

[REDACTED]

From: deborah wallace [REDACTED]
Sent: March 14, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Office of the Legislative Counsel
Subject: Public Bills committee submission for March 17 meeting

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL / COURRIEL EXTERNE ****

Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links / Faites preuve de prudence si vous ouvrez une pièce jointe ou cliquez sur un lien

Hello

I am writing to express concerns/offer input on two of the bills that the Public Bills committee will be discussing on March 17, 2025.

1. Bill 1

I am concerned about clause 1 that would amend the Auditor General Act to allow the AG to be removed by the governor in Council on the passing of 2/3 vote from the House of Assembly, for reasons other than cause or incapacity. I understood from the media coverage that this change was no longer being pursued so I am hoping that this clause has just not been removed in the draft bill. If not, and it is still up for debate, I am strongly against this clause as the work of the AG and their office should be completely independent of the sitting government in order to both maintain, and be seen to maintain democracy, a core principle of which is impartial review. I appreciate the need for some mechanism to remove an auditor general who is not performing their duties, but perhaps this could be assigned to an independent third party.

Regarding clause 4 of the same bill, I would like to see the Auditor General's opinion of revenue estimates.

Finally, regarding clauses 16 B and 18, I think the causes for disregarding an information request that is deemed frivolous or vexatious should be made public while respecting the private information of the applicant.

2. Bill 6

I see no need for Clause 22 to repeal the Uranium Exploration and Mining Prohibition Act. Rather, given the decision to create the Act was made decades ago, there should be a formal public process to explore the issue, and better understand current risks and benefits, in order to inform our choice on uranium mining. Repealing the Act now publicly signals the outcome of such a review and doesn't seem to serve any purpose?

Thank you.

Debbie Wallace