



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session

Standing Committee
on
Privileges and Elections,
Standing Orders and Printing

Wednesday, May 9, 2018
6:17 p.m.

Transcript No. 29-4-1

**Legislative Assembly of Alberta
The 29th Legislature
Fourth Session**

**Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections,
Standing Orders and Printing**

Fitzpatrick, Maria M., Lethbridge-East (NDP), Chair
Babcock, Erin D., Stony Plain (NDP), Deputy Chair

Anderson, Wayne, Highwood (UCP)*
Carson, Jonathon, Edmonton-Meadowlark (NDP)
Coolahan, Craig, Calgary-Klein (NDP)
Cooper, Nathan, Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills (UCP)
Goehring, Nicole, Edmonton-Castle Downs (NDP)
Gotfried, Richard, Calgary-Fish Creek (UCP)
Hanson, David B., Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills (UCP)
Kazim, Anam, Calgary-Glenmore (NDP)
Loyola, Rod, Edmonton-Ellerslie (NDP)
Miller, Barb, Red Deer-South (NDP)
Nielsen, Christian E., Edmonton-Decore (NDP)
Nixon, Jason, Rimbey-Rocky Mountain House-Sundre (UCP)
Panda, Prasad, Calgary-Foothills (UCP)**
Pitt, Angela D., Airdrie (UCP)
van Dijken, Glenn, Barrhead-Morinville-Westlock (UCP)

* substitution for Jason Nixon

** substitution for Glenn van Dijken

Support Staff

Robert H. Reynolds, QC	Clerk
Shannon Dean	Law Clerk and Director of House Services
Stephanie LeBlanc	Senior Parliamentary Counsel
Trafton Koenig	Parliamentary Counsel
Philip Massolin	Manager of Research and Committee Services
Sarah Amato	Research Officer
Nancy Robert	Research Officer
Corinne Dacyshyn	Committee Clerk
Jody Rempel	Committee Clerk
Aaron Roth	Committee Clerk
Karen Sawchuk	Committee Clerk
Rhonda Sorensen	Manager of Corporate Communications
Jeanette Dotimas	Communications Consultant
Tracey Sales	Communications Consultant
Janet Schwegel	Managing Editor of <i>Alberta Hansard</i>

6:17 p.m.

Wednesday, May 9, 2018

[Ms Fitzpatrick in the chair]

The Chair: Good evening, everyone. I will call the meeting to order.

You see in front of you a copy of the agenda. Could I have a motion to move the agenda? Member Loyola. All those in favour? On the phone? Anybody opposed? Seeing none, the agenda has been accepted.

Now I'd like to do introductions of everybody around the table. I'll begin. I'm Maria Fitzpatrick. I'm the chair of this committee, and I'm the MLA for Lethbridge-East. We'll go to my right.

Mr. Cooper: It's Nathan Cooper, the MLA for the outstanding constituency of Olds-Didsbury-Three Hills.

Mrs. Pitt: Angela Pitt, MLA, Airdrie.

Mr. Panda: Prasad Panda, MLA, Calgary-Foothills.

Mr. W. Anderson: Wayne Anderson, MLA for Highwood.

Mr. Gotfried: Richard Gotfried, MLA for the upstanding community of Calgary-Fish Creek.

Ms Kazim: Good evening. Anam Kazim, MLA for Calgary-Glenmore.

Ms Miller: Good evening. Barb Miller, MLA, Red Deer-South.

Mr. Coolahan: Craig Coolahan, the MLA for Calgary-Klein.

Mr. Carson: Good evening. Jon Carson, MLA for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

Mr. Nielsen: Good evening, everyone. Chris Nielsen, MLA for Edmonton-Decore.

Loyola: Rod Loyola, Edmonton-Ellerslie.

Ms Goehring: Good evening. Nicole Goehring, MLA, Edmonton-Castle Downs.

Dr. Massolin: Good evening. Philip Massolin, manager of research and committee services.

Mr. Roth: Good evening. Aaron Roth, committee clerk.

The Chair: On the phone, please?

Mr. Hanson: David Hanson, MLA, Lac La Biche-St. Paul-Two Hills. I am travelling, so I hope that I don't drop off. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

For the record I would note the following substitutions: Mr. W. Anderson for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Panda for Mr. van Dijken.

Before we turn to the business at hand, a few operational items. Please note that the microphones are operated by *Hansard* and that the committee proceedings are being live streamed on the Internet and broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV. Please set your cellphones and other devices to silent for the duration of the meeting.

We've adopted the agenda – I jumped ahead; I'm sorry – so now we go to the minutes. We're moving on to the minutes from our last meeting. Are there any errors, omissions, or anything to note?

If not, would a member move adoption of the October 17, 2016, minutes? Mr. Carson. All those in favour, please say aye. Anyone

opposed? Hearing none, the minutes have been accepted and carried as presented.

Motion Other than Government Motion 501 review and process. We received a referral from the Assembly of Motion Other than Government Motion 501. Hon. members, this meeting is the start of the committee's review of Motion Other than Government Motion 501, introduced by Mr. Wayne Anderson, MLA for Highwood, on March 19, 2018. The motion was referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing on April 16, 2018.

Motion 501 as amended reads as follows.

Be it resolved that the following proposed amendment to the *Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta* be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing for review and that the committee submit its report to the Assembly on or before June 19, 2018:

That the *Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta* be amended by renumbering Standing Order 52.04 as Standing Order 52.04(1) and by adding the following after suborder (1):

(2) Suborder (1) does not prevent a Legislative Policy Committee from undertaking a hearing or inquiry during the same period of time that a matter stands referred to the committee by the Assembly if the hearing or inquiry does not interfere with the work of the committee on the matter referred to it.

Members will appreciate that we have a fairly tight window to report back to the Legislative Assembly. At this time the committee should consider the process it wishes to follow in reviewing Motion 501. It has been a common practice to direct Legislative Assembly Office research services to provide a briefing to the committee concerning how the changes proposed in Motion 501 compare with similar provisions in other jurisdictions. It has also been the practice in similar reviews to invite presentations and submissions from various caucuses. Following presentations and the collection of submissions, research committees in previous reviews have commenced their deliberation and provided direction for a report back to the Assembly.

Dr. Massolin, do you have anything to add to this brief description of the review process?

Dr. Massolin: No, not at this point, Madam Chair. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

At this time I'd like to call on Dr. Massolin to provide the committee with an overview of the support that Legislative Assembly Office research services can provide the committee as part of our review of Motion 501.

Dr. Massolin: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll be brief because I think this is a pretty tightly focused review. As committee members know from other committees, research services is available to this committee to provide nonpartisan research support during the duration of this review. I think, as you alluded to, Madam Chair, in your earlier remarks, the committee may want to consider a little bit of crossjurisdictional analysis with respect to Alberta's standing order as it compares with other similar standing orders from other jurisdictions across the country.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Massolin.

I would like to open the floor if members have any comments or questions regarding the support that research services can provide to the committee. Yes, Member Loyola.

6:25

Loyola: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As part of the research process I'm wondering if we can examine the number of groups that the policy committees have met with over the past 10 years or so as part of committee-driven inquiries. I think that having a sense of how many groups the committees are already meeting with would be useful.

Dr. Massolin: Madam Chair, could I just get some clarification on what Member Loyola means by groups? Does that just mean, like, public meetings with different organizations who want to talk to the committee, or are we talking about the reviews that the policy committees have undertaken?

Loyola: I would suggest the number of groups that have directly submitted inquiries to meet with different committees.

Dr. Massolin: Fair enough. Yeah.

The Chair: Okay. Can we have . . .

Loyola: Madam Chair, sorry. Were you going to comment on my request? I have a couple of other questions for Dr. Massolin that I wouldn't mind getting on the record.

The Chair: Okay. Please go ahead.

Loyola: Yeah. I wouldn't mind also if we could look into how many stand-alone meetings were held, perhaps, during that same duration.

Dr. Massolin: Madam Chair, if I may.

The Chair: Yes.

Dr. Massolin: So you're looking, again, for the meetings of policy committees over the course of the time frame from when they were created, in 2007, up until this point and the number of groups that these committees have met with?

Loyola: Yeah. How many stand-alone meetings have been held in order to fulfill those inquiries?

Dr. Massolin: Oh, yeah. Yeah, certainly, we can look at the groups that the policy committees have met with, in your first request, and the meeting dates and even the duration of the meetings and what came out of the meetings because there would be reports and so forth.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Ms Dean.

Ms Dean: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to clarify because the word "inquiry" was used by Member Loyola. "Inquiry" has its own meaning in connection with the powers of the committee. Am I correct in understanding that the request pertains to where a group has asked to meet with the committee?

Loyola: Indeed.

Ms Dean: And it's not been solicited by the committee?

Loyola: Indeed.

Ms Dean: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Cooper: I wondered if it might be advantageous to have a sense of what stand-alone meeting means or exactly what the member is looking to achieve with respect to a stand-alone meeting.

The other thing, then, that I might be curious to know is if there are many occasions in which the committee met and dealt with two separate subjects at a meeting, as in that they might have reviewed some policy and then potentially had someone else present about a separate matter. So I'm just not sure. I'd be curious to know what his definition of a stand-alone meeting is and then if there are examples where a committee achieved two goals in one meeting.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.
Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. For clarification's sake, I would say that stand-alone would mean a meeting outside of a review process that was being undertaken by the committee, as I responded to Ms Dean, of course.

The Chair: Okay. Dr. Massolin, is that clear for you?

Dr. Massolin: Yes, it is clear. You know, I don't think there are many examples of the situation that Mr. Cooper just mentioned, but I can certainly come back to the committee with confirmation on that.

The Chair: Okay. Do we need a motion?

Dr. Massolin: Not if the committee is all in agreement with this.

The Chair: To the committee: do we have agreement on this? Please say aye. Anyone opposed? On the phone? Okay.

Are there other matters in relation to research services that members would like to discuss? Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. Most definitely, Madam Chair. I wouldn't mind looking into the budgetary implications that there would be if these changes were made. I mean, I understand that, you know, we require *Hansard* staff to be here, so if that could be part of the research done, I would really greatly appreciate that.

Dr. Massolin: It's a difficult task because it's a hypothetical in terms of understanding how much additional work it might entail if this change were to be adopted. I mean, it would be difficult to estimate that, but we could try.

Ms Dean: What we can do is we can undertake to look at the costs, the committee meeting costs when we're in session and when we're outside of session. There are certain wage costs associated that I think we can put together fairly easily.

I'll leave it at that, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Ms Dean.

Any other questions with regard to that?

All right. Is everybody in agreement with that? I need a general consensus.

Mr. Nielsen: Sorry, Chair. Just to clarify, we're just getting a consensus about adding budgetary implications?

The Chair: Yes. There's no motion.

Mr. Cooper: I'm offering this up as a suggestion or just as sort of a question, I think, perhaps, to find out what sort of resources might be required – I don't know if I'm suggesting this yet or not – and what such a review would also cost while we're here.

Dr. Massolin: Madam Chair, just for some clarification: what the cost is of doing this research task?

Mr. Cooper: Correct.

Dr. Massolin: I guess I get paid either way. I don't know.

Mr. Cooper: It's fine. I guess I would just like to provide a little bit of clarity. I think having this information will be able to assist in making the decisions, but I also think that it's important that it should be possible for the committee to add an additional hour. Like, we don't need to necessarily be having significantly more meetings, just using the meeting time that we have in a more effective manner. While that will be impossible for you to quantify or research, I think that it's important that all members of the committee keep that in mind as we make decisions in the future on this particular issue.

6:35

The Chair: Thank you, Member.
Yes, please, Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess I have to agree. I think the intent here, if I'm not mistaken, is that we can continue our normal course of business when we have a referral to address here. I would like to think that under the direction of the committee clerk and the rest of the team we could find the most efficient way. I'm sure you do that all the time, find the most efficient ways for us to conduct our business. What I don't want us to see is to waste the time of the clerk's office on this unnecessarily if what we're actually asking for is to allow us to continue our normal course of business. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that's what we're asking for, that we can continue our normal course of business, and that may involve during session and occasionally it may out of session. But we always, I would hope, try not to incur additional costs when we're meeting. Unless I'm completely off base on this, my understanding is that this is just to allow us to continue to do good work for Albertans when we are dealing with other business at the same time.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Gotfried.
Mr. Hanson, I believe you wanted to speak.

Mr. Hanson: If I could, Chair. Thank you very much for the opportunity. I hope I'm coming through clear. I just wanted to point out that we're going to now spend more money and time of staff on doing some research into how many meetings were possibly missed due to committees being assigned a project. I would just like to point out that if we miss hearing from one Albertan or one group of Albertans because we're too busy or landlocked by the standing orders, that is one too many.

Thank you.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I just wanted to make the point that in terms of requesting the research in terms of the budgetary implications there, there may be cases where we may have to have a, quote, unquote, stand-alone meeting, and of course that would have budgetary implications. So I just want to make that clear, that, yes, it may be the case, as both Mr. Cooper and Mr. Gotfried have indicated, that it may be tacking on additional presentations to existing meetings, but at the same time, as has been brought up in other committees, it may mean actually having an entire stand-alone committee outside of the regular business that we're doing in terms of reviewing pieces

of legislation. So it's important that we understand the budgetary implications of that as well as potentially just tacking on presentations to existing meetings.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.

Are there any other members with comments or questions on the matter of presentations? Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just one more comment. I guess my concern and perspective on this is timeliness. If we have issues that Albertans are asking us to address, I think I'd rather see that we have an obligation to not push those down the road in terms of our ability to address those at various committees. Delaying decisions and delaying access and delaying consultation with Albertans, to me, is a higher cost than us managing it the best and most efficient way, trusting our legislative staff to ensure that we are doing things as efficiently as we can. Insofar as we're following that approach to it, where we're doing things efficiently and effectively, I think that outweighs delaying consultation and decisions with respect to how we deal with Albertans. That's more of my concern.

I'm obviously concerned about the financial and fiscal aspects, but I do trust our staff to ensure that we're doing things as effectively as we can. We do have to spend money occasionally to consult appropriately with Albertans. That's more my concern than the minutiae of whether we can manage that well.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.

Ms Goehring: I would just like to perhaps suggest that we not debate the motion but talk about the information that we need gathered today in order to make the decision about how we proceed with this matter, as that's what's on the agenda.

The Chair: Are there any further comments on the research part?

Seeing none, as I asked before, I'd like to open discussion about whether the committee would like to invite presentations from various caucuses. Yes, Member Cooper.

Mr. Cooper: Thank you, Chair. I think that there are a number of folks who it may be advantageous for us to invite to the committee, in particular the sponsor of the motion. I think that could be useful. I also think that perhaps the Government House Leader and the Opposition House Leader and the House leader of the third party might like to present to the committee on behalf of those caucuses, and if they don't, perhaps invite them to provide a written submission for us to review. I think that could be a useful tool for us to potentially utilize. I'm not sure whether or not all of those individuals would like to come, but I think that would be a worthwhile exercise in getting a bit of a sense of direction. I also think it's a very good precedent to set that we are inviting individuals to testify before the committee to assist in the decision-making process more generally as well.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.

Any other comments? Yes, Member Pitt.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you. I think it would be advantageous for us to invite the clerks in some capacity or have some sort of testimony or interview process with committee clerks and get some insight there also. I don't know if we can just put the ones we have on the stand, but I am certain they would have a lot of insight into this matter.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.

Any other comments?

Then could I have a motion for what you've recommended?

Mrs. Pitt: To invite the clerks?

The Chair: Well, everything that you've said so far. I need a motion for us to vote on.

Mrs. Pitt: Okay. I make a motion to invite the mover of the motion; the House leaders from the Official Opposition, the government, and the third party; and at least one committee clerk.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

What I'll do is have our assistant here come up with some wording for us.

Mrs. Pitt: Thank you. That was painful for me.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Madam Chair. A possible motion for this might be that the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing invite Mr. W. Anderson, the MLA for Highwood; the House leaders; and the committee clerks to make oral presentations in relation to the committee's review of Motion Other than Government Motion 501 for the next meeting of the committee.

The Chair: Yes, Ms Dean.

6:45

Ms Dean: Just as director of the branch on that, I'm wondering if it would be possible for the committee, in terms of participation of the committee clerks, to entertain a written submission, and if there's anything further that's required, then it could go through the committee chair and the committee clerk. That might be more reasonable in terms of staff coming before the committee.

Mrs. Pitt: Sure.

The Chair: Can I get a consensus before we actually go to the motion on that part of it?

Mrs. Pitt: Actually, while we're kind of consensus amending this, if it's appropriate, Chair, perhaps also any other member of the public that wants to . . .

The Chair: But you didn't include that when you made your motion.

Mrs. Pitt: Okay. There's very clearly a consensus to not do that, so I will withdraw that.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Are we in discussion?

The Chair: Yes.

Loyola: I wouldn't mind asking Mrs. Pitt if she would entertain the question: what potentially is she hoping that she would get out of the clerks?

Mrs. Pitt: Just procedural insight. I mean, the clerks have been in various sorts of meetings and, I think, would have some good insight into efficiencies, really. Yeah.

Loyola: Thank you.

Mrs. Pitt: I would also add that they might be expert witnesses in regard to this matter.

The Chair: Okay. Member Nielsen.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a question, I'm thinking, maybe for Ms Dean. Is there any concern just with, you know, the duties of the clerks, with the chairs that – I don't know. Is there any kind of confidentiality? I'm not quite sure I'm wording this very well.

Ms Dean: Well, if the committee is interested in some background information about what a change would entail in terms of committee processes, I think that's what I am envisioning as part of this process. The committee clerks would not be comfortable coming forward with a recommendation on this because it's an issue for the committee, but they can provide some, you know, logistical information about meeting organization.

Mr. Nielsen: Thank you.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Carson: I'm just wondering if we could hopefully get a consensus that, within the motion, written submissions from the House leaders might be acceptable.

The Chair: Okay. We're still on the discussion, so any feedback on that?

Mr. Cooper: I certainly would like that, that we invite them to present. Having said that, I understand the schedule that those individuals keep. So we may invite them to present but acknowledge that if their schedule doesn't allow that, we would accept a written submission.

The Chair: Any further discussion?

Okay. Can we incorporate that into our motion?

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just based on the discussion of the committee what I have is that

the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing invite Mr. W. Anderson, MLA for Highwood; the House leaders; and the committee clerks to make either oral or written presentations in relation to the committee's review of Motion Other than Government Motion 501 at the next meeting of the committee.

The Chair: Okay. Somebody needs to move that. Member Cooper. Any discussion?

Seeing none, all those in favour, please say aye. All those opposed? Member Hanson? Okay.

It's approved by the committee unanimously.

All right. Are there any other members with comments or questions in the matter of presentations or other requests for information as part of this review?

Mrs. Pitt: Would there be a scenario in which there would be an expert that we have not thought of who follows this committee in particular very closely, that's very interested in this, who would want to offer some expert testimony that could be discussed amongst this committee, and a decision will be made there? I don't know who that person would be – Ben – but I would like to discuss that, perhaps, just to not close any doors. I think that's my intent, to allow for that to happen should there be a reason to do so.

The Chair: Member Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, I thought we did great work on that motion, and we should probably just move forward. That would be my input on that one.

Thanks.

Ms Miller: What I was going to say is that we're on a really strict timeline because we have to get this reported. To get an expert person in – we're looking at, like, five weeks that we have to have the report in the House, so I'm thinking that it's not feasible in such a short timeline.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments?

As Member Miller just mentioned, we're on a pretty tight timeline. I would like to suggest that for the next meeting the committee hear the presentations requested. Following those presentations, I would suggest the committee then commence deliberations and make recommendations for a report back to the Assembly either at that meeting or at a subsequent meeting if required.

Do members have any comments on that approach?

Ms Dean: Madam Chair, would it be beneficial for the committee to have what is typically requested from research by way of a crossjurisdictional analysis in connection with this?

Mrs. Pitt: That's a good one. See? Experts already.

The Chair: Okay. Any discussion?

Mr. Gotfried: So moved. Do you need a motion on it?

The Chair: Are you making a motion?

Mr. Gotfried: Exactly what Ms Dean said.

Do we need a motion, Clerk?

Mr. Roth: I have perhaps some draft language, Mr. Gotfried, if that would work. Moved by Mr. Gotfried that

the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing direct research services to provide a crossjurisdictional comparison of the rules of procedure in the Canadian parliamentary committees similar to Standing Order 52.04 of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta for the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. Gotfried: You took the words right out of my mouth or, actually, Ms Dean's mouth.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Coolahan.

Mr. Coolahan: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick question for Ms Dean. Would that include the Canadian Parliament? We know sort of where they are, but you would include that as well?

Ms Dean: Yes. Certainly.

The Chair: Thank you.

Any further discussion?

Okay. Seeing none, we have a motion on the floor. All those in favour, please say aye. Any opposed? Mr. Hanson? Thank you.

That motion is carried.

I'd like to suggest that for the next meeting of the committee, members be prepared for deliberations and to make any recommendations for a report back to the Assembly.

Now, do you have any other comments about that approach for the review?

6:55

Mr. Cooper: Just very briefly, I recognize the timeline. I have some reservations about getting the report and the deliberations and making the recommendations all in the same day. Should there be something in the report that is of significance – I'm just not entirely sure. I am under the impression that we're going to get all of that at

the same time. Perhaps it may be advantageous to get the report prior to the actual deliberations.

The Chair: Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. On that note perhaps we could do one meeting where we hear the presentations. Perhaps that could even be next week, before the constituency break, as a suggestion, and then perhaps deliberations could take place on June 1.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you for your suggestion.

I'm going to ask Dr. Massolin: is that a time frame that you'll be able to meet?

Dr. Massolin: Well, it's a little tight, but we probably could work within that, as long as there's not a need for a lot of lead time.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Mrs. Pitt: Unless there's an actual oral presentation – it kind of sounds like things are going to be written and submitted anyway, which could very likely be distributed to committee members; thus not necessarily having to have a meeting. Would that be a possibility?

The Chair: It's open for the discussion of the committee.

Loyola: Yes, most definitely. Since the motion sought either oral or written submissions, I don't see why that would be a problem, right?

Mrs. Pitt: Then we could bump up the date.

Loyola: Yeah. As long as we're not hearing oral presentations and going into deliberations right away. I think that we want to be able to contemplate these matters with some time before we make some decisions.

Mr. Carson: I mean, my only concern is that: did we not just earlier move a motion that included oral presentations as well?

Loyola: We said oral or written. That's my understanding.

The Chair: The motion was oral or written, yes.

Okay. It's my understanding from this discussion that you've agreed to either oral or written presentations. We'll review those. Then if we have to have a meeting for oral presentations, we meet, and then if we need to set another meeting to discuss, we will.

Loyola: I just wanted to highlight the fact that if there were to be oral presentations, if we could have them, say, next week, Thursday or Friday, before the constituency break. I just want to put that on the record.

The Chair: We'll poll members for a date next week.

Member Pitt, did you have something else to say?

Mrs. Pitt: No.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms Dean: Madam Chair, I am going to step in here just as director of the branch. I do not think that the branch is in a position to provide the requested research before a meeting next week. With three sittings a day, we do not have those resources available.

The Chair: Okay.

Member Loyola.

Loyola: Yeah. I completely respect Ms Dean's perspective, of course. I mean, she knows her branch better than anyone else, and we don't want to push them to meet deadlines that we can't meet. Essentially, then, if people did want to make oral presentations, then they could do so. We would do that, but we would not expect the research submitted by that time. I just wanted to make that clear.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

Now, what we've heard is that we won't get the written presentation from research next week; however, we could have the oral presentations and possibly written presentations from the House leaders. We'll poll the group for a meeting next week, and then we'll expect the report from research at a later date.

Could you give us some idea of a date?

Dr. Massolin: How about we just work with you, Madam Chair, to provide a reasonable time frame, given the tight time frame for the committee to report back to the Assembly?

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Carson.

Mr. Carson: Sorry.

The Chair: It's okay.

Mr. Carson: I have some concerns with these timelines. I'm just thinking, like, maybe we could do a lunch meeting May 28, presentations May 28, and some deliberations the following week. I don't know if that's . . .

The Chair: Okay. May 28 is the Monday, right?

I need to go back to research again. Is that feasible for you? No.

Okay. So we could have the other presentations, and we will have to play it by ear in terms of getting the research presentation. We will poll the group for a meeting date to review that. Okay?

Is there any other business to be brought forward?

Seeing no one, hearing no one, the date for the next meeting: we'll poll the members for the meetings, as I just suggested.

Would a member like to move a motion to adjourn?

Mr. Cooper: So moved.

The Chair: Okay. Member Cooper. All in favour? Anybody opposed? Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 7:02 p.m.]

