

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

February 23, 1995

Ms. Ronyk: — I think we're all here with a good quorum, so we will begin. And because we have lost the chairman of this committee since the last meeting, the first item on the agenda is the election of the committee Chair, and the floor is open for nominations.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Ms. Ronyk, it's my pleasure to nominate Carol Teichrob as Chair. I've spoken to her previous to this meeting, and I think other members have as well, and she has consented to serve as Chair. So even though she's absent here today, I would put forward that name.

Ms. Ronyk: — Thank you. Are there other nominations? If not, would someone move nominations cease? Ms. Stanger, thank you. Is that agreed? I then declare Mrs. Teichrob elected as Chair. And in her absence this morning, we'll call upon the vice-chairman of the committee, Mr. Britton, to chair this meeting.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thank you, Gwenn. Good morning. On the unexpected pleasure to have the power of the Chair, I will use it judiciously. However, Gwenn, what do I do?

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the job of the committee this morning is to deal with the report that is in front of you. And perhaps it is a report from the Clerk to the Chair of the committee. And if I could present that report, that's the way we could begin.

This report is based on the requirements of rule 65 which I will just go over for you as the basis for your review this morning.

Petitions for Private Bills . . .

Under rule 65,

. . . when received by the Assembly, are to be taken into consideration (without special reference) by the Committee on Private Members' Bills which is to report in each case whether the Rules with regard to notice have been complied with; and in every case where the notice shall prove to have been insufficient, either as regards the petition as a whole or any matter therein which ought to

have been specifically referred to in the notice, or is otherwise defective, the committee is to recommend to the Assembly the course to be taken.

So that is the function here this morning. And to enable you to carry out the duty, this report outlines for you all of the petitions that have been received and outlines that the petitions have been advertised in the newspapers and in the *Saskatchewan Gazette* as required, that the rules with respect to filing of those petitions, the time frame in which they must be filed, and the note, the advertising, have all been complied with.

So if, Mr. Chair, if you'd like to take the committee through the petitions one by one, with each petition we need to agree that the rules have been complied with and, secondly, to move that the petition be accepted.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thank you Gwenn. Well gentlemen and ladies, you heard what our duties are today. Let us start off then with the Caronport schools in the province of Saskatchewan. Is there anyone has any comments to make on that particular petition?

Ms. Stanger: — I move that we accept the petition, 01.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Moved by Vi Stanger that we accept petition no. 1. Second? Dan D'Autremont.

Ms. Ronyk: — You don't really need a second.

The Vice-Chairperson: — You don't need a second? That's good. You should kick me under the table when . . .

Are you all in favour? That's carried. Thank you. That is 01. We will go to 02, Our Lady of The Prairies Foundation. Gwenn, could we have a bit of an explanation about this?

Ms. Ronyk: — The private Bill that this petition is asking for is . . . It really deals with the foundation which is in Saskatoon. It's the old Leier Foundation. And the Bill is actually asking for some changes in the way that the trustees of the foundation are appointed, the terms, and how vacancies are filled. And that

is really the sole purpose of the Bill.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thank you, Gwenn. I'm a little bit familiar with the Leier family. Peter Leier left a legacy, I guess you would call it; it's in the foundation. And it looks to me like what they're doing here is try to keep the . . . have the family have control of how the funds are administrated. And I think this . . . I've known several times where this family has helped out with some funds. So is there any comments on this?

Ms. Ronyk: — I might mention, Mr. Chair, that when we deal with the next stage of the process, when we're actually reviewing the Bill, there will be representatives of the petitioners here who will be able to answer any questions you might have about the foundation.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Would someone move that we accept 02? Okay, we have a mover and a seconder, take your choice.

Thank you. We'll move on now to . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, everybody agreed? Of course, sorry about that. It's been a little while since I've sat here.

The next one is 03, to do with The Seventh Day Adventist Church Act. Any problems with that? Could I have a mover? Vi. Lloyd, seconded.

Mr. Johnson: — Question on . . . Manitoba, Saskatchewan, that doesn't create any . . . That isn't a problem in the sense that . . . a Saskatchewan Act?

Ms. Ronyk: — No . . . I'm not sure. They may have to incorporate in Manitoba as well. Often we'll have a private Act being requested in every legislature across the country when there's some organization that crosses the borders. But I'm not sure that they have to do that, but they may.

The Vice-Chairperson: — We'll have a further chance to discuss this at the time that they . . . they'll have a presentation, won't they?

I need a seconder. Mr. Knezacek. All agreed to 03 to go to committee?

All right, we'll move on to 04, which is Saskatchewan Wheat Pool asking for the right to consolidate chapter 107. And I think we're

all quite familiar with that. Is there any discussion? Does anyone have any questions?

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to ask for clarification about the process that will follow. I think that there are a number of people outside the legislature who have interest in this particular Bill. And we should be able to have a clear record for them as to when they can come and petition or make their views known, and what processes this particular petition — as well as the others, I guess — will be going through. I wonder if we could have that clarified at this time.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. The process for private Bills does give several opportunities for the public to become involved.

First of all the rules require that a petitioner who's seeking a private Bill must advertise that fact in the local newspapers in the area affected so that the public and other private interests have a way of knowing that a group is asking for a private Bill.

Now that the petition is before you, and if it is received and reported today, then this afternoon when the committee reports to the House the Bill will be deemed to have been read a first time and will be introduced today. All these — the four Bills — will be introduced today and receive first reading. You won't notice that happening because the rules state that once the committee reports that the petitions are accepted, then the rule states that the Bills are deemed to have been read a first time.

Then tomorrow they will appear on the order paper under second readings, and they will come up for their first opportunity to be dealt with under second readings on the first private members' day, which is next Tuesday, February 28. And at that point the members who are sponsoring the Bills will be called upon to move second reading and there could be debate at that stage.

If the second reading is adopted on Tuesday, then we will want to set times for this committee to meet again to review the Bills. And at that point you have the Bills in front of you, you review them clause by clause, and you hear from witnesses who are appearing

both for and against the Bill. And at that point, Bills may be amended as well.

We usually like to give petitioners and the public at least a week's notice after second reading has passed, that the committee has been established, so I would expect you would be looking at setting some committee meetings for the week following February 28, which would be the week of March 6. And I think this committee would be wise to look at your calendars and decide which days or day you would like to have the first meeting of the committee when you're reviewing the Bills in detail; it could be March 7, 8, 9, in that . . . If you think a week is enough time. If you prefer to leave more time for the public to be informed, it could be delayed until the week of the 13th. That's entirely up to the committee.

And the way that the public can be heard from and can petition for or against the Bill, are two ways. They may either choose to go with a formal petition in the same way that the Bill was initiated by a petition. And that is, it has to have the statement at the front of what the petitioners see as the issue, and then a prayer that asks the Assembly to do something with respect to the matter that's at issue. And that is filed in the House and it's presented one day and read and received the following day.

But for private Bills it's also quite possible for the public who want to appear at the committee, to walk in the door at the committee meeting and say, okay, this is a public meeting, I want to sit in and watch, or maybe I will want to speak whenever there's time to be heard.

Normally we like to encourage people who wish to appear, to let the Clerk's office know so that we can give the committee some idea of the numbers of people who may be appearing to speak. That is not required, but it does help. What we tell people is that they at least will know that they will be called upon first or early in the stages. And if they just walk in the door, they will get a turn down the road once the committee gets to them.

It's also up to the committee to determine how much time you want to spend in the committee review, how many meetings or hours or whatever, and to that extent you can also decide how long you would give each presenter to speak. And that will partly depend,

I guess, on the number that present themselves. The committee may determine after some time that they have heard sufficient argument and will conclude their deliberations at a time that the committee decides. Does that cover . . .

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you very much. Just to reiterate — my understanding is then that people who may wish to make presentations or appear at the committee could contact or should contact the Clerks' office to be advised of the dates and the times of the meeting and about the procedures if they needed further clarification. The point of contact should be the Clerk's office.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. Now certainly if members are contacted, we certainly . . . if you let us know that you have constituents or whoever who has expressed an interest, just let us know and we'll add them to the list. If they require information that you can't give them, we'll just send them on to us.

Mr. Kowalsky: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McPherson: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should have brought my *Rules and Procedures* booklet here today, but I think there's . . . the 30th day is the day that you have to bring the Bill forward. But is there an ending date, or how long can this Bill be before the legislature?

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. McPherson, no, the rules don't provide for any ending date. So once the Bill is before the House, as it will be presumably by this afternoon, then it just takes the usual course through the House. And it's up to the House and the committee how long they wish to spend on the Bill. And there isn't any rule that specifies that it has to be completed by any particular time.

Mr. McPherson: — All right. Is there . . . I understand that there's some legal proceedings that may proceed against the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool. Now will this have any effect on the private members' Bill?

Ms. Ronyk: — I'll call on the Law Clerk to see if he could answer that.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Yes, Bob Cosman, will you please bring us up to date on the legal side of this?

Mr. Cosman: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Other than a convention that when a matter is before the courts, as a courtesy or a convention, the Legislative Assembly generally does not discuss a matter that's before the courts, because it can perhaps affect the outcome of the case to a degree.

However there is no rule of law, as such, that the legislature cannot proceed with the Bill. The legislature is independent from the judicial system in that sense and the matter may be discussed here in the legislature.

You wouldn't be discussing the court case as such. You're discussing the Bill that is brought on petition. Now they're basically one and the same, I'm sure, but our matter here is the Bill as presented, or on petition, and certainly the legislature has the prerogative to continue discussion of the Bill.

Mr. McPherson: — All right. So depending then on the legal outcome, there would probably be retroactive legislation on either the present Act or the new Act. I guess that's a pretty tough one to answer, isn't it?

Mr. Cosman: — If I might, Mr. Chairman. I think I see what you're saying, Mr. McPherson, that if we were to pass the Bill and yet the court was to come to an opposite decision, in effect that whatever was happening was not legal, not correct, that we might either have to have a retroactive amendment to the Bill or deal with . . . correct some matter at some point in time prior to the court challenge and so on. There might be an aspect to that but at this point, for the purposes of this committee, we're certainly just going to be looking at the Bill that is before us on petition.

The Vice-Chairperson: — We act on the Bill itself. And whatever happens after that . . .

A Member: — Nothing outside.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Yes. That's the way I understand it.

Mr. Cosman: — Yes. Now I don't know what the courts will do, whether they might look at the Bill if we have passed the Bill before the court case proceeds. I believe that if the law changes after a court case has been initiated, the judiciary does have an opportunity to take into account the new law.

However in many, many cases, if an event has happened before the new law has come into force, they apply the old law. But that's for the courts to decide. I don't want to get too far into that. I don't know how the courts would handle this situation.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Does that . . . is there another question, Glen?

Mr. McPherson: — Can you also answer how many different ways can this Bill be proclaimed and by . . .

Mr. Cosman: — One way would be for the Bill to come into force on assent, that is, after it's passed third reading and the Lieutenant Governor has given his royal assent. The Bill could be operative if it so stated that it comes into force on assent. Or indeed if it says nothing about coming into force, our Interpretation Act says an Act comes into force on assent.

However there likely is a complex situation involved here. And there may be — without my revealing too much of the content of the Bill at this time — I suspect there may be some form of proclamation. And the mechanics of that, we will see if and when the Bill is presented.

Mr. McPherson: — But it will be in the Bill.

Mr. Cosman: — Yes.

Mr. McPherson: — Okay. As far as suspending it, only this committee or the government can suspend the Bill? There's no three-day hoists and the like on private Bills?

Mr. Cosman: — Defer to the Clerk.

The Vice-Chairperson: — We've got to go to you, Gwenn. Thanks, Bob.

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. McPherson, there are all of the usual opportunities for dealing with the Bill except for the hoist. The three-day hoist provision is only applied, according to rule 55.1, on public Bills. So that option isn't available to the House.

Mr. McPherson: — . . . rule 77, 78? It's been a while since I read it, but is that something to do with the committee hoisting the Bill?

Ms. Ronyk: — Those are the rules for private

Bills. And the thing that the public Bills rules provide is of course the same as in any Bill. The committee may decide to not proceed with the Bill, and they recommend that to the House, this committee, after reviewing the Bill at your next meeting.

Or that committee may make substantial amendments to the Bill. The rules there require that important amendments that may be proposed at the Committee of the Whole stage — that's after this committee has done with it, and you send it back to the House — if there are significant amendments proposed at that stage, then there has to be a day's notice given. So that would make sure that people and the public and petitioners could be aware if substantial amendments were moved at that point.

But the committee stage, there is . . . at this committee stage there's no requirement for notice on substantial amendments to the committee . . . or to the Bill.

Mr. McPherson: — One of those rules, does it have to do with this committee being able to suspend?

Ms. Ronyk: — I don't think so.

Mr. McPherson: — Well it wouldn't matter. We're not at that stage anyway so it's . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — There is a provision that we're not to . . . the Assembly should not suspend the rules respecting private Bills when we deal with private Bills unless this committee has recommended that they be suspended, and that they have to give grounds for such a suspension of the rules.

The normal suspension of rules with respect to private Bills is to speed up the process. I wouldn't expect, you know, that there'd be any other sort of major reasons for suspending the rules.

Mr. Roy: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The petitioner of Bill 03, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the province of Saskatchewan, requests from the committee . . . I'm not sure if this is doable. But she's going to be absent on February 28 and she was wondering if it would be possible to delay the introduction of the Bill so that second

reading would fall on another day than February 28. Is that possible?

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. Chairman, and members, I have been notified that the members who are sponsoring both Bill 03 and Bill 01, Mr. Swenson for Bill 01, are not going to be in the Chamber next Tuesday. We can still proceed with the other Bills. There is no way for someone else to move the private Bill on a private member's behalf, so they would just have to sit there. We could proceed with the other ones.

At that point then it may be up to the committee to decide whether they wish to wait until all the Bills are referred to the committee before the committee meets, or do you want to meet and deal with the ones that have been referred and then meet again on the other Bills. That's up to the committee.

Mr. Roy: — Well I think we should deal with the ones that have been referred and then deal with the others at a later date, if that's acceptable to the committee.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Any further comment on that? That satisfactory? All in favour of the suggestion by Mr. Roy?

Mr. Johnson: — Mr. Chairman, on this subject related to when it comes through and that and the establishment of times for sitting of the committee, can that be left to the Chair and the Vice-Chair in consultation with the Clerk and that to set those dates? Because that's sort of what has happened.

And I would recommend that so that, depending on what variations occur between now and then, we have a way of getting things going without . . . Because here, right now everybody has different possibilities and things that aren't in place.

The Vice-Chairperson: — I have no problem with that, meeting with the Chairperson to set that up. As to the meeting dates, there's no problem there.

Mr. Johnson: — I would move that as a motion or . . .

The Vice-Chairperson: — Moved that the Chair or the Vice-Chair be authorized to set

the next meeting dates. Is that acceptable? All in favour?

I have Ms. Stanger on the list. Did you want to get in on this?

Ms. Stanger: — Yes, go ahead.

Mr. McPherson: — I do have a question on time — 15 minutes ago I had Crown Corporations meeting start and I'm the only member we have on that, so Thursdays are very tough for me.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thursdays? Okay, I'll just put a note that Thursdays is bad for you. Okay.

Ms. Stanger: — I was just going to say, Mr. Chairman, as the Clerk was going through the rules, I think this Bill 04 is very well advertised, so I think I would recommend that we proceed with the regular time lines, unless somebody has some objection to it.

But if you look at the advertising that has been done, and I think if we get a hold of everyone that's interested in petitioning, I think the week time line is okay. If everybody else is in agreement, I would recommend that.

Mr. McPherson: — . . . you just dealt with?

Ms. Stanger: — No, no. This is the week notice to the . . .

Mr. McPherson: — I thought you talked about all Bills that are . . .

Ms. Stanger: — No, no, no. What I am talking about is that the Clerk said in her remarks that there is usually a week where it's advertised so that people can come and petition for and against the Bill. And I'm saying that I think that that's likely enough time.

She wanted some direction from the committee in that area. Unless somebody else says something different, I would say proceed with the regular time frame.

The Vice-Chairperson: — The way I understand what you're saying, Ms. Stanger, is that one week notice to interveners . . . had a week and that you feel that's enough time.

Ms. Stanger: — I think it is because of the

publicity that 04 has had. Unless somebody else has some strong objection to it, I would say to the Clerk to proceed.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Do you want to make that a motion, or do you think there's general agreement?

Ms. Stanger: — General agreements.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Is everyone in agreement with Ms. Stanger's motion? Okay, here we go.

Mr. D'Autremont: — When we go into hearings, both the petitioners and any possible interveners, how much advertising will be done in advance of that to allow them to know when the committee hearings will be held?

The Vice-Chairperson: — This is the week that we're talking about — one week.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay. Those advertisements will be carried out in the same papers as the petition?

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. D'Autremont, no. We do not do, as a matter of course, any regular advertising. The only notice of the Private Members' Bills Committee meetings is published in the back of the Votes, which you know isn't that widely spread among the general public, and it's posted in the Legislative Building.

But other than that, we do not normally do any advertising of hearings. That's up to the committee — the committee could decide to do so if it so wished.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well this is a very — as my learned colleague says — contentious issue out in the general public. And I wonder whether or not it might be advisable for us to give some consideration to allowing the general public to know what is going on and when it's going to happen. And I'm not sure either way on it.

I just wonder, because of the fact that it already is in the courts, some of the situations dealing with this matter, that perhaps it might be advisable for us to advertise. The question would be, if we advertised, who do we allocate those costs to? Does the petitioner bear them, or does the legislature bear them, or who

would be affected by the costs?

The Vice-Chairperson: — Good question. Are you going to take the chair . . . (inaudible) . . . I'm getting ahead of you.

I'd have a little problem — I think the same as the rest of you — about this because it seems to be one of the first times we've had in this committee since I've sit on it what I would term as a major opposition to a Bill.

And I was listening quite closely to Mr. Cosman, and I got the impression from Mr. Cosman that this committee would concern itself only with the Bill and that under the general rules of this committee we are not obligated to notify interveners. Now we all know that sometimes rules don't cover all circumstances. And because this is something that most of us have been touched with at some time or another, I believe we have to go back to what Mr. Cosman said and concern ourselves only with the Bill itself, as a committee.

As individuals, we may want to take a different step. And if individuals, I think, of the committee decided to notify interveners, they can go ahead and do that. And I would suggest, in response to Mr. D'Autremont's query . . . would be at the expense of that person as an individual, rather than as a committee or the legislature.

If we was to do something different than what has been a normal procedure of this committee, we may find ourself, you know, in some kaka here. So I'm just putting this forward, knowing full well that it's all registered.

A Member: — Do you have the correct spelling for *Hansard*?

The Vice-Chairperson: — However, having took the chairman's prerogative, I now recognize Mr. Roy.

Mr. Roy: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I would agree with your assessment on this particular issue, and I am sensitive to what my friend and counterpart, Dan, is saying.

I think this has a certain level of . . . it is fairly contentious. But I firmly believe that the individuals and groups that are interested in

following the path of this particular Bill are going to make a special point of appearing at the committee level, so I think it would be probably unnecessary for this committee to proceed with trying to advertise.

And again we would be breaking away from, I think, the rules and procedures we've used in the past. I would certainly agree with the chairman's assessment and his version of this particular issue. Thank you.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thank you, Mr. Roy. Any other?

Ms. Stanger: — I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think that was a clear assessment of the situation, and I agree with you.

Ms. Ronyk: — I might just add for the committee's information as well, that the Clerk's office will undertake to notify anyone who asks to be notified. And we do. Often in private Bills we will have people call up and say, well would you let us know when the committee meeting is going to be, and we make a list, and we undertake to notify them. To that extent, it helps.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Another question, Mr. Chairman.

A question of procedure. When this petition goes through the committee and returns to the House to Committee of the Whole, at that point in time, if there was debate on the floor, questions on the floor, who would be the representative for the petitioner on the floor?

Ms. Ronyk: — That's a question that has come up before. But in practice, it has been the member sponsoring the Bill who is required to answer any questions on the floor, and there aren't other officials or petitioners there on the floor to assist that member. It could be nearby but . . .

Mr. D'Autremont: — So they can't have officials on the floor. The member would be there by him or herself.

Ms. Ronyk: — That's correct, according to past and current practice.

Mr. Roy: — I think, Mr. Chairman, it's obvious by the amount of debate that me and Mr.

D'Autremont are creating here this morning, we've had practice on the Driving Safety Committee here for the last number of months.

I just want to be clear about the correspondence that I got from the petitioner of Bill 03, and I believe, Gwenn, that you indicated that you had had communication from the petitioner indicating that . . . the petitioner indicated to me that February 28 was a very important date for her; that she was going to be absent. And that she felt that if the Bill, I believe, could be brought in for second reading on a different day — I think that was my interpretation of what she was telling me — that would certainly assist her greatly.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, any members who are not there to move their Bills on the 28th, then it would stand over until the next Tuesday.

Mr. Roy: — Good. Thank you.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Any other questions as to Bill 04? If not, I'm going to ask the question . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Johnson: — Let's move that we proceed with Bill . . .

The Vice-Chairperson: — Just before I accept that, Lloyd, could I make a . . .

Mr. Johnson: — Yes.

The Vice-Chairperson: — I don't know whether this will be Mr. Cosman's territory or Gwenn's, but when we meet with the — shall I say? — the interveners, we would have the right to ask the interveners question as well as any presenter. But there would be no cross-debate between the presenter and the intervener, would there?

Ms. Ronyk: — No, that's correct, Mr. Chairman, that the Chair will preside over the hearings. You will call upon the witnesses appearing for the Bill. You will call upon witnesses appearing against the Bill. After each witness the members of the committee may wish to question that witness. And indeed you members may say to a subsequent witness now: we heard the witness before you say this, how do you respond to that?

So indeed there may be some back and forth,

but it will not be directly between the witnesses. It will be from the Chair and through the members of the committee.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Would there be any limit on how many spokespersons could address the committee? Would they have 1, 2, or 3 spokesmen from the . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — That will be up to the committee to determine and based on kind of the requests that you get to be heard. The committee itself can determine whether you'll hear everyone, whether you will hear representatives, whether you feel after a certain length of time that there are no new arguments being put forward. That would be within the committee's mandate to determine.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Thank you, Gwenn. I was going to ask . . . that was my next question, is the Chair can control the time that's allocated to a reasonable degree.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, the Chair has the discretion to do that, but likely the committee might want to determine a guideline for the Chair, whether you're going to give each presenter 15 minutes or 3 minutes or whatever you decide.

The Vice-Chairperson: — So just before I accept your motion, Mr. Johnson, maybe this committee should think about that a little to pass on to the Chair or person who I assume will be here at that time as to what we feel . . . shall she have that direction from us to not let it, you know, go too far.

Ms. Stanger: — Do you want us to come up with the time just for a rule of thumb, like 20 minutes or something like that that we could pass on to her?

A Member: — Is this not something that . . .

Ms. Stanger: — That's what I'm asking.

The Vice-Chairperson: — No, excuse me. My thought was simply a general guideline to let the chairperson know that we as a committee realize that at some point in time the Chair may have to say you know . . .

Mr. D'Autremont: — My question would be, is that time allocated to the presenter because once you allow committee members to start

asking questions, it seems to drag on quite a bit longer. So if you're going to say 20 minutes for the presenter and for any questions, after having sat on a number of committees with Mr. Roy, it doesn't seem to work that way.

The Vice-Chairperson: — Okay, thank you Dan. Okay. If there's nothing else then, Mr. Johnson, we'll entertain your motion here.

Mr. Johnson: — I move 04.

The Vice-Chairperson: — All in favour? That is carried. We need a motion to present all four petitions to the House. Vi Stanger. Are you all in favour? Thank you very much.

Could I then have a motion for adjournment? The next meeting will be at the call of the Chair. Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 9:02 a.m.