



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 7 — December 5, 2006



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-fifth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE BILLS
2006**

Ms. Judy Junor, Chair
Saskatoon Eastview

Mr. Glen Hart, Deputy Chair
Last Mountain-Touchwood

Ms. Doreen Hamilton
Regina Wascana Plains

Mr. Don Morgan
Saskatoon Southeast

Ms. Sandra Morin
Regina Walsh Acres

Mr. Lyle Stewart
Thunder Creek

Mr. Kevin Yates
Regina Dewdney

[The committee met at 10:30.]

The Chair: — We're ready to go, everyone. We'll call the meeting to order. The items on the agenda today are petition 301 and petition 302. And the first thing we'll do is have the committee Clerk report on the petition for the private Bill, petition 301.

Ms. Woods: — Well I've provided to each of you a copy of the Clerk's report in regards to both petition 301 and 302. You'll note that I've set out the three requirements that they have to meet. The first is rule 88, which is the filing deadlines, and this rule has been complied with. The second requirement is in rule 89 with regard to payment of filing fees, and that also has been complied with.

The third requirement is regarding the publication of the notice of petition. And you'll note there that they've published their notice in *The Saskatchewan Gazette*, and that they have to do on two occasions, which they've done. And they've also published in the *Regina Leader-Post* and *The StarPhoenix*. That rule requires them to publish on four consecutive days, and as you'll note there, that they've complied on that regard too.

So this petition from the Hotels Association of Saskatchewan is in order.

The Chair: — Thank you. Then we need a motion to accept the report of the Clerk on petition 301.

Ms. Hamilton: — I would.

The Chair: — Thank you. All in favour?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. Then the report of the Clerk on petition 301 is accepted. And now we'll have the report on petition 302, private Bill.

Ms. Woods: — Once again you'll see that the three rules have been complied with, with regard to the Full Gospel Bible Institute. You'll note with regard to their publication of the notice, they did it in *The Saskatchewan Gazette* as required and just in the Saskatoon *StarPhoenix*. That's because their particular area of influence or catchment area, yes, is more with regard to Saskatoon, so they don't have to publish, you know, further than that. So once again they have complied with all the three rules.

The Chair: — Again we need a motion then to accept the Clerk's report.

Mr. Hart: — I'll do it. I'll so move that.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Hart. Mr. Hart's moved that. All in favour?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. That is carried. Next then we need . . . You have a report or you have the piece of paper that says this

is the seventh report of the committee. I need a member to move that we accept the draft of the seventh report.

Ms. Hamilton: — I would so move.

The Chair: — Ms. Hamilton, thank you very much. Is that all agreed upon?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — And that's carried.

At our last meeting, which was April 20, the following document was tabled by the Law Clerk, and that's Standing Committee on Private Bills, the report of the Law Clerk on limited degree-granting status by a private Act. And Mr. Ring is here; he could make some comments on that.

Mr. Ring: — Thank you, Madam Chair. My only comment would be that committee members have the report and, when the committee meets to consider the two Bills with respect to the petitions this morning, we may want to set aside some time to discuss the degree-granting status issue.

I did have something of a recommendation in the document that I've tabled. But I would prefer that the committee have some type of a discussion with respect to that, so that I don't presume what I think the committee would like to do. And there are some options there to be considered with respect to the . . . how this degree-granting status has sort of slowly moved along, as well as the two letters from the universities in the province.

The Chair: — Mr. Yates.

Mr. Yates: — Thanks very much, Madam Chair. Going over the report I noticed that there was a great deal of interest by the universities on the issue of degree granting. Do you see any value, Mr. Ring, in actually having the universities meet with the committee at some point?

Mr. Ring: — The committee could extend an invitation to the two universities if we have a meeting date to ask them to appear if they would like to. Given the two letters that I received from them, I think it would be . . . from my point of view, I think it would be beneficial to hear from the universities at that time. And then they can respond to questions, indicate to the committee where their particular concerns are. And I believe you would be able to make a more informed decision.

The Chair: — Mr. Yates.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Madam Chair. That was my assessment, reading the letters from the universities as well, that I think there would be some benefit to have them come before the committee and give us the opportunity to hear first-hand their concerns. And we'd be in a better position then to develop a policy moving forward.

The Chair: — Given that, I'd ask . . . There's nothing before us that we need to do this in any hurry, right before the next session. We could probably schedule our next meeting if there are petitions coming forward on private Bills for the spring

session, and then include this as an agenda item, so we all have brought ourselves up to speed on reading Mr. Ring's document, and then invite the two universities to come. There's nothing pressing that we need to do it before March.

[The committee adjourned at 10:41.]

Ms. Hamilton: — What's the time frame for dealing with the Acts on the two before us this morning?

Ms. Woods: — What'll happen is once the report from the committee today is presented in the Assembly, that has the effect of the Bills being read for a first time. They'll then be set down for second reading in the spring session, so that would happen on a private members' day.

Following that step of the process, this committee will meet again to actually hear from the petitioners and from the member sponsoring the Bills. They'll then go back to the Assembly and go through Committee of the Whole if needed, and then receive third reading. So there is another meeting of this committee that will take place in the spring session and that'll be up to the members of the committee to decide exactly when they want to do that.

Ms. Hamilton: — And that would be I think the time that we would want the universities to appear.

The Chair: — Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Morgan: — Yes. They're not . . . the universities aren't related to these Bills. But I mean it would be a convenient time to do at the same time which I suspect these would be both short matters to deal with.

Most of these petitions deal with name changes of the institutions. Is part of the proposed legislation going to change the name of the legislation that creates them as well?

Mr. Ring: — Yes.

Mr. Morgan: — So that you wouldn't . . . going to look for say the hospitality, you wouldn't have to know to look for the . . . it would change the name of the Act as well?

Mr. Ring: — Yes, the draft Bill proposes to change both the long title and the short title of the Act so that you get the proper legal entity, the name of the proper legal entity expressed in the legislation.

The Chair: — Okay. So it's agreed that we will leave that item about the limited degree-granting status discussion till the spring session and coordinate it with our meeting with these two petitions. Agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Okay. Then we need a member to move that this committee now adjourn. Mr. Morgan, thank you. All agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Agreed. The meeting is adjourned until the call of the Chair.