



# **Standing Committee on Private Members' Bills**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 6 – June 6, 2002**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-fourth Legislature**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS  
2002**

Doreen Hamilton, Chair  
Regina Wascana Plains

Greg Brkich, Vice-Chair  
Arm River

Denis Allchurch  
Shellbrook-Spiritwood

Carolyn Jones  
Saskatoon Meewasin

Arlene Julé  
Humboldt

Judy Junor  
Saskatoon Eastview

Warren McCall  
Regina Elphinstone

Daryl Wiberg  
Saskatchewan Rivers

Kevin Yates  
Regina Dewdney

The committee met at 10:36.

**Ms. Ronyk:** — Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the committee. We are now ready to begin. And as the first item of agenda is to elect a Chair, I ask for nominations for the position of Chair.

**Ms. Jones:** — I nominate Ms. Hamilton.

**Ms. Ronyk:** — Ms. Hamilton is nominated. Are there other nominations? If not, will someone please move that nominations cease.

**Mr. Yates:** — I move that nominations cease.

**Ms. Ronyk:** — Mr. Yates has moved that nominations cease. Is that agreed? There being no other nominations, Ms. Hamilton is declared elected as Chair of the committee. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, committee members. We have, this morning, delegations for each of the Bills and we would call them in order, have them come forward and present. There is one Bill that I'm sponsoring. At that time I would ask Mr. Brkich if he'd take the Chair and I would introduce the guests and then we would open for questions. And then a motion on the Bills that are before us, that then would be transmitted to the House.

So to the items before us, the consideration of private members' Bills. So I would call the witnesses on behalf of Bill No. 301, the Conference of Mennonites of Saskatchewan, to come forward.

Welcome and good morning. I'll ask your sponsor, Mr. Peters, to do the introductions. Thank you.

**Bill No. 301 — The Conference of Mennonites of  
Saskatchewan Amendment Act, 2002**

**Mr. Peters:** — To my left is Dr. Ernie Baergen; and further left is Al Klassen.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Would one or the other be presenting just an overview of the Bill and what you hope will be accomplished by the Bill. And then we'll open for questions of the committee.

**Mr. Baergen:** — Okay. The Conference of Mennonites of Saskatchewan exists under a private Act. And it was connected with the Conference of Mennonites of Canada and also with the General Conference Mennonite Church which was an international North American organization.

Now the international organization decided to fold and form into the Canadian branch and the US (United States) branch. And that involved a change of name so that the Mennonite Church of Canada became the Mennonite Church Canada and the decision by our group in Saskatchewan was to follow that pattern and have our name changed to Mennonite Church Saskatchewan. So that's the nub of it.

**The Chair:** — That's very straightforward and very succinct.

And we thank you. I'll open up to questions from the committee.

**Ms. Julé:** — I have no questions. It appears quite evident that this is a name change for very good, commonsensical reasons. And therefore we have no problem with this Bill.

**The Chair:** — Any further questions or comments? I think it just remains to be said that you've been active and doing very well in Saskatchewan. And we appreciate you being part of the fabric of our province. So with a name change we expect the same good work will carry on.

And I'll ask for a motion on the Bill . . . I'm sorry, we'll first have the Law Clerk's report.

**Mr. Ring:** — I've examined this private Bill and I'm pleased to report it's drawn in accordance with the rules of the Legislative Assembly respecting private Bills.

I'm further pleased to report that in my opinion it contains no provisions which are at variance with the usual provisions of private Acts on similar subjects or which deserve special attention of the committee. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — And now I'm told we're going to go through the Bill clause by clause. And then I'll initial it to make it official. And so first we'll call for a motion to adopt the preamble.

Preamble agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

**The Chair:** — And I would conclude by saying:

Therefore Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan enacts as follows:

An Act to amend The Conference of Mennonites of Saskatchewan Act.

With that I'll sign it and we'll get it moving into the Assembly and thank you very much for being with us this morning.

Could I now have a motion from the members to report the Bill? Moved by Mr. Yates. All those in favour? Carried.

Moving right along, I've asked Ms. Jones to bring forward her delegation from the Sunnyside Nursing Home.

Well good morning and welcome. Some of us were able to meet you in the hall but I'll ask Ms. Jones to formally introduce you.

And then going through the procedure, as I stand corrected from the last one, is then we'll hear from the Law Clerk about your Bill, and then we'll hear presentation from you and a description of the Bill.

So Ms. Jones, if you would introduce please.

**Bill No. 302 — The Sunnyside Nursing Home  
Amendment Act, 2002**

**Ms. Jones:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. I have with me this morning Mr. Allen Fowler who is the administrator of Sunnyside Nursing Home, and Mr. Clifford Holm who is the solicitor for Sunnyside Nursing Home.

**The Chair:** — Thank you and we'll now hear a report from our Law Clerk on the Bill before us, No. 302.

**Mr. Ring:** — I've examined this private Bill and am pleased to report that it's drawn in accordance with the rules of the Legislative Assembly respecting private Bills.

I'm further pleased to report that in my opinion it contains no provisions which are at variance with the usual provisions with private Acts on similar subjects or which are deserving special attention. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. If we could have from you a brief introduction to the Bill and an overview and then we'll ask for questions from the committee.

**Mr. Holm:** — Okay, basically there are . . . I've identified or you will see that there are three, basically three main components to the proposed Bill.

The first component in the main purpose behind the proposed Bill was to bring forward two amendments to allow for making the operations of Sunnyside more efficient and to expedite the structure of the membership of the corporation and the number of directors of the corporation.

With respect to the membership of Sunnyside Nursing Home it certainly was open to Sunnyside to bring forward specific amendments just to tinker with the wording of the Act. This would have had the effect of making section 9 of the Act as the one to set out the parameters of membership. However, the problem with that — and was readily identified by the membership of Sunnyside — is that as the . . . as the things changed in future, as they felt the need to make changes, they would always have to come back to the Legislative Assembly to make amendments, which is a, as we found out, is a time-consuming and costly mechanism to do that each time we required a . . . to tinker with membership.

So in order to avoid that, Sunnyside suggests in this proposed Bill that the bylaws be made the vehicle for establishing the parameters for membership in the corporation. And then, of course, any such bylaw changes that would be required in future would come before the membership of Sunnyside Nursing Home and would not require the time and the cost of coming before the legislature with each one.

We also suggested a change to the number of directors and that was for the very purpose of just bringing it in harmony with the bylaws, to have a flexible number rather than a set number of directors.

The other aspects that come out of this Bill were sort of ancillary to that and that was the name change. We felt that if we were coming with an amendment, we ought to look at that

aspect as well and deal with that in this proposed amendment. Sunnyside Nursing Home — and I will have Mr. Fowler give a little bit of the history to Sunnyside — but it's been in existence almost 40 years. And names have changed. Nursing home is not sort of the name of . . . that we normally have for these type of institutions any more. And we thought we'd try to make it more modern to incorporate the name of the sponsoring organization and change it to the Sunnyside Adventist Care Centre.

And then finally the third component of the Bill was the transitional provisions that you'll find at the end of the Bill, which basically provide that the new named corporation, Sunnyside Adventist Care Centre would continue to be liable for the obligations that exist with respect to Sunnyside Nursing Home, as well as to continue to be entitled to the benefits that accrue to Sunnyside Nursing Home as they exist today.

That's basically an overview of the amendments as you have them. And I'm just going to ask Mr. Fowler if he would give some background to Sunnyside.

**Mr. Fowler:** — Thank you, Madam Chairperson, members of the committee. The Sunnyside Nursing Home was opened in 1965 as a 66-bed institution. Three years later, in 1968, an additional wing was added and it now constitutes 106 beds.

Sunnyside Nursing Home is one of more than 350 medical institutions operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church around the world. It's been my privilege over the past 37 years to have worked in five of these institutions: two of them here in Canada, the other three were overseas.

Sunnyside is located on the south bank of the South Saskatchewan River right next to the exhibition grounds in Saskatoon. It has a beautiful view of the river. It's a very, very nice and peaceful location. Through the years we have served hundreds of residents of Saskatoon through the nursing home facility and it is our hope that we will be able to continue that service on down the road.

The intention of the name change — I'll just comment on that briefly — was to more closely identify it with its parent organization which is the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and also to come up with more modern terminology to describe the institution. Nursing home — the name nursing home — is becoming quite archaic today. And it's the intention of Sunnyside that one day — and we have plans in the works now — that it would be expanded to incorporate seniors' housing as well. And so it was felt that by changing the name to a care centre, it more . . . it described in a more concise way exactly what the institution was all about.

I believe that's all that I have to say on the issue. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — I'll open up to questions of the delegation from the committee. Again I think you presented very clearly and straightforward, and we appreciate hearing some of the plans for the future of the organization and the centre. So I guess we could then go to . . .

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Thank you for your presentation, gentlemen, and Mr. Fowler. And I'd just like to commend you on the fine work and services you're

providing for the many seniors in and around Saskatoon and I'm sure throughout the province.

As far as the name change goes, I'm wondering whether there has been just a thorough . . . I guess a thoroughness attended to as far as whether there's conflict with any other care centres in the province, and whether or not there will be clarity to the general public when they read, care centre, that they'll understand that this is a nursing home as such under a different name — care centre in this case — and what kind of services it will provide.

I'm just wondering if there's been any question from the general public or from your organization on whether that will provide clarity to the public, whether there's any conflict I guess would be a better way to put it with any other services in Saskatchewan?

**Mr. Fowler:** — At this point in time I'm not aware that there's any such conflict. There are, as I review these type of facilities in the province to date, very few of them carry the name nursing home any more. Many of them are referred to as special care homes, some are referred to as centres such as we're proposing here. And so I'm not aware that we're in conflict with any . . . that this confuses the role of the institution in any particular way.

**Ms. Julé:** — Okay. Thank you very much. That's the only question that came to mind and I thank you for your answer.

**The Chair:** — Any further questions of the delegation? Okay. Then I think we'll take the clause by clause motions again and maybe to speed things along we'll start with Mr. Brkich and then I'll ask for this side's response and we'll go through this quickly.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

**The Chair:** — We just got so efficient there.

Thank you. And now a motion to enact . . . and Mr. McCall moves that we report the Bill without amendment. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, enacts as follows:

An Act to amend an Act to incorporate Sunnyside Nursing Home.

Thank you very much for taking the time to be with us this morning and safe travels. And we'll report this now to the Assembly without amendment.

I'll now leave the chair and ask . . .

**The Vice-Chair:** — Good morning. I guess the Bill up before us is Bill No. 303, The Saskatchewan Association of Rural

Municipalities Act.

I will ask Ms. Hamilton to introduce those appearing before us, and if they can give a brief overview of the Bill.

**Bill No. 303 — The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Amendment Act, 2002**

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Well thank you. I get to view these good-looking committee members from both ends of the table.

I introduce to you this morning Mr. Ken Engel who is executive director of SARM (Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities). And next to Mr. Engel is Mike Morris, the manager of legal services for SARM as well.

**Mr. Engel:** — Thank you. Good morning, committee members. The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities has a long history of serving rural municipalities in the province. We were established in 1905 so we're as old as the province and about to celebrate our 100th anniversary.

And over those years, since we were first established, we've continued to offer programs to our municipalities to assist them in any way that we can. And that's probably the best way to describe why we're here today is to enhance our services to our municipalities.

There's three different aspects to this Act to amend our SARM Act, and the first being to accommodate municipal districts in as members of our association. The amendment to the SARM . . . or to the RM (rural municipality) Act that's going through will allow rural and urban municipalities to form together under the name of municipal districts as opposed to . . . so there'll be opportunity for urban municipalities, rural municipalities, and now municipal districts.

And so this will just allow us to also have those people or those municipal districts as members because right now we're limited to rural municipalities.

The second thing is to establish a property insurance program. We've got a lot of experience with offering insurance programs to our members. We've been involved in a liability, self-insured liability insurance program for the last 15 years that has operated very well, and it's been a saving, constant saving for our members as far as premiums is concerned. And certainly following the September 11th incident . . . Like we're somewhat shielded from the impacts on the reinsurance costs because of the fact that we're self-insured in Saskatchewan here.

And we've also been involved in other insurance, like our disability insurance program, since 1967, and we've got other programs that we offer that are also run internally.

So we've certainly got a lot of experience with self-insurance programs and the property insurance will just allow us to expand the insurance coverage for municipalities into the property area.

Certainly property insurance costs have gone up as well significantly since September 11. In the past year . . . For this

year, we're in a brokered program for our members so there's group insurance that they can buy, but it's brokered. And so the premiums that are received go outside of the province; they don't stay in the province.

Under our program or under a self-insurance program, they would be entirely in the province.

And the last item there is just a housecleaning kind of thing. It'll change the name of the officer from secretary-treasurer, an old term, to the current designation of my position which is executive director.

So those are the three areas.

**Ms. Hamilton:** — Could I add, Mr. Brkich, as well that unlike the other two Bills before us this one has the ability to impact on other groups and organizations, and SARM has done their homework with Government Relations on that. The insurance brokers, when they found that the insurance would be on a voluntary basis, I think now have agreed to have the Bill go forward. And Government Relations looked at that in light of the changing world when we talk about the municipal districts.

And I think that they have done, as I said, a good job of contacting others and talking to them about the Bill. And with that, we're pleased to bring it forward this morning.

**The Vice-Chair:** — Well thank you. And I'm glad you did your homework; it looks like you have. I will ask for the Law Clerk's report.

**Mr. Ring:** — I've examined this private Bill and am pleased to report it is drawn in accordance with the rules of the Legislative Assembly respecting private Bills.

I'm further pleased to report that, in my opinion, it contains no provisions which are at variance with the usual provisions of private Acts on similar subjects, or which are deserving of special attention. Thank you.

**The Vice-Chair:** — Thank you. Is there any questions from the floor?

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good morning, gentlemen, it's good to have you here. I know this Bill has been in the makings for quite a little while and that you were looking forward to having it move ahead and passed.

Mr. Engel, I'd just like to ask you a question regarding the implications of the municipal districts and what that will actually mean for urban and rural municipalities that now have the opportunity to, I guess, join forces if I'm hearing you correctly; that in some aspects they may do that and, I take it, would be advantageous to them.

Could you give us some examples of how that may happen?

**Mr. Engel:** — I think the idea of the municipal district is that there's towns and there's RMs out there that may want to join together and form one administrative unit, and the question then becomes what do we call ourselves. Do we call ourselves a rural municipality or an urban municipality? And they can

choose to do that still, or now they can also call themselves a municipal district.

And so it just provides, I guess you could say, an easier movement into that change for their people. Like they would no longer be simply the town of or the RM of, they could change the whole title and therefore accommodate everybody.

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you. Do you see that this may become the trend in the years ahead of us? So that we may end up, you know . . .

**Mr. Engel:** — I know personally in my past, I've met with municipalities and talked about this kind of thing, and where there was several towns and a couple of RMs that were talking about doing this, and I know of some areas where they're considering this kind of thing.

Our position is that we support that. Wherever the people involved wish to do that, our position on it is if it's something that's of an advantage to the community with regard to economics or social reasons that they would want to do this, we would certainly support them in every way in doing that and encourage them to look at those options if they are something that would be of a financial benefit to . . .

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you. And I'm sure that I heard the word voluntary in your presentation and I think that that's very good because it would certainly have to be on a voluntary basis. Thank you.

**Ms. Junor:** — I'm just wondering from . . . I think it's from a legal perspective, if there's any impact or conflict with the intent of the content of the proposed cities Act?

**Mr. Morris:** — I don't believe so. I've reviewed the cities Act, but this simply gives the . . . you're speaking now of clause 3, I assume?

**Ms. Junor:** — Well any . . . yes. I think more the . . . what made me think of it was the levying of . . . levies on municipalities participating in the insurance plan and some of the powers that are contemplated in the cities Act to municipalities or . . . so.

**Mr. Morris:** — That would have no application on the cities. That would apply only to the rural municipalities who are participating or rural municipalities or municipal districts that are actually participating in these plans.

**Ms. Junor:** — Okay. Thanks.

**The Vice-Chair:** — Any other questions? If not, we'll vote on the Bill, clause by clause. And if it's all right, we'll do like the previous Bill, just go around the table and if that . . . so I guess the first motion would be . . . to adopt, would be the preamble.

Preamble agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

**The Vice-Chair:** — This Act:

Therefore Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan enacts as follows:

An Act to amend The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities Act, Bill 303.

Agreed.

A motion to report the Bill without amendment. Ms. Junor.

I want to thank you for coming and having a very well report and being very informative, and I wish you the best of luck in the future. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — While he's initialling, I'll entertain a discussion on . . . Usually we would look at the organizations that are before us, and there is an ability for the committee to make a decision to waive the fees and charges. And they would be in the order of about \$250. So on each Bill we would discuss that.

We've usually done that in the past for religious organizations, non-profit groups, that kind of organization. So I guess we could go through each of our delegations this morning and see if that merits the waiving of the fees.

So we could begin with a discussion on the Mennonite organization of Saskatchewan that was sponsored by Mr. Peters. Discussion?

**Mr. Yates:** — I would move we waive the fees, \$250.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Is this a non-profit organization?

**Mr. Yates:** — It's religious. They're non-profit. It's customary that we do for religious and non-profit organizations.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Then I agree with Mr. Yates.

**The Chair:** — So further discussion to the motion to waive the fees for the Mennonite organization? All those in favour? Carried — seeing no opposed.

The Sunnyside Nursing Home sponsored by Ms. Jones. It's the Seventh-day Adventist group.

**Ms. Jones:** — I think that they also would fit the category of religious organization.

**The Chair:** — And you'd like to move that?

**Ms. Jones:** — I would move that.

**The Chair:** — All right. Discussion? All those in favour? Seeing no dissension, agreed. Carried.

The Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities.

**Ms. Jones:** — They don't fit.

**Ms. Julé:** — The Saskatchewan Association of Rural

Municipalities is an organization for service to the municipalities. And I'm not aware of any intent on their part to be a for-profit organization either, in any way or form. So I think we need some further discussion on this and I would be really happy to hear from other members of the committee.

**The Chair:** — I guess I would ask of Ms. Ronyk if we have any experience with SARM or SUMA (Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association), and have there been fees waived for them in the past?

**Ms. Ronyk:** — I don't have an answer to that question. My expectation is that no, it usually is charitable or religious. But they're a little bit in-between. They're not a corporation in the business sense. So it's really up to the committee.

**Mr. Yates:** — Well in my tenure here, this is their second time before us. And in the debates previously we did not waive the fees, based on the fact that they don't fit into The Non-profit Corporations Act or they don't fit into the general criteria we used in the past.

Now that was based on that conversation and discussion. They were before us two years ago. And we didn't, didn't waive the fees at that point.

That's all I can say, is that if we're going to be consistent and we didn't waive it two years ago — and perhaps we need to have a larger examination of the issue of what we waive — but being consistent with what we've done in the past, we didn't waive it two years ago.

**Ms. Julé:** — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Madam Chair, I certainly concur with the comments made by Mr. Yates but I do know that any SARM members actually within municipalities, rural municipalities, get a remuneration for their attendance at meetings and so on, and I think as well for their travel. And I'm not aware of any salary as such. There may be that for the executive of SARM. I'm not too sure but I know that the remuneration is sort of like a . . . (inaudible) . . . at the municipal base.

So I agree that we maybe should look into the rules a little bit further here and get some sort of a determination from the Legislative Assembly on what to do about these kind of situations.

**The Chair:** — I think we can give that to ourselves, but Ms. Ronyk first, for some homework to do on that, to be consistent with the previous discussion. And it wasn't brought to my attention or I don't think brought forward here, that they were requesting the fees be waived either. I think they were aware of the fees and charges.

**Ms. Jones:** — . . . if the amendment passes, they've just declared themselves a corporation. So I think that they're funded through their membership fees and ought to be able to withstand that charge.

**Ms. Julé:** — I think I'd feel a little bit more comfortable if we had some further discussion on this and we're advised, advised properly on it before we make a decision whether or not this . . .

**The Chair:** — Are you making a tabling motion on that then?

**Ms. Julé:** — I will make a motion on that, yes. I think it's important.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Julé makes a motion that we would table this discussion until we've had the further discussion occur. Discussion? Ms. Jones.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well I'm not positive on our rules, if tabling motions are subject to discussion.

**The Chair:** — Oh probably not.

**Ms. Jones:** — But my question is: is this the only business that this committee would normally undertake in this session of the legislature and is it worth reconvening a committee meeting to consider a \$250 fee?

**The Chair:** — I will entertain that because it is a question rather than a discussion of the . . . And Ms. Ronyk suggested to me that this would complete the deliberations of the committee for this session.

A question, Mr. Yates?

**Mr. Yates:** — Well a point of clarification, I guess. In coming to a determination on this issue, I would like to have some information on the number of Bills we have a year and what's the impact, is it budgeted for. It would appear to be a very, very small impact either on the organization or on the government.

And are we in a position to change those rules, you know, anyway? Do they fit into some other purview as to what fees we can and cannot waive and how we interpret it? I don't know that. Is there some other jurisdictional issue here that . . . Whose budget does it come out of, you know, is it a Board of Internal Economy issue?

All those types of things which, before we get into discussion, I think we need to know. It may be none of those. May be we have the independent ability to decide, I don't know.

**The Chair:** — We'll have the answer that is the knowledge that we have today, and then we'll ask Ms. Ronyk for your . . .

**Ms. Ronyk:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. The rules, with respect to private Bills, permits the committee to make a determination as to the remission of fees, but that's all it says. It doesn't give any guidelines, so it has been by practice that the committee has done so with respect to charitable and religious organizations.

But I would have to pull together the information on, you know, on the numbers of Bills and the occasions on which we've remitted fees and that kind of thing and bring that back to the committee.

**The Chair:** — Is this a further to your question?

**Mr. Yates:** — Well yes. Just on a, I guess, a point of further clarification because on a tabling motion we cannot discuss it.

I guess over my three years experience on this committee, the costs we're going to spend researching this and that will far, far exceed paying everybody's fees for the number of Bills that have come forward in the three years I've been here. Because we pay 90 per cent of them anyway, most of them are charitable organizations or churches.

**The Chair:** — I think I'm going to call you to order now because this sounds more like debate than it does . . .

**Mr. Yates:** — I'm suggesting that if she withdraws it, I'll agree that we pay the fees.

**Ms. Julé:** — Well, it's difficult for me to make a decision on whether to withdraw this motion or to go ahead and, I guess, there's more members that will vote to defeat this motion.

I guess, what I'm asking then, is that we have some further clarity on what constitutes a non-profit organization more so than what would constitute a religious or charitable organization. That seems to be fairly clear. But non-profit organization, I think we just need some clarity on that. If I had that I would be satisfied, so that in further committee meetings we could make some good judgments and determinations on things like this.

So I will withdraw the motion on the condition that we have further clarification on what constitutes . . .

**The Chair:** — As a Chair, could I suggest that our first meeting of this committee generally is to just review the Bills and there's not a lot discussion on them at that point. So perhaps the first meeting that we come together next session we would have some more information on that and we can make a determination before we meet with the organizations, we'll have more information. Would that suit the committee? Okay.

So the motion is withdrawn.

**Mr. Allchurch:** — Madam Chair, does a decision have to be made now whether to have the organizations pay their fee or can it wait until the next sitting of this committee?

**The Chair:** — I'm alerted by the Clerk that it needs to be in this fiscal year and that the organization has already paid their fee, so this is a discussion of giving back.

Mr. McCall had his hand up, and I apologize for not recognizing you in order.

**Mr. McCall:** — That was just my point, Madam Chair, is that we can have this discussion at the outset of the next round of business for the private members' committee, but the expectation of payment was there from the outset for SARM. The precedent of payment for SARM was there from the outset so if we want to have a broader conversation about, you know, what the guidelines should be, that's all fine and good but it shouldn't impede the work of this committee in that regard.

So I think we should go ahead, we should levy the charge or we should keep the charge, and if we want to have this broader conversation, let's do it next time.



**The Chair:** — Okay. I sense we're all at that same place now. And the cost of printing the Bill, I've been told, is \$40. So it would be \$210 is what we're talking about here in the waiving of the fees.

**Ms. Jones:** — Well I don't . . . I mean unless you're going to waive it, you don't need a motion. So I move that we adjourn.

**The Chair:** — Well we have one more item of business I'd like Mr. Ring to take us through. It was given to you — the standard transitional provision. And he's making a recommendation.

Mr. Ring, do you want to just give us an overview of what you're suggesting and we could make a motion on that?

**Mr. Ring:** — Certainly. To start the discussion, I'll indicate to the committee members that this standard transitional provision was included in the two Bills that you just passed, which was the Conference of Mennonites and then the Sunnyside Nursing Home.

And what the transitional provision does is, when a name change is made to an organization, it changes its legal identity the same way as a person would. And so that way the new organization is still responsible for the obligations, any outstanding lawsuits, but they also retain the assets of the former corporation.

So that's, I think, an important point — that a group could not come to change their name in order to avoid liability. And a transitional provision is usually something a lot of people overlook, although it is important.

The second aspect of this is the two provisions in subsection (2) and (3) that deal with the provisions in wills, in so that if a will is made to organization A, 25 years later, 30 years later when the will is probated, organization A no longer exists because it's changed its name to organization ABC. If someone wanted to try to contest the will, they would have an opportunity to say that entity no longer exists. We'll deal with it another way.

This way there would be less question of the will and the money that was designated for that organization would go to that non-profit organization.

So this would be a standard one that we'd use in particular situations, or parts of it would be used in particular situations. And I urge the committee to adopt it.

**Mr. Yates:** — I would move we adopt the transitional clause as presented by the Legislative Law Clerk.

**The Chair:** — Further discussion? All those in favour? None opposed? It is carried.

And now I would entertain the motion from Ms. Jones. I agree that probably everyone would be in favour. Thank you for your attention to the matters before us.

The committee adjourned at 11:30.