed with amendments. But the Legislature, as it has the right with any Bill, would be free to introduce further amendments.

MR. SEKULIC: How does a sponsor of the Bill participate and approve amendments? The Legislature surely couldn't do it on the sponsor's behalf. Who would be the party representing the sponsor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: While it is a Bill that is being passed on behalf of the petitioner, it's still within the purview of the Legislature to pass laws to the satisfaction of the Legislature. Obviously there would be consultation with the petitioner. I wouldn't expect further amendments would be proposed without consulting with the petitioner. The bottom line is that this Legislature is responsible for the laws it passes.

Mr. Pham.

MR. PHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After I receive the information from the Gimbel Foundation today, I would like to ask them to come back for another session because I had a whole bunch of questions for them last time. Because of the time constraint and also because of an understanding that they would submit their written response to the concerns people raised first, I need to review that information. Then I would like to ask them any outstanding questions that haven't been addressed by the written response.

9:09

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you're certainly entitled to that opinion, Mr. Pham. I think my intention is to get a feeling and, if necessary, have this come to a vote today, whether or not that indeed is necessary. Mr. Wickman has indicated that he doesn't feel it's necessary; you feel it is necessary. I think that's really what we're discussing today.

MR. PHAM: I didn't want to bring all the intervenors in, but I did want to bring back Dr. Gimbel and his staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should point out that it is within the rights of this committee to request any of the intervenors or the petitioner, in fact anyone they feel would be beneficial in helping to make this decision. I think it would be reasonable, though, that if we choose to bring back one or two of the intervenors, we would at least have to advise the rest of the intervenors that we are having further hearings and invite them to come back as well. Even if we don't want to ask them a specific question, they would have to be informed that we are reconvening.

Mr. Beniuk.

MR. BENIUK: Perhaps legal counsel could respond. If we pass a private Bill which has a major impact in an area where government policy should have an impact and the two are not co-ordinated, where does that put us as a Legislature? In other words, are we tying the hands of the Minister of Health, that until this Bill is reamended, it's binding on all successive governments? Because this isn't just dealing with one individual. This is dealing with virtually reorientation in policy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that's similar to what Mr. Herard has asked Parliamentary Counsel: to prepare some information for us for the next meeting.

Keep in mind that this committee does not decide the fate of this Bill. This committee makes a recommendation to the Legislature, and the Legislature decides whether or not the Bill should pass. So this Bill would require the majority of the Legislature to vote in favour of it before it could ever become law.

MR. BENIUK: But if it did proceed and set a course that the government didn't set yet . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, presumably if the Bill passed the Legislature, it could only pass with the support of the government.

MR. BENIUK: So it becomes government policy through a private member's Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't say that. It becomes a law of Alberta, not necessarily government policy. But I think that is precisely the discussion Mr. Reynolds is going to need to address when he prepares some briefing notes for us.

Do I have any other indication from the committee on the direction I should take as chairman with respect to calling back intervenors or the petitioner? Mr. Herard.

MR. HERARD: Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that we not call back the petitioners and the intervenors. I think the issue is well documented and we have enough to go on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have a motion, then, on the floor that we not call back any further intervenors or the petitioner.

Mr. Smith on this.

MR. SMITH: No, I'm on the next point. I'm ready to roll on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any further discussion to this motion? Mr. Pham, would you like to address it?

MR. PHAM: You cannot put a negative motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I thought of that, but I understand the intent. He could also say that we proceed next week without further intervention.

MR. HERARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PHAM: I certainly would not like to bring back the whole group of intervenors. I really want to see the petitioners again so I can ask them any questions I may have, but if the wish of the committee is not to have the petitioners come back again, then I would have to make my decision with what I have. That may not be favourable to the petitioners. I don't know whether it's fair to them or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A little conference. Excuse me.

Is there any other discussion, then, to the motion? All in favour of that? Mrs. Laing.

MRS. LAING: Could you rephrase the motion before we vote now, because we . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Would you like to rephrase your motion in a more positive manner?

MR. HERARD: Being a positive type, I would very definitely like to proceed next week without calling back the intervenors and the petitioners.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All in favour of that motion then? Any opposed? Two opposed. The motion is carried.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Indeed, it's a pleasure to be here this morning.

Is everybody clear on the process as to what happens next Tuesday? We walk through, I assume -- and perhaps I'm the only

one who's not clear on this process -- we debate and then make a recommendation from this committee to the Legislature to either not proceed or proceed to bring this Bill into Committee of the Whole. Is that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second reading.

MR. SMITH: Second reading, then Committee of the Whole.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then Committee of the Whole.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Everybody understands it better than me. Fine; that's great.

MR. WICKMAN: Just one question, Mr. Chairman. From a technical point of view, there are a couple of technicalities in here. If a Bill is recommended to proceed, it goes forward. If it's not recommended to proceed, it dies here; does it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. WICKMAN: Okay. Secondly, if it is recommended to proceed and it goes to the Legislative Assembly for committee, my understanding is that when the Bill is read, if somebody does not speak to it at that particular time, even though that occurs before question period, further debate on that Bill will not be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that's not correct, Mr. Wickman. That happened last time when this committee recommended that a Bill not proceed. That's when the debate needed to take place, because there were individuals in the Legislature who wanted it to proceed. If the Bill proceeds, then it receives the full debate any Bill would. Anyone has an opportunity to speak to the Bill at any stage throughout second reading, committee, and third reading.

MR. WICKMAN: Yeah, you're right, Mr. Chairman.

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Mr. Chairman, now I am confused about the procedure. If we recommend that the Bill not proceed, then it dies right here, or can it still be resurrected in the House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we recommend that the Bill not proceed, then I as chairman will stand up in the Legislature in the routine under reports from standing and special committees. I will say: the committee has had under recommendation the following Bills and recommends that the following Bills proceed, the following Bills not proceed, and the following Bills proceed with amendment. After I give my report, I make a motion or I'm deemed to have made a motion that the Assembly concur with the recommendation. That's the point and the only point where someone would be able to debate the committee's recommendation not to proceed. If you concur with the committee's recommendation to proceed, you have ample opportunity to get involved in debate when the Bill comes up on the Order Paper. If you do not agree with the committee's decision when the committee says not to proceed, then you must voice your objections immediately while that motion is under debate, so to speak.

9:19

MR. VAN BINSBERGEN: Okay. Can members of this committee speak at that time as well against the recommendation from this committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. SMITH: If I were to assume one alternative that could possibly be taken, that we would like to see fuller debate on the issue and it's put on the Order Paper, is it put on the Order Paper as government business or is it put on the Order Paper on private members' day, or is it Saturday morning 6 till 8?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Standing Orders are written such that private Bills are discussed in the same time frame as government Bills and motions. However, I along with the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader have had an informal agreement since we started introducing private Bills that we would alternate the days, and it's worked quite well. So we would have second reading on a day that would normally be considered a private members' day and then committee on what would normally be a government day. That's why I've had to get unanimous consent from the Assembly when I stand up and ask unanimous consent to waive standing order such and such. Because the Standing Orders say that they need to be discussed on government Bills and motions, but we have an agreement with the House leaders that we alternate. There are basically four processes, so we alternate it.

MR. REYNOLDS: If I could, Mr. Chairman, just to supplement. There is a specific time given in Standing Order 8 with respect to when private Bills are considered. For instance, they're to be considered on Monday and Thursday afternoons after the daily routine, and on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings. It says the order of business shall be Government Motions, Government Bills and Orders, and Private Bills. So it comes just after government business.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The most difficult part about this job is negotiating with the House leaders to get things on the Order Paper.

Any other discussion then? Are we all set to go?

Mr. Beniuk.

MR. BENIUK: Just a concern. Will we be sitting till August with this Bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I certainly hope not, because I'm going on a vacation in August, but I guess anything's possible around here.

Okay, then, committee members, I will entertain a motion to adjourn. Just before I do, I want to remind everyone that in addition to the Gimbel Bill we'll be discussing next week, we also have about three or four other ones. So make sure you have done your reading and are familiar with all the Bills, not just this particular one, because we will be discussing all the Bills next Tuesday and making our decision.

With that, then, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Mr. Amery. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. The meeting is adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 9:24 a.m.]