

1:44 p.m.

Friday, April 5, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sorry I'm late. I tried to squeeze in a half-hour meeting. It's not easy.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, while some documents are being circulated, the minutes, an agenda, a workplan and all those good things, I'd just like to open the meeting by welcoming the members. This is the first official meeting of the Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform, and I'd like to welcome the members of the opposition parties who had not been in attendance at the last meeting: Bob Hawkesworth, Barrie Chivers, John McInnis, Yolande Gagnon, and Sheldon Chumir. Pam Barrett is around somewhere.

MR. ANDERSON: She went to make a phone call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: She's temporarily absent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Here she is.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, I just made a phone call.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They hadn't been at the informal meeting which we held on Tuesday, March 12, 1991. Since that was not a formal meeting, we've circulated draft minutes of that meeting. I think really in view of the fact that it was an informational meeting and informal in nature, the minutes cannot really be adopted in the formal capacity but are circulated by way of information to the members of the select committee. Any comments about that procedure? Pam, you had a chance to look at those.

MS BARRETT: No. I've just got them now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. In any event, I think that's what we have to do, if I'm not mistaken, just accept these as information without any formal motion to adopt.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I would agree. It was informal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The next item on the agenda is a workplan.

MS BARRETT: When you get a speakers' list, I'd like to get on the list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The workplan which is set out obviously is not precise because we had thought about a committee meeting on April 2 and this is April 5. So that is clearly not where we are.

In any event, we are going to have to start some advertising relative to a series of public hearings to get the public hearing process under way, and it was proposed in this workplan that we commence our public hearings with an all-day public hearing. It originally suggested that we have a full committee hearing on Friday night and Saturday, April 26 and 27. Events have intervened on the 26th with the retirement dinner for the Lieutenant Governor, which would make it very difficult for members to attend. Therefore, I think the earliest we could possibly proceed with a public hearing would be a full hearing on Saturday, April 27. Then the following week of April 29 to May 4 it would be proposed to adjourn the Legislature for the

week and the committee would divide, one half to tour northern Alberta and the other southern Alberta; then, on May 10 and 11, hearings in Edmonton Friday night and all day Saturday. Following that the committee would meet to review the public hearing process and see whether or not it would be necessary to expand upon it. Now, that was really an item that was discussed in the course of our meeting on March 12, and I would now think it's where we really have to start in terms of discussing that particular hearing schedule.

Pam, do you want to make a comment?

MS BARRETT: Yes, thanks, Jim. When we looked at this time frame, had things proceeded as originally anticipated, it might have been reasonable. But it seems to me that a delay of the public hearings to accommodate both the advertising campaign time requirements and public response would be in order. I don't have a particular date or series of dates in mind, but I think we did agree that after we do the first round of public hearings - and we weren't bound by that agreement - we would stop, go back into a meeting like this, and decide if we need additional hearings. In the meantime, I wonder if we shouldn't try to push back the dates of our initial hearings as we are already now a couple of weeks behind schedule according to the original plan.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. McINNIS: Perhaps an additional comment. There is a further agenda item dealing with communications. I've quickly reviewed the advertising strategy recommended by Baker Lovick in this case, and it looks like they recommend a two-week flight of television advertisements to kick it off, with radio commencing in the second week and into a third week, followed by at least two weeks of print advertising. So we're looking at a minimum five-week advertising program to successfully communicate to Albertans that this process exists. The mock-ups of the ads don't provide any details as to the precise date of the various hearings, which I think would be extremely helpful information to communicate to people who may be interested so they would have some idea on what date they would have to appear in their town or wherever to make their hearings. I think it is an essential piece of information that we need to put into the advertising campaign to facilitate their participation.

So I think we need to do a couple of things. One is to get the hearing schedule in place before we do the communication program, and secondly, I think to do that properly - we're set to go three weeks from now basically, we need to look at probably four weeks beyond that to successfully do all those things, just adding to what my colleague said in terms of time frame to commence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further comments?

Yes, Sheldon, then Yolande.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I would share these concerns. It seems that things are very rushed in terms of the current schedule. Of course, it's already three weeks out of date, so it's not realistic. I think generally we need to take more time to inform the public to make sure there is an awareness that we're holding our hearings and then to get whatever written submissions are appropriate, to give people a good period of time to provide thoughtful submissions and get them before us. I guess one

concern I have overall is that there seems to be a foot race here to get the report in before the Legislature adjourns for the summer. There may be some imperative in that regard in light of the schedule of what Quebec has in mind, but I would like to hear more about whether or not the whole schedule couldn't be put back so as to complete a report by the end of the summer rather than by the end of June.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yolande?

MRS. GAGNON: Thank you. My concern is similar, but I have another, which is the locations. Looking at the map, it seems to me that the whole area of the Peace River country has been missed, and I would suggest that if at all possible that be added as a location where one of the public hearings would be held.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that particular point, we looked at Grande Prairie as being the point in that particular region which would at least have the initial visitation. There's no question we have a problem with our timetable here. Dennis Anderson, though, first.

1:54

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, actually I was going to ask you to address that. I agree with the comments that have been made in terms of the rush there is and the desirability to have a longer time frame both for people to input and for us to complete our work. But I wonder if you could give us an evaluation of where you expect the national discussion to go and whether or not by lengthening that time frame at this juncture we would be jeopardizing our ability to speak on behalf of Albertans with their input at a crucial period of the constitutional discussions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a hard question to assess at the moment. Let's just take a moment or two to go back over the situation as to what we have facing us. We now have the province of Quebec with two documents out there. One is the Allaire report relating to the Liberal Party of Quebec and their particular position; the other is the Belanger-Campeau commission report, which, as you know, has had a number of recommendations and has proposed a timetable for the rest of Canada to respond to. I'm not suggesting for a moment that we are accepting that as being the ultimatum or timetable we are going to have to respond to. Nonetheless it's there; we know that.

The Spicer commission, which is now conducting its public hearing process and has been in Alberta this week, has a timetable to report to the federal government by July 1. The Edwards joint parliamentary committee of the Senate and the House of Commons is also in a public hearing process, and their timetable for reporting - I'm not exactly certain. It's July 1 as well, I think, to coincide with the Spicer report.

The Ontario select committee held their first round of public hearings and submitted an interim report to their Legislature a short while ago. That was before the end of March. It was due and it was submitted. They're now going to go back again and have some further discussions with a view to putting in the final report by the end of June.

Those were dates I had in mind as being of concern to us: the Ontario and the Quebec situation, the federal government's initiatives. Since then, however, we've heard tell through the news media alone - without any formal communication to me, to my knowledge, from the federal government - that they are

going to structure another public hearing process involving a select committee of the House of Commons and perhaps the Senate as well and that that work would not begin until sometime later this year. Now, I'm not certain of the timetable.

Garry, do you have any more . . .

MR. POCOCK: I've just heard perhaps in August.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That they would start their process.

That strikes me as giving us more room to complete our work and, if you will, releases some of the pressure to respond by the end of June. That's my general feeling. I'll just say it this way. The other report that came out, because I say there's been no formal indication by correspondence or otherwise as to what this new process would do - the general tone was that it would try and gather in the thoughts of the rest of Canada, if you will, by the federal government and then use that gathering in to prepare a federal government response to the Quebec positions. I have difficulty with the federal government doing it in that fashion, because I don't see how they could, if we had completed our work by the end of June, have the federal government take what we had come up with and then incorporate that with whatever they're doing and say, "Now we represent the views of Ontario, Alberta, New Brunswick, Manitoba, et cetera, and we're pulling it all together under the sole aegis of the federal government to prepare a response to the Quebec position." Am I clear? I find that approach - if that indeed is what they're proposing to do - to be unacceptable. Therefore, I think if they're going to do that, we don't have to be in any rush, quite frankly, to have a response before they start that next process later on in the summer. Am I clear? Does anybody object or have any other views on that particular point?

Stock?

MR. DAY: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, not on that point. Just to be on the list for discussing the time frame.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's part of the time frame discussion, though.

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: Just one point. The Ontario model of having an interim report followed by more consultation might be something to look at in terms of keeping options open. There may be some need to do that, put a position out and then seek a reaction. Sometimes you get a more firm reaction that way than you do if you just lay open some questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the next thing that has to come forward is a position paper of sorts, but I don't think it has to be a hard and fast position. I think there have got to be a number of options laid out that we might follow without being too loose. I don't think it has to be absolutely iron clad that this is Alberta's position even if we could arrive at that within a limited time frame.

Okay. Well, if we agree, then, that we are not going to be bound by completing something by the end of June and that this new federal initiative is not going to be the sole initiative we would recognize from the rest of Canada, I think we can agree that we would have more time in which to operate. Is that agreeable?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.
Stock?

MR. DAY: Well, given that decision, this probably won't be as difficult. In looking at the locations – and I know there's a cost involved; we're going to keep costs down on these – I do have a feeling for some of the rural areas, farther flung communities. Certainly we experienced on the electoral boundaries review the importance of trying to get out to as many locations as possible. If we were to add to this list even one more in the north, one in the west, one in the east, one in the south, like a High Level, maybe coming west a Sundre, Rocky Mountain House or Caroline, Hanna, and a spot in the south . . . If we're looking at breaking, and we are, then we're looking at farmers in the field having to drive all the way into, let's say, Grande Prairie up there or further from that. Making ourselves more generally available geographically, I don't think we want to expand it to a pile of meetings we can't handle, but I would like to see even one more in each of those geographical sections out in a small community. That cuts down that travel time, and I think it sends a message too.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I concur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that's a very good point, and I think that point was also made at the informational meeting originally.

MS BARRETT: Yes. It's not minuted, but it's true. It was presented again and almost identically from that perspective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Assuming that we aren't bound by that particular week and probably can't meet the timetable, I think it would be extremely difficult for us, while the Legislature is sitting, to break for more than a week and that we would try and do that during the sitting but then schedule further time following the spring sitting to accommodate any additional places where we would have to meet. Could we have general agreement on that: just one week off from the spring sitting?

204

MR. McINNIS: Not necessarily the week we identified.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily the week we identified, no. Probably not the week we identified, from what I hear now. Just take the one week, and then accommodate other hearing sites when the Legislature is not in session.

Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I agree with that.

Further to our conversation, though, I want to say that I certainly agree with lengthening the time frame, but I think we also have to be really careful not to be following the national debate but to be part of it. I think we should remain flexible in our scheduling, put the public hearings together for when we can, but also be ready to discuss again the need there may be for us to have that input of Albertans at a crucial time period. I don't know that any of us can predict that now, given your remarks on what we see in the national media.

MRS. GAGNON: While appreciating the need for a thorough advertising campaign and so on, I'm also conscious that if we go into the late June-July period, people are on holidays and so on. The last thing they're interested in is making a presentation to

this committee. I think we have to be cognizant of that fact and try and go earlier in the spring if possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A very good point. I think the week that we take has to be as soon as possible, without getting down to a week. I think the week that's been suggested is probably too soon, but the week we take has to be as soon as possible so that people aren't running off on summer holidays.

All right. Where does that leave us then? We have given notice to our caucus that that would be a week off, and I guess members will probably have started making plans for activities. What's the situation in regard to the other caucuses?

MR. McINNIS: We're always ready to work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's all work but work of a different kind.

MS BARRETT: Well, I did give notice as well, but I did say that it wasn't necessarily firm. So I don't think our group would weep if we changed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

On the technical aspect of the advertising and fitting that all in . . .

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. Yes.

MRS. GAGNON: Just to comment. It is only the 5th. Surely we do have time to advertise and stick with this first week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

MS BARRETT: Not according to the advertising plan.

MR. McINNIS: No. I mean, that was the discussion we had at the beginning of the meeting. That's clearly not possible. I think the earliest would be around the third or fourth week in May, realistically, if we make decisions today on when and where we're going to go.

MS BARRETT: I have a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: How long does it take them to get the advertising ready to go? How soon could TV and radio ads start?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can I get comment on that from the expert?

MS PARR: Mr. Horsman, for television I would see the earliest start as April 15, if time were available: one week production and then into advertising. The newspapers: ads could begin within a week in both dailies and weeklies. Radio: it could commence the week of April 15 as well. That's depending on approval today and availability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The newspaper advertising, then, would go ahead in any event. The timetable would be to start when?

MS PARR: The 11th?

MR. POCOCK: We could start the newspaper advertising by the 10th, next week, but for the advertising I think one of the key things we need to do is put in a closing date for submissions. That would probably be some time about two weeks before the actual public hearing date to allow time to review the briefs to prepare briefing notes for the committee so that they can engage in discussion.

MS BARRETT: So, in other words, John might be right then. It would look like maybe the week of May 13 is the earliest. If you've got TV that can start on the 15th and print that can start on the 15th, radio can bridge in quite quickly, right?

MR. CHIVERS: And the closing date for submissions.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. You'd have to make something like May 3 the closing date.

MR. CHUMIR: That's a bit rushed, isn't it?

MS BARRETT: Is that a bit rushed even?

MR. CHUMIR: If somebody's going to write a paper on something as complex as this, you also have to give them at least three weeks and maybe more to give you the written presentation.

MR. CHIVERS: I think adjourn the whole process until the end of May, about a one-month postponement of the first hearing date.

MS BARRETT: Okay. So May 10, then, the deadline for submissions and May 20 the week we can start hearings?

MR. DAY: Just a question, Mr. Chairman, on the written submissions. I'm assuming the deadline for written submissions is not going to be before the public meetings, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. What do you mean?

MR. DAY: Why is that?

MS BARRETT: For the ones that they want us to respond to, right?

MR. DAY: Why would we insist on that?

MR. McINNIS: I don't understand either.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, there has to be two categories.

MR. DAY: Right. A written submission, I understand, is somebody writing a submission rather than appearing.

MS BARRETT: No; it's not that. If you look at April 12, you'll see it: "The last date to mail-in a brief for consideration by the committee at their public hearings." I don't think we even talked about a deadline for other submissions. Let's say that you want to write in, and then you want it discussed at a public hearing, then you've got to have a deadline before the public hearing.

MR. DAY: Right. But we are allowing also - are we not? - just walk-on presentations?

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's just try and gather this in a little bit here. It's not clear from the advertising material, and I should have questioned this earlier. If it's being suggested that all types of news media advertising have to start at the same time, that is in my view unnecessary. Is that what is being suggested?

MS PARR: No. The print advertising would stream in along with the television. The radio would bridge the second week of the television advertising. Two weeks are being proposed here, and the radio would commence in the second week of the television and then also just prior to the actual hearing dates commencing in order to generate some more interest, to remind people that a hearing is going to be in their location. The print would be more information intense and would appear during the time of the initial television and then again as a form of public notice prior to the actual commencement of the hearings in those locations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: The first knowledge that many Albertans will have of this process is during that advertising campaign, and it seems to me that it's imperative to give them a period of time from, say, the middle of that advertising campaign in which to start preparing their submissions. The first set of hearings were scheduled for the week of April 27. If we postponed this whole process by one month, that seems to me to be a sort of realistic work plan. That'll permit Albertans to become aware of the process and then to do their homework so that they can participate in a meaningful way.

MR. CHUMIR: I would certainly second that sentiment. I don't see how you could do it within any shorter time span without really rushing something that's far too important to be rushed in that way.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, if I could just comment on that. That's come up a couple of times today. I certainly don't want something rushed unnecessarily, but Albertans have been telling us now for a couple of years, "We want in on this discussion." I really don't think we're catching anybody by surprise in this process. I'm looking forward with equal anticipation to both the learned, scholarly written submissions and those Albertans who are going to come to the microphone and speak straight from their heart, who don't feel comfortable putting down their dissertation on paper. I think we've been a number of years letting Albertans know, and certainly recently the media all over the province are talking about this process that's coming. I don't want to see it rushed unnecessarily, but I think we should dispel the thought that we're going to be catching Alberta off guard here. Albertans I've been talking to are ready and waiting for this.

In looking at our timing in May, I think that we do have to consider the May long weekend. That's got to be a factor. If we're starting May 13, on a Monday, I think we can rule out having meetings on May 18, which is the Saturday, because, let's face it, a big part of the people are going to be holidaying somewhere. That, then, would rule out the week of May 20 since that Monday is a holiday. So I think we have no choice

but to look at no sooner than Saturday, May 25, if we're not going before the long weekend.

2:14

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, May 25 would give us, I'm sure, enough time to get our advertising out and get people's views in and then to conclude on June 1 the first round of public hearings in any event, and I use that term advisedly, I think. It will create considerable problems for myself in terms of my own calendar, but then perhaps the meetings can go on in my absence.

How does everybody else's calendar look at this stage?

MR. SCHUMACHER: We're not going to start on the Friday afternoon like we originally . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think Friday evening, all day Saturday, and then go all day Monday right through till Saturday the following week.

MS BARRETT: That's fine with me. I know that I'll be out of town for the following week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not going to get everybody at all the meetings; we all know that.

All right. I guess we don't have much choice but to do that. Would that be the week then?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. ANDERSON: So that's starting the 24th, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The evening of May 24.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just a procedural item. Let's say an evening meeting on the Friday, and then do we move to a different location for an all-day meeting on the Saturday, or is it one and the same?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it was our view that we would try and do one of the major centres by a Friday evening meeting and an all day Saturday meeting in Edmonton or Calgary.

MR. SCHUMACHER: The full committee, and then we'd split up. Or are we going to split and do . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Split. We're going to have to split in order to cover.

MS BETKOWSKI: Travel Sunday, work Monday.

MR. SCHUMACHER: No, I meant on the Friday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Friday night half of us would be in Edmonton and half would be in Calgary. Right? I think we have to do that in order to maximize the opportunities for Albertans.

Okay. Well, it looks like that's the time.

Yes, Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: In both Calgary and Edmonton the entire committee would have public hearings?

MR. SCHUMACHER: No. We're split right from the beginning, Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: All the way through.

MRS. GAGNON: Then we could add four locations.

MR. CHUMIR: We talked about a day and a half in Calgary and Edmonton and the balance, the rest of the week, Monday through the next Saturday, for the rest of the province. Doesn't that sound like a little bit of an imbalance?

MS BARRETT: I'm sorry. Could you repeat?

MRS. GAGNON: Not if you consider population.

MR. SCHUMACHER: The original thing said Calgary was the first and Edmonton was the last. If we're split at the beginning, then I guess they're each going to get three days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Edmonton and Calgary will get three days.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Yeah. Right. Three days for Calgary and three days for . . .

MR. CHUMIR: Well, which three days?

MR. SCHUMACHER: The first evening and the first day: Friday evening and all day Saturday, May 24 and May 25, and then May 31 and June 1.

MR. CHUMIR: So it would be the following weekend?

MR. SCHUMACHER: No, I'm sorry; there's only a full day there at the end.

MS BARRETT: That's right; one day at the end.

MR. SCHUMACHER: So it's two and a half days each.

MS BARRETT: It's pretty good, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two and a half days each in Edmonton and Calgary; right.

Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would urge some flexibility in designing the schedule. From previous experience, you don't necessarily have equal interest in different Alberta communities, including Edmonton and Calgary, and we might well find that there are equal numbers of submissions on this issue at this time. On the Senate committee, for example, in '85 there were far different interest levels. So I think that while we need to define that we're covering the province, we also need to have some flexibility where we can add a half day or so to an area that obviously has a great deal of interest and wants to meet with the committee.

MR. CHIVERS: I certainly agree with that.

MR. SCHUMACHER: That could also be adjusted in our subsequent hearings, too, where the demands are.

MR. DAY: That's what we did with the electoral boundaries committee meetings. When it was seen that the demand was great, we notified that community that we would be back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
John wanted to speak.

MR. McINNIS: That speaks to the question of how long you spend in a community, but it doesn't give people there an idea of when the committee will be there. If I understand what Dennis is saying: if we've got half days here and there, if we hit, say, Fort McMurray on Tuesday or Wednesday, we're not going to know until we hear from people there how many want to go. Is that . . .

MR. ANDERSON: I think we'll have an idea by the time the submissions have come in. So we'll have a sense of where the people are from who wish to make submissions, and we'll be able to gauge whether you need another hour or two in Calgary or less there.

I would agree that we should advertise the locations and that we've got to advertise when we'll be in a community, but we need also to leave enough time in between some of those meetings so that we can tack on a few hours or we can come back and tack on a day if we tell them we're going to do that, but some way in which we can respond to the volumes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to rely on staff, et cetera, to do the adjustments and the logistics. Sixteen members of the Legislature trying to do it would end up, I think, worse than the horse designed by a committee. So we're going to have to rely on the staff people to look into that.

Okay. Do we need a motion that those be the hearing dates?

MS BARRETT: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett, seconded by Stan Schumacher. The secretary understands the clarity of that motion, I hope? Yes.

MR. McINNIS: A subsequent comment was made by Sheldon, I think, that people should have three weeks at least to prepare a submission. I think that the deadline for submissions should be three weeks from the end of the advertising, which I understand to be around May 10.

MR. CHIVERS: Make it two weeks before the commencement of hearings.

MR. McINNIS: Before commencement of the hearings. Okay. How's that? Two weeks before the commencement of hearings: that would be Friday, May 10?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's contemplated that the advertising continue right up to the actual hearings. I don't think you can let it die.

MS BARRETT: No, but remember what was said, though, was that basically if you have a written submission that you want contemplated at the meeting, then you have to meet a deadline, but if you want a written submission, go ahead and make it, and if you want to come do an oral submission, but to get a guarantee that your submission would be contemplated. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We don't want everybody speaking at one time; we've been very informal.

Barrie Chivers, and then Stock.

MR. CHIVERS: I don't assume that we're going to be so strict in following these guidelines that if we don't have a whole bunch of written submissions filed by the two-week deadline before the hearing, whatever deadline we choose, we wouldn't permit people who have filed written submissions after that to appear before us and present their submissions if time is available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're right. We would want to ensure, though, that anybody who had given a written submission by a deadline got a chance to be heard. They, then, would have a priority in terms of what they wanted to say. Others would certainly be welcome to come in, but we couldn't guarantee that everybody would have a chance to stand up and make their piece.

MR. CHIVERS: Perhaps that could be made clear in the advertising.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have to do that.

MR. CHUMIR: I've got some ambiguity as to whether or not by giving a written submission you're getting yourself priority over somebody who doesn't make a written submission, and I don't know that that is necessarily a sensible way of doing it. I'm noting a great deal of ambiguity as to what that means, and I think it needs some thought.

2:24

MR. McINNIS: Generally, in my experience you have time for written submissions followed by time for oral submissions, or it could be the other way around, so that people who do take the time to prepare a submission have some idea when their submission would be heard.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would think that people who gave notice that they wanted to make a submission as of the deadline date, be it oral or written, we would hear them the same. I would agree with Sheldon that we shouldn't treat those who want to give a written submission any differently than those who give oral, but to schedule, we would need to know that they wanted to do that. They would get the priority in accordance with them calling or writing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I just outline a little bit what I talked about when I met in Toronto with the chairman of the select committee in Ontario and with a member from each of the other two caucuses on that committee? What they did there – and I think it's useful – is that they gave a set period of time for the more formal type of submissions, either written or verbal or written plus verbal, to explain what was in them and allow some questioning back and forth and so on. They then also specified a set amount of time for people just to come forward and have some verbal dialogue with the committee or file short briefs or whatever. They said it worked very, very well. I really would like us to do that too, and that helps alleviate your concern, I would think, Sheldon, so that nobody is going to be shut out by not having said, "By the Xth day in May, I have to file a written submission." That, quite frankly, would have an inhibiting effect on a lot of people. I really would like to suggest that we try that approach that Ontario used and used very effectively. All

parties agreed that it just was excellent, and some of the best dialogue came not from the written, formal presentations from groups and organizations but rather from the sort of guy or woman off the street who came in and made a position known.

MR. CHUMIR: That does answer one thing. I'm trying to figure out what the significance is, what we're trying to signal to the public by stating that "here is the date that we want your written submission." It seems to me that the concept has to be that if you don't get it in within a certain time, we're not going to be able to consider it appropriately, perhaps read it or be briefed on it so as to be able to discuss it meaningfully with you, as opposed to the alternate interpretation, meaning if you don't get your brief in, you can't come and make a presentation. Now, maybe there's a difference there, but it seems to me that if it's simply a matter of the individual being warned that if you don't get in by a certain point in time, you're not going to get as full a treatment, then we perhaps don't have to give quite as much time in terms of advance time on it. We can give ourselves more time; for example, give ourselves two weeks, have them in perhaps two weeks before and then get an opportunity to get briefed on them and more time to read.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we're hung up on the advertising copy here, because it does make it appear rather formidable. You know, "the deadline for written submissions to the Committee is [blank] 1991." Now, I think that would have an inhibiting feature to it. I think perhaps the text of the advertising is going to have to reflect the concept that if you want to make a written submission, that would be filed with the committee, but if you want to appear without a written submission, you're welcome to.

MR. CHUMIR: We should ask for a certain time frame as to when it should be submitted and with it perhaps an explanation that this will then give us a chance to consider it in advance. Otherwise, it may not get proper consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "If you want us to have read your material, please have it in by such and such a date." I think that's the idea, right?

MS BARRETT: Right on. Yup.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can we adjust the advertising to meet that concern?
Yes, Yolande.

MRS. GAGNON: I know these are meant to be public hearings, but will we allow for those who might wish to present something in private? Sometimes committees like this allow for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, your leader wrote me a letter.

MRS. GAGNON: I know; openness and everything. But we're there to listen. I'm just wondering if that was talked about earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. My experience with a select committee has been limited. I've only served on one, and it was on trucking regulations and perhaps wasn't as important as this. I don't think we've ever had a private or in camera session in a select committee. Can anyone else help me on that?

MRS. GAGNON: I'm not suggesting it's good. I'm just asking if it was discussed at an earlier meeting.

MS BARRETT: No, it wasn't discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it wasn't discussed.
Dennis, what was your experience?

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, in the Constitution committee that was struck before the '82 accord, we did meet with caucuses and other groups of that sort in camera, not in all cases but in some.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You went across the country, though, meeting with party caucuses in other provinces.

MR. ANDERSON: Right. That's the difference. I'm not aware of any where there were public hearings where we met separately with individuals, certainly not in the Senate committee hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody else? What about the select committee on boundaries and so on? You didn't do that?
Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: I was just going to say that presumably if somebody wants to make a written submission and not appear on its behalf, they have effectively made a private submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Except that I don't think we could accept a private submission and not be prepared to make it public.

MS BARRETT: That's true.

MR. SCHUMACHER: It would form part of the transcript for sure.

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah. They'd have to understand that it would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would have to form part of the record.

MS BETKOWSKI: But they wouldn't have to verbally present it as a written submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Everybody agreed, then, that we will not conduct private hearings?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, somebody used the word "contemplate" their submission. I don't want to give the feeling to people giving a submission that somehow it has to meet our approval in any way, shape, or form.

MS BARRETT: "Deliberate." That is what I meant. You know what I mean.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The term "contemplate" was not . . .

MR. DAY: That was the word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Consider."

MS BARRETT: "Consider," "deliberate."

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Review" is a better word.

MR. DAY: Yeah. But not reviewing for approval.

MS BARRETT: That was never implied, Stockwell.

MR. DAY: Okay.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, in the original work plan that was circulated for the weekend of April 26 and 27, it was contemplated that for the Calgary public hearings the full committee would meet, and then it indicated that on the weekend of May 10 and 11 committee hearings are scheduled for Edmonton, although it's not clear whether that would be for the full committee or not. Is there a suggestion now that those two public hearings in Calgary and in Edmonton would be divided or that in both those instances, both those cities, the full committee would participate? Have we made a decision on that one way or the other?

MR. CHAIRMAN: My view is that the whole committee might be in a community. If there were enough requests – and I think there probably would be – for people to appear, there would be two panels, and that way we can double the amount of public input.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, then, we've got a difference from what I understood and what I understood the deputy chairman was saying.

MR. SCHUMACHER: I thought at the beginning of this meeting that we decided we would split from the beginning, but maybe that wasn't the explanation in the original.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I wasn't at the meeting, so I was just going on the basis of this.

MR. ANDERSON: That's what the Chairman was saying, though, I think. We would still split, but we would be split in the same – in Calgary: half in south Calgary and half in the north.

MR. CHUMIR: But that's at odds then. We had everybody sit quietly and listen to the deputy Chair give an explanation of how we're going to have two and a half days in each of Calgary and Edmonton, and that's only possible if we split the committees between Calgary and Edmonton on the first Friday, the first Saturday, and the last Saturday.

MS BARRETT: It doesn't matter. I mean, you're talking about capacity.

MR. CHUMIR: You're also talking about the fact of whether or not you're going to have only one and a half days in your two largest centres.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Mr. Chairman, as I understood it, in our original work plan we were going to all be together that first one and a half days and then we were going to split. Then when we met here today, I had the sense that people thought we should split ab initio and have half the committee here the first

Friday evening and Saturday and the other half in Calgary the first Friday evening and Saturday and the same for winding it up on the last Saturday.

2:34

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're mixed up between two work plans, I guess. We had on the work plan, you will see, that we would have full committee hearings on Friday night and Saturday, April 26 and 27, and then we would go into six days of hearings throughout Alberta, and then on May 10 and 11 come back to Edmonton and do a Friday night and Saturday performance. Okay? That, in fact, was more than just the six. That would give Edmonton and Calgary the same amount of time.

Now, it's always been in my mind – and I'm sorry if I haven't communicated it as well – that in order to hear more people and give opportunity for more public participation, we should have two panels at all times and not have 16 people sitting and listening to people. We'd have two groups of eight, and that would give more people the opportunity to make their presentations.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, to clarify, I agree with that. That was my understanding also. That also goes for other centres. We're not going to be in a smaller centre with the entire group.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

MR. SCHUMACHER: You're looking at north and south for the week.

MR. DAY: Yes. The other thing: if we are going to be in two groups, I would recommend that the committee not be split in Calgary at the same place. We want to also encourage audience to attend. People are going to say, "Which one should I be in, the one over here or the one over there?" I think we want to have media coverage so that other Albertans know what's being said. You're going to have reporters rushing: "Should I go to this room or should I go to that room?" If we're going to split, we can still cover it the same way you want to in terms of time, but why don't we have half the group in Calgary and half the group in Edmonton?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. Okay. But why don't we have one group at Crescent Heights high school and one at Bishop Carroll or whatever? You know, in Calgary is that not . . .

MR. SCHUMACHER: Then our written presenters may wonder which place they're going to go to.

MR. DAY: Some are going to say, "I want to be at the one where the chairman is," and others will say, "I don't want to be at the one where" – with respect – "just the vice-chairman is."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you're really complicating the issue here. With respect, what are you suggesting?

MR. DAY: Well, if we're going to do those days, you want to do the equivalent of let's say Calgary, the two groups. It doesn't have to be on the same day. While the one group is in Calgary, the other half can be in Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see what you're getting at.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, one other consideration. Let me explain what I'd like to see. No doubt there will be provincewide associations and organizations, on behalf of their members, that would want to appear before the committee. I could pick some, maybe the Franco-Albertan association or the Cattlemen's Association. There are any number of provincewide organizations who will have representatives on behalf of them and all their members in Alberta. I can't say that they'd all appear either in Calgary or in Edmonton, but I would tend to think they would be more likely to show up either in Calgary or in Edmonton for those hearings. If I'm in Calgary at one day of hearings, there might be some groups slated to appear before the Edmonton hearings that I would also like to be at.

What about the possibility of carrying on as was originally suggested here, where you have the full committee hearings in Calgary and the full committee hearings in Edmonton? You could say, for example, at the Calgary Convention Centre, if that's where the meeting's being held, for the sake of argument. On the Saturday morning the entire panel, all 16 of us, would be there to hear submissions, and we would be scheduling in organizations that might be provincewide in their representation. Then in the afternoon perhaps divide into two panels in two smaller rooms, at which point we'd perhaps provide the opportunity for people who hadn't submitted written submissions or something like that, and the same sort of format could be held in Edmonton. So sometimes throughout the course of our work the entire 16 of us would be in one room hearing submissions from certain groups and associations and then dividing off later in the afternoon perhaps to allow for more people to attend.

Just picking up on something that Dennis Anderson said earlier, a lot could be driven simply by the number of submissions that we know of ahead of time. That may give us the advance clue to be flexible and arrange things along the lines I'm suggesting. Or if it doesn't look like there are going to be lots and lots of people coming, perhaps for the Calgary and Edmonton hearings the entire group of us could be listening to all the submissions in both cities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's a possibility. Just to make a comment quickly . . .

MRS. GAGNON: Could I just respond to my constituent? I promised I'd, you know, listen to his views, but I think what you're suggesting, Bob, is less flexible. You're asking these provincial groups to appear at a certain limited time. It limits the time frame to three hours rather than a day and a half or whatever, so I think it's less flexible.

Secondly, having served on the so-called Ghitter committee for 18 months, the way that we scheduled hearings in Calgary and Edmonton, for instance, was that at no time were we ever all present in a room. It's ridiculous. Some of us won't be able to be there for whatever reason on a given day, number one. Number two, while five or six are meeting in one place, the others can be elsewhere, maybe at Airdrie or Okotoks. You know, we could do it that way too, spread out a little to the area, not only just to the one location. I don't agree, really, that we should all be there at any given time, but I am concerned about the process after the day is over.

All day long members of the committee have met with people and have heard from these individuals or groups. How are we going to then debrief ourselves and collate the information that we've received? I know there's a lot of staff, but there's the whole thing about . . . At the end of the day would there be

time allowed for those who were at those hearings to sort of have a short discussion and so on leading into the next day or whatever?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bring the two panels together, you mean?

MRS. GAGNON: No. If we're in different places, that may be impossible, but just the people that were there that day. Would we allow for something, a debriefing, to make sure we all heard the same thing or whatever? It's really important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I think we'd have to have informal discussions about what we've heard and so on.

MR. CHUMIR: I almost find myself somewhat sympathetic to Bob's view that at some stage - I don't like to categorize the quality of presentations, but there's a reality that some will be of greater depth and better thought out and more significant than others. I've been troubled, as we've listened to the concept of having two panels, that we're never there at any given time to make sure that for some of the really significant briefs we're all there to hear the discussion and the debate. I'm wondering whether there isn't some flexibility available this time. It isn't a matter that might be left in abeyance. If you're going to decide to sit in two cities, Calgary and Edmonton, separately on these given days, you've got a problem. But I am sympathetic and want to at least throw that in, too, Bob's thought that there are some things that perhaps we should all be hearing.

2-44

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, just on that point . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute, please.
Dennis, Barrie, and then Stock.

MR. CHUMIR: To the extent that we're all able to be there, of course.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess two points on aspects of this discussion. First, I assume, further to Sheldon's previous remarks from a time or two ago, that because we're not limiting the deadline, we are going to essentially say that we will meet with any Albertan, and if we're oversubscribed in an area, we'd be coming back to it.

The second point would be on Bob's suggestion. My inclination would be much closer to Yolande's. I think 16 people in a meeting with briefs are far too many to sit in one room. Secondly, I think all viewpoints in Alberta are important, and I don't want to determine what are first-class briefs and what are second-class briefs. I think we need to listen to all presentations made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Barrie, then Stock.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, my initial inclination on the idea of split panels - we discussed it amongst our members of the committee earlier - is that I didn't like the idea to begin with, but I've been persuaded that that's the only feasible way of handling this project within any kind of reasonable time constraints. What it seems to me is important to determine, though, is: is there going to be some flexibility so that people who want to hear a particular submission would be able to move from one panel to another, or are we going to be assigned to a

panel and only be permitted to participate in hearings that are assigned to that panel?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On that perspective, let me just deal with it. I don't think the panels will be absolutely fixed in their composition. I think you have to allow some flexibility.

MR. ANDERSON: A trade-off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . a trade-off of members.

MR. CHIVERS: But would it only be by way of trade-off? I mean, I don't see why you couldn't have a panel of six sitting in one location and a panel of 10 sitting in another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The permutations of combinations of this thing are getting to be a little bit extreme, it seems to me. I think the original purpose of having a committee of this size, 16, which is very large for a select committee, was to permit it to be split into two to allow some flexibility, obviously, as to who sits on one panel or another at any given time. At the same time, I have real concerns about us trying to come together as a whole group, and as Dennis says, if I were a presenter, unless I was extremely sophisticated . . . Listen; being chairman of a group like this isn't much fun today. What about the guy on the street? Unless you're very sophisticated, appearing before 16 members of the Legislature I think is kind of a tough chore. Quite frankly, I think that we should try and stick to the concept of two panels, maximizing the opportunity for people to be heard. Then of course we're going to have to come together and exchange amongst ourselves and, with the help of *Hansard*, which we have to know what was said at the other panels, come to conclusions as to what people are telling us.

As chairman I think we're getting a little bit too complex if we start talking about coming together at one time, then splitting like an amoeba. Let's stick to the two panels. We can have some flexibility as to who sits. I don't think we should go into that one, single panel thing until we get together in the process of our meetings to exchange views. Would you agree with that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, the logistics are going to be substantial; they are. The staff are going to have start booking halls. They're going to have to start doing all these good things. I don't think we should get involved in that.

Okay. Is the work plan generally decided? We've got the general concept of how we'll be operating, the dates, and then we're going to have to meet and determine whether or not, and how, additional submissions may be required, whether or not we will in this relatively short time period of hearings have heard enough, whether or not there's been a build-up of requests that far exceeds our expectations, and then make a decision as to what additional hearing process would be necessary.

John, did you have a question?

MR. McINNIS: I think that's exactly it. Sometime that week in June, that first week, we get together and assess where we've been, what we've learned, where we go from here. The other dates I have are April 15 for advertising, May 10 to book a time, and then the others we've discussed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: No, that's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Budget. Now the budget's been put together in consultation with my staff at the department, and I assume that it's what we're going to have to pay for all these things. It's a little more than I had anticipated, but the advertising aspect of it is substantial, particularly when you get into using television.

MRS. GAGNON: Mr. Chairman, I see the word "vans." I'm wondering about airplanes, or was that not contemplated at all? Some of the distances are quite far.

MR. POCOCK: For the travel costs we had anticipated air travel for most. The vans are also to transport *Hansard* equipment and that sort of thing.

MRS. GAGNON: I see. Okay.

MR. POCOCK: Some localities do not have air service available.

MS BARRETT: Aw, gee.

MRS. GAGNON: You can always use DC-3s.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are some people who don't like flying, I understand.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I want to tell you, you may be a shadow FIGA minister, but if you ever become minister of FIGA . . .

MS BARRETT: You don't get any choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly.

MR. CHUMIR: Is the expense going to be sufficient to put us into a deficit only a day after the budget has been presented?

MS BARRETT: If this is what they've come up with, I think we should approve it as an interim budget.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we'll have to go with it. I can't, quite frankly, start justifying . . . Could we have a motion, then, to accept the draft budget, recognizing that we're going to perhaps have to come back and review it?

MR. BRADLEY: I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fred. Stan. Are we agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The next item, then, is Communications. We've kind of touched on that as we've gone along. I have just one concern, however, and that is that I'm not certain that we have to wait for our print advertising to start until television starts. I think we can start some print advertising in advance and use the television advertising as an enforcement of what's already gone out in print rather than the other way. I don't know about you folks, but when I watch television and

they say, "Public hearings will be held in Medicine Hat on the da-da-da and Lethbridge on the . . ." then it's gone, but if you've got it in print . . . I think we should get that out in print as soon as possible and then supplement it with radio and television as we move along through the process. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Date of Next Meeting. Is there anything else on Communications? Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I'm just wondering if we're not a little bit too hasty in setting aside a strategy that somebody thought out who probably knows more about how these things work than some of us do. Their suggestion was to launch on television, hit radio in week two, and at that same time do the print advertising. I can't vouch for the wisdom of that advice, although it does seem to me that somebody in Baker Lovick must have had a reason for suggesting it that way, but I don't know. Can anyone advise us around the table?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can somebody help me on that?

MS PARR: The concept would be that people's awareness would already have been raised by the television and radio advertising, and then they would have seen it in print with more of the details and facts. We could certainly go with print prior to the electronic media, I believe, without losing any of the effectiveness, particularly because one of the prime focuses of the advertising strategy is the 1-800 number, which has proven itself effective already. That's where people that are really interested are going to be going for their information anyway. I think that's the key way of getting the information out.

2:54

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got a document here from Baker Lovick. It doesn't have any dates on it, no timetable. Could you get them to give us a timetable for this advertising program, and circulate it to all members of the committee? I do think we should think about getting some print out there as quickly as possible and then use radio and television - I think that's been agreed upon - to supplement that early print.

MR. SCHUMACHER: Will that change the budget, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it shouldn't.

Judith, you have a sort of mock-up of the TV campaign. I must tell you that the first thing that was presented to me was an interesting proposal. I'm going to tell you what it looked like before you see this. I told Pam what it looked like originally. They had a video shot of a huge hall with the notion of persons walking down an aisle to a desk in front of a panel of people sitting there. It was very, very intimidating.

MR. CHUMIR: Franz Kafka's trial: you're guilty of something. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I nixed it. Let's hope this is better.

MS PARR: This might be a bit difficult for you all to see. It's using Alberta in a New Canada, something that has been out or something that is recognized, something that identifies with this committee.

A small child sits there in front of a piece of paper with the crayon, and you'll hear the proposed sound effects, the sound of a crayon on paper. Then there would be a montage of voices coming over saying things like: "The big question is: whose Constitution is it? How do we change the Constitution? What about Ottawa and the provinces?" Different voices will be used. "Here's your chance to be heard on important issues facing Canada. The Alberta Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform is holding a series of public hearings to help determine our future in Confederation. There'll be a hearing in your area soon." Then you'll hear crowd noises, the sounds of people assembling in a hall and talking about Alberta in a new Canada, just very briefly. "We want to hear from you."

The names of the locations where the hearings will be held would be scrolling on the screen, and then the final panel would be the number, 1-800-661-3741. Is that our number? Anyway, "Call this number for details on hearing dates and how you can participate." "This is the Alberta Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform" is the final.

The message is simple: there are hearings; the committee wants to hear from you; call for more information.

Are there any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's better than the last one. Any concern with that: the child, the concept? I kind of like the idea of the child, the new thing coming on the scene, the maple leaf.

Yes?

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I think the concept is great. With the different committees that are out - the federal ones, the one on the amendment, and everything - is there enough either being said or visualized which says that this is Alberta's? In the final frame where he or she, whoever the child is, is holding that white folder, if that were cut out exactly in the shape of the province, something that gives a distinctiveness. I know we say, "Alberta select special committee," but are people just going to think: is this another one of these things floating across Canada? Something to give it an Alberta distinctiveness.

MR. ANDERSON: Actually, on Stock's point, I think that in the copy one could build in a bit more Alberta focus, just because of that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that's a good point: the Alberta Legislative . . . So we don't get mixed up with Spicer and company.

Yes, Fred.

MR. BRADLEY: One comment on the advertising. It says, "Call 1-800," and gives the 1-800 number. Shouldn't it say, "Call toll free"? Not everybody knows that 1-800 is a toll-free number.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, definitely.

MR. OLSEN: It should also say, "Or contact your MLA."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that's true. All MLAs.

Okay. Date of the next meeting. When do we need to meet again? Well, first of all, there are a couple of things I want to do before we establish that, because then we'll adjourn. We've been clipping material from around the country from news reports and so on about constitutional issues. Now, they've just been coming to me. I think all of you should be receiving that material. Right?

Bob.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: That's a good idea. I appreciated that you circulated a summary of the Allaire report to all MLAs some weeks ago. You mentioned some others, such as the Ontario interim committee report and the Belanger report and so on. If you have copies of those as well, I wonder if you could include them in a package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've just been given a copy of the material you're all going to get. This is just a seven-page index of all the material you'll be getting. There'll be backgrounders on Meech Lake. There'll be the major reports, which include everything that's been done; from Ontario, for example - they call theirs An Invitation to Talk about a New Canada; that was the title of their document - and the Allaire report and the Belanger-Campeau. So you'll be getting a lot of additional material; we'll get all that out to you. New material that comes in - for example, the clipping service - should go to all members of the select committee. We'll be killing a lot of trees in this process, but we'll be recycling as much of it as possible. All right?

One other thing - and I originally put this in correspondence to Aldea Landry, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs in New Brunswick, who's co-chairman of the committee in place in New Brunswick, suggesting that sometime we should think of exchanging amongst the provincial groups what we've been finding. When I met with Tony Silipo, who's the chairman of the select committee in Ontario, he suggested that at some time we may want to consider gathering together as a group.

Yes?

MR. POCOCK: I have some further information on that. Wally Fox-Decent, the chairman of the Manitoba select committee, just contacted us this morning and is going to be proposing that Manitoba host a meeting of the four provincial committees to meet in Winnipeg sometime in late May or early June.

MR. SCHUMACHER: While we're sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a bit early in view of our timetable, but the concept of doing that is interesting. I just thought I'd put it out there for you to think about a bit, because Tony thought it was a good idea. Certainly when you get into a forum like that, the partisanship is very minimal. I think that may be useful, so I just throw it out there for your consideration.

Okay. The date of the next meeting. I want to get that advertising timetable from Baker Lovick out as quickly as possible, if you could. That should go directly to all members, and then we should be prepared, I would think, to meet - when would we need to meet again? Not until after you've got all this briefing material that's set up.

MR. POCOCK: It's ready.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's ready?

MR. POCOCK: Yeah.

3:04

MRS. GAGNON: On Friday, April 19, two weeks from today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, that's fine. How about that? And because it's a Friday, right after session, right at 1 o'clock?

MR. SCHUMACHER: One o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Let's do that. Anything anybody else wishes to raise before we adjourn?

MR. McINNIS: Do we need a motion to appoint Garry as the secretary of the committee? If so, I'll do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Are you a secretary or . . .

MR. POCOCK: Whatever title is appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we need that as part of our process?

MR. ANDERSON: How does that work with the Assembly? Is Louise the official Assembly one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Louise is the administrative assistant to committees, right?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yes, and Corinne as well.

MR. POCOCK: I would be officially seconded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're officially seconded from Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Do we need a motion to that effect from this committee? I don't know.

MR. McINNIS: Not to second him but to make him our secretary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, why don't we make that a motion then.

MR. McINNIS: I'll just move that motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

AN HON. MEMBER: I'll second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MS BARRETT: No division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. All free votes today, folks. Motion to adjourn?

MS BARRETT: So moved.

[The committee adjourned at 3:05 p.m.]