

1:12 p.m.

Friday, April 19, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we can call the meeting to order, if that's satisfactory with everyone.

MR. McINNIS: Stockwell's here.

MR. DAY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do it.

In any event, we have the minutes of the meeting of April 5, 1991, which have been circulated. Does anybody have any questions or comments relative to the minutes? If not, I would simply declare them as being adopted without comments. I don't know whether we need motions in select committees or not, do we? Could I have a motion to adopt the minutes then? Dennis. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried.

The next item on the agenda is the Proposed Subcommittees, with the locations and dates of the public hearings. The committees have been set up with equal representation obviously. Does anybody have any concerns about the way the membership has been distributed? Okay. Everybody's satisfied with that.

Now, the proposals for the communities and the dates for the hearings have been worked out so that the subcommittees would be meeting on the first two days in different communities, Edmonton or Calgary. Then keeping in mind the geographical circumstances of meeting north/south to have a fairly equal distribution: a lot of logistics and planning have gone into this so that transportation can be arranged for members of the committee as well as the equipment and so on which will have to accompany the committee. So we can't all take it by air. There will have to be surface transportation arranged as well. Any concerns anybody has there? Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I'm assuming there will be some chartering going on, because from Fort McMurray to Grande Prairie by schedule you have to come back to Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I put in a request for a government aircraft. It will help us in this process. I haven't had a response yet as to the availability of the Dash and the King Airs, but if we can utilize those, we will do that. If not, because of other usage, we will then have to charter, but that's being worked out now.

Gordon, have you . . .

MR. OLSON: I haven't heard anything back on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But you did put in the request. The Dash, of course, will accommodate quite a number of people. King Airs are smaller; therefore, we might have to use two rather than one. It would be very difficult to do it by commercial aircraft.

Any concerns with these proposals? Could I then have a motion to accept those? I'm sorry. Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: I don't have a concern. Maybe now isn't the appropriate time, but I note that there was one date set for Camrose, and I don't note Camrose as being on the draft advertisement.

MRS. GAGNON: It is.

MR. CHUMIR: Is it on? It's not on the ones that I'm . . . Oh, there are new ads. So I have the old ads. Okay. I just thought maybe the old proofreader in me caught that, but that's good. Sorry about that.

MS CALAHASEN: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to find out: once we finish these communities that have been listed on these dates, are we going to have some opportunity to go out to some of those other nonurban communities which we had identified at one time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, the decision at the last meeting was that after we dealt with these, we would then come back and determine as a committee where else we might want to proceed to have additional hearings.

MS CALAHASEN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was somebody who had made a motion.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam Barrett. All those in favour? Okay. Thank you very much.

On the Communications Update, I shall call on Judith to bring us up to date on where we are there.

MS PARR: Okay. I'd just like to run through the print advertising first. Some of you may have seen the ads that appeared in the daily papers. They appeared last weekend and again in the middle of this week in the nine dailies across the province. They're running in the weeklies starting this weekend. Some of you may have caught one of them that appeared in the *Edmonton Examiner* last week. That was in error, and they're running it for us again this weekend as a makeup. We were able to place two ads in *Alberta Report*. Those will start in the issue dated April 22, and the following week, April 29, they'll be appearing. I provided you with copies of the revised ad copy as it's been placed in all three. We were not able to place ads in *Maclean's* or *Time* because of the time lines they require beforehand; it's a six to eight week lead on those.

In terms of the television commercial, the copy was revised as per the suggestions of the committee. The lead narration for it now starts out in saying, "What's Alberta's future in Canada," so we get that mention of Alberta right off the start. Alberta is mentioned about five or six seconds after that first mention, so there should be fairly strong identification with Alberta right off the beginning. The shooting for the commercial has been completed, so we have all the pictures. The initial editing of the pictures has been completed, the narration has been completed, and the mixing of both will be done on Monday. The commercial hopefully will be ready on Tuesday. The television ads will start, then, on May 5 and run for a two-week period.

The radio has been recorded again. There is some final mixing that has to be done on those, and those will be for five days starting May 1.

That's the first flight of advertising. These ads are designed to attract attention and also submissions to the public hearings. The second flight will involve radio and print, and that will be to get people to the actual locations of the hearings, to get them to attend. That will be the main focus of that advertising.

There was an initial news release sent out announcing the composition of the select committee and the locations for

hearings. Locations, specifically leases, will be sent out now that the dates have been determined. The plan is to do both regional releases and a provincewide one, meaning that where you're going, say to Camrose, a specific release will be sent to Camrose focusing on that hearing as well as mentioning the others.

As well, we'll be developing a brief information package to give to media across the province, hoping to generate as much publicity and stories as possible, particularly in weekly papers.

We've had almost 2,000 calls to date on the 1-800 lines. There have been about 50 calls since this last flight of ads, and over a third of those have been for specific hearing information and people wanting to appear. I anticipate that to build as the weeks go on.

Finally, an education kit has been developed. We'll get these passed around to everyone. This is a kit that will enable teachers to duplicate the hearings in their classrooms and provide students with an opportunity to discuss the issues as they will be discussed across the province and, indeed, across Canada over the next months. It's being sent to high schools on the advice of educators. The Constitution and related issues are dealt with in grades 10 and 11. We've worked with teachers on the content and have incorporated their advice. Now, I'm providing it to you for your input. It has not yet been sent to schools.

1:22

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I want to deal with this as a sort of separate item, so let's just take a look. I think everybody's had this document supplied to them, have they not, which is one entitled Select Special Committee on Constitutional Reform - Advertising Schedule. It basically outlines the various types of advertising we have engaged in. I think it's a pretty clear chart relative to what we are proposing to do. Are there any questions or comments relative to either the print advertisements, which have been circulated, or this advertising schedule? If not, then I would like to take a look at this documentation which has been prepared for distribution to the schools.

I just had a brief opportunity to look at this in advance, and I don't think any of you will have seen this before today. I had a look at it just the other day. Before sending it out, I would like the committee to take a look at this material over the weekend perhaps, and if you have any concerns or suggestions for improvement, if you could let me know before . . . When would they have to go out to the schools?

MS PARR: We'd like them to go out at the end of next week or early the week after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before Wednesday, then, you could let me know. Then we could perhaps make some adjustments to this. I hate to ask anybody to comment on it right now because you've just seen it, but if that would be satisfactory, I could then hear from you by Wednesday, say at noon, and then if necessary we could make adjustments or additions to the material. Would that be satisfactory?

MS BARRETT: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see we have general agreement on that. Anything else on communications? Any questions any member of the committee would like to pose? Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: There is a suggestion in here that the classrooms invite their MLAs to come to their hearings. I wondered where in the schedule you'd fit that in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is a challenge for all of us to try and work out obviously. In any event, I'll appreciate your comments on this material for the schools.

The next agenda item, if there's nothing further on the communications update . . .

MS BARRETT: I think I would like to make a comment on this. This document reflects the single-party composition, and it's not made clear until page 5 or something that the composition has changed. Is there a way that we can highlight that change? I think we should do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps that's an excellent comment, and I think you should perhaps incorporate that in the facing letter to all schools. It would be very useful right now to agree to make that change. Is that agreeable to everybody? I think we must start identifying this committee in a separate way, using the discussion paper as that, but all new materials should identify clearly the membership on the committee.

Thanks, Pam. That's useful.

Okay. Research/Public Responses is the next item on the agenda. Garry, can you bring us up to date on that?

MR. POCOCK: Yes. I've asked John McDonough to join us here. John has been seconded as the director of research from the Department of Health to assist the select committee in its activities. I think John is familiar to a number of you, as he was the former director for the research branch of the Legislature Library. John also worked with the Select Special Committee on Upper House Reform.

I'd like to ask John to give an overview of the public responses that we've received to date, both in terms of some of the written responses that we've received from the tear-out from the former composition of the task force and also the responses we've received through the select special committee. John has developed a methodology or a codebook to record the information that we are receiving from the letters and briefs and submissions, and perhaps John could run through that for the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By the way, I hope that everybody's received their small binders.

MR. McDONOUGH: Nothing to carry them in, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe we can borrow some briefcases from Mr. Kowalski.

MR. McINNIS: They aren't big enough.

MR. McDONOUGH: Yes; the binders were the first part of our activities, and we would appreciate any comments with regard to that as well in terms of the research and research requirements, which we will try to meet.

Our main focus at the moment is managing the information coming in through the public response. That's coming in to us from the 1-800 line, the telephone calls, and we've received approximately 2,000 of those. Of those, there have been over

350 which have been giving specific comments on constitutional reform.

The other thing that's been happening is that we've been getting a great many letters and briefs from citizens. We've been looking at these since the February date announcing that there would be the change from one process to the current process. Some of these are simply people writing on the back of the document. Well, some people write all over the document and send us the document. Those nice people often just tear off the back page and write on that page. They may attach two or three other pages. But we are getting documents. Beautifully word-processed, bound, 20-page documents have been coming into the committee giving an analysis of the Alberta in a New Canada document. They've been going through the document, much to my surprise, and have been trying to answer all of the 80-some odd questions, which makes the other part of my work quite difficult. In any event, the response: some of it is heartfelt, but a lot of it is quite analytical and carefully crafted and constructed. I'm very impressed with the quality of the response. We've only now been getting to notice some briefs coming in from associations. The final part of the public input will be the hearing process, and we will be coding that information as well.

The process of coding is intricate and interesting. I've developed a coding document that's currently some 90 pages long. The reason for that is that people are commenting on the whole range of government activities, constitutional and otherwise, so we're trying to capture much of the information. It's often stated in different ways, so we are able to capture it in different ways. We have contracted with a data analysis firm to help us use some sophisticated software to do the counting. So we are coding the letters. We are starting with the written documentation first. We have received something like 455 letters and briefs; we have coded over 200 of them. We are now going to test that. We're working as quickly as we can with the consulting firm. We were only able to do the contract with them with the last budget, getting the budget for this committee. We will be testing the mechanism very shortly, and then data analysis will follow from that. As I'd mentioned, that, too, was an art.

The next stage will be the public hearing process. As we get briefs from citizens and organizations that wish to appear, we will be trying to collate those into binders for each of the locations, and we'll try to do a briefing note on each submission, a brief note on the submission in terms of what are the general topic headings to be addressed and perhaps offering possible queries for that document. We will include the document itself plus our briefing note on that document. I'm sure that we will get the documents all on the last day. We will then be working very hard to get them ready. Some documents may not come in within that process, but we will do the best we can in terms of sorting this out. The logistics will be interesting.

The final stage of the research work will be providing data analysis of the information for the report writing.

1:32

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

Any questions for our expert on this task? Dennis Anderson, and Pam Barrett.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, to John. I'm just wondering if at this stage we can characterize at all the 350 calls or the briefs themselves related to comments. Are they broken into certain categories, taking a certain direction?

MR. McDONOUGH: We're doing that. I haven't done any number runs on this yet. I'm having some impressions; the calls are angrier than the letters sort of thing. The one thing that I'm noticing is that people are coming from all over the ballpark on the issues. The one thing that you will note in this process is that every comment will become a kind of minority response in the sense that people are not - even though bilingualism is a very hot topic, the last time I looked, when I did a quick count by hand for the first hundred phone calls, it was still only about 30 percent. So every set comes in as a minimum of that set, but you can look at them only in terms of the other kinds of responses in relation to the overall set of responses. No, there are no numbers on that at the moment.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow on that. Is it fair to say that the calls are motivated by the discussion paper as opposed to the newspaper articles of the day which would elicit a response to that number?

MR. McDONOUGH: Certainly the letters, the briefs are in response to the document. The calls are coming in, I think, a little more in response to the ads where they see the telephone number. Okay? I think the calls are motivated more by the ads, although that's not particularly clear.

I'm sorry, I should hand this out. This is just a breakdown of some of the numbers of the responses that we've got.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Pam Barrett, Barrie Chivers, and then Stock Day.

MS BARRETT: These 450 written deals so far, whether they're letters, submissions, et cetera, et cetera: is it your intention to do a sort of pollster's type of analysis of this? Explain how it is that you're going to convey the contents of that material to us, please.

MR. McDONOUGH: Okay. I have to be very careful in that this information is not statistically valid. We have not done a scientific poll.

MS BARRETT: I understand.

MR. McDONOUGH: What I am able to do, though, is to break down the responses and to tell you who's talked about bilingualism, whether they were positive about bilingualism or whether they were negative, whether they talked about employment in the public service, whether they talked about bilingual education.

MS BARRETT: These are your 95 categories.

MR. McDONOUGH: These are the 95 pages of categories.

MS BARRETT: Pardon me.

MR. McDONOUGH: Some of my categories I made up, thinking that people would respond to them, and they've obviously ignored all of those. The instrument is pretty well closed at the moment, although it's never closed if we started getting responses. For example, if somebody were to make a new public declaration and put something new on the constitutional agenda and we got calls on that, we would open up our coding document to record that kind of information.

MS BARRETT: Thank you, John.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Barrie, and then Stock.

MR. CHIVERS: I was just wondering whether there was any projection as to what type of a response you were expecting and whether the response that you're receiving is as great as or greater than that.

MR. McDONOUGH: I have no expectations. I'm constantly surprised. We had no way of judging public response, what the pick-up would be in terms of people writing or calling. There's no benchmark on which to measure this. This seems to be substantial, both in terms of the numbers of responses and in terms of the content.

MR. CHIVERS: Could I just follow up on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly.

MR. CHIVERS: I'm just wondering. In the time periods you've got here on this chart, you indicate the hearing ads responses since April 13. There are 16 of them. Can you give us a breakdown with respect to those other categories? What period of time is covered by each of them?

MR. McDONOUGH: The period of time covered by each of them is from January 21 till this week. As of this morning, the 16 responses are 16 substantive telephone calls. There have been other letters, although those letters would have been generated, in most cases, in advance of the ads that had gone out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, Barrie?
Stock, Sheldon, Dennis, Pearl.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, have there been any letters of acknowledgment going out to the respondents? If not, is there a plan to do so?

MR. McDONOUGH: Yes. What we've done in going through this process was to code the names of the individuals on our sheets so that we can recognize who said what if we want to get back into the process. We will generate from that an address list, and letters will go out on that basis.

MR. POCOCK: We were waiting to receive letterhead from the select committee and would suggest that the chairman, on behalf of the committee, send a letter of acknowledgment. We received the letterhead yesterday, so those letters will all be acknowledged shortly.

MR. DAY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you got a signing machine for me?

MR. McDONOUGH: If I could mention something else. In this process we're able to capture quotes on issues, so we are not only able to capture the coding. Although I try to develop many, many pigeonholes, you still are pigeonholing people. We are also trying to capture the flavour of the documents by capturing specific quotations from those documents as they relate to the issues and as they relate to the broad spectrum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.
Sheldon, then Dennis Anderson.

MR. CHUMIR: We're going to get summaries and some statistics, but I was wondering what plan, if any, there is with respect to transmitting those actual hard copies of specific briefs. Will there be some that we will be getting that will be so substantive that we should read them all? If there is no plan in that regard, to what extent will they be available if we wish them?

MR. POCOCK: Yes. We don't know yet the specific number of briefs, of course, that will actually be presented at the public hearings. We'll get a better idea of that as we move through the weeks. We can provide the committee with all of the briefs for the various associations and groups that are appearing and indeed for the individuals that have been preregistered for the hearings plus a summary for the committee on each particular brief.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that all the material is available to any member of the select committee. If you want to see any or all of it, that's certainly available. Okay?
Dennis, and then Pearl.

1:42

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, just in terms of collating the data, we're encouraging all MLAs to survey their own ridings; mine has gone out. I'm just wondering how we're going to feed that data in and what process you've got for dealing with the MLA survey responses?

MR. POCOCK: We don't have a particular system in place for that. If the committee wishes us to receive that information, we can put it into the reporting system that we have, and we will be able to put it in with the numbers of the presentations relating to the select committee or keep them separate as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's going to be a difficult process, because I've noticed that some of my colleagues have started the process of surveying but they haven't been using all the same questions. So that's going to be interesting, but we'll have to work that through as we move along.

MR. ANDERSON: Could we, though, Mr. Chairman, suggest strongly, through all the caucuses or directly by the committee, that all members do submit that data so that we have that additional information for the committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, yes.
Pearl, and then John McInnis.

MS CALAHASEN: Could you give us an indication of where the greatest numbers of respondents are from? Do you have that kind of indication, if you have the names of the respondents?

MR. McDONOUGH: Well, we're quoting by address. My sense - and it's only my sense at the moment - is that it started off very heavy from Edmonton and Calgary, and now I'm seeing many more responses coming from rural communities.

MS CALAHASEN: So you don't know what the percentage would be between the rural and nonrural?

MR. McDONOUGH: No; I am quoting that, though. It's a very simplistic breakdown between rural and nonrural, but we are capturing that.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: Just a couple of questions. The reports that come out of the coding process would indicate how many people took each of the 95 positions or whatever we end up with. Is that more or less . . .

MR. McDONOUGH: Oh. I think there is going to be a process that I said would be somewhat creative, in the best sense of this word, of trying to link data elements. We are capturing a lot of different data elements, some of which stand by themselves; others would be better used if you could link them. So it'll be a process of trying to go through this mass of information, and it is massive in the sense of all the different kinds of responses. To code a letter may just take a page, but coding letters have gone on to six pages of separate little items. People are all responding in quite detailed fashion, and that's just too much information. If I just put it on the table, it wouldn't be meaningful. So there will be a process of trying to make this meaningful.

MR. POCOCK: The coding book is not based on the questions that were asked in the discussion paper. Those questions are incorporated within it, but it is much broader than that, because there are a lot of issues that people are raising, some of which we didn't anticipate and some of which in fact don't necessarily relate to the Constitution.

MR. McINNIS: The idea seems to be to give us a quantitative view of how the public input goes so that we have some idea in terms of numbers. I would just like to express a concern. I think a committee like this should, among other things, look for new ideas, because it's a dead cinch that all the old ideas haven't worked 100 percent to everybody's satisfaction. You may only get one person who suggests a new idea. So I hope the committee doesn't take it that the highest numbers win, because we really have to look at it from a more global point of view.

MR. McDONOUGH: We are able to quote people in this process, and from that we are getting interesting, individualistic ideas. That should be part of the process. Or different explanations provided they chose a particular heading may be helpful. So we are able to capture specific quotes in this coding process. That I think will be instructive as well, and we're coding them directly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. It's going to be an interesting process, but I think you're quite right that this isn't just, if you will, a numbers game that we're into. The committee is and should be seeking out new ideas.

Barrie, did you want . . .

MR. CHIVERS: Yeah. I just wanted to get a breakdown on the letters and briefs. It says 455. How many of those are briefs?

MR. McDONOUGH: Oh, all right. You have to accept that I'm playing around with the concept of "brief." I would say

probably 10 percent, maybe a little higher. It seems to me that out of every 10 documents I record, one or two is a substantial document, six pages or more. It's not only pages. It's sort of whether we're just on one subject or whether we're really addressing this process in a different way. It's about 10 to 20 percent.

MR. CHIVERS: And are you going to be following up with these people to invite them to come and present their briefs? I take it that these have mostly been filed not in response to this committee's hearings.

MR. McDONOUGH: They will all receive an acknowledgement letter which I think indicates that the public hearing process is under way. That goes to everyone, whether you just wrote a one-page letter or whether you - I don't want to judge quality in that sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay? Does that answer questions about this process?

I guess we have to acknowledge that we're all not going to be able to read all the information. It is all going to be available to every member of the committee, but we do need somebody and some process by which we can get a general overview of what we're being told.

Okay. Just for your information, under Other, we have just received information that on March 23 a Select Special Committee on the Constitution of Canada was established by the Prince Edward Island Legislature. That committee was established without any news releases, so we just found out about it yesterday, I believe. That's for the information of the committee as well. Their public hearings will be held in mid to late May, and no final reporting date has been set for that committee, although it is anticipated that they may report to a fall sitting of the Prince Edward Island Legislature sometime in October. The committee has seven members: five Liberals and two Progressive Conservatives. I guess the NDP is not represented in that Assembly. In any event, that's some information for the committee as well.

Anything else under Other that anyone else would like to raise?

Yes, John McInnis.

MR. McINNIS: These are really final supplementaries dealing with the hearing schedule. I have three questions. One, is it possible to trade off between committees A and B if we run into scheduling difficulties with ourselves; you know, trading outside the committee? Secondly, what hours are the hearings held? Thirdly, where do we overnight? Is it in the community that's indicated on the schedule?

MR. CHAIRMAN: To answer your first question, I think it would be desirable to stay together rather than having a great deal of switching back and forth, but I don't think we should preclude that in the case of real problems for scheduling. I think it would be better for the logistics and continuity if we were able to keep the subcommittees as intact as possible, but certainly I would not rule out some movement.

Relative to the times of the hearings, Garry asked me that, and I said that I thought we'd be meeting mornings, afternoons, and evenings all the days we have available to us. Everybody flinched at that. That may be unrealistic, but on the other hand a lot will depend, I think, upon what the workload is too.

1:52

MS BARRETT: I have an idea on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes? Pam Barrett.

MS BARRETT: We're going to have to allow some travel time too, though, you see. It seems to me that mornings would have to be designated because a lot of people work. They can't come out and speak in the daytime, and they can in the evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, afternoons and evenings I thought would be basically the times when we would try and hold the public process. That would be my general inclination, but I wanted to spend a little more time working on this with Garry. At our next meeting we would then approve final arrangements for the public hearings. That would include the timing and logistical issues such as overnighting and so on.

While we're discussing that, I'd move forward to the time for our next meeting. May 10 is a Friday, and that is two weeks in advance of our first public hearing date. Would that be suitable to members of the committee? At that time we can deal with these logistical issues in more detail.

MS BARRETT: Fine with me.

MS CALAHASEN: Same time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Same time; right after session. Let's say 1:15. One o'clock makes it a little difficult for people to get out of the House and right up here.

MR. McINNIS: So, Mr. Chairman, are you saying the overnighting issue is not yet decided?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. We'll have that in place for the next meeting.

MR. McINNIS: I think Pam's point is a good one. If we're sitting in the afternoon and evening, morning is probably a travel time, which means we likely retire at the end of the day's hearings and leave the following morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's likely.

MR. McINNIS: Well, we could drive all night and hear all day, but I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I don't think we can drive all night.

Evening hearings have, I think, the advantage of allowing people who work during the daytime to come and make their presentations and allow us some flextime towards the end of a sitting period to expand it. You can't really work that in in an afternoon sitting.

Yes, Pam?

MS BARRETT: I just want to request that as things get prepared prior to May 10 - if, for instance, you come up with a proposal for a schedule for travel time and hearing times before May 10, that stuff could be sent out; similarly, if John's shop comes up with stuff that we could use before then. Basically I'm asking that the committee have stuff as it becomes available rather than getting it all at once, if that makes sense.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly. We'll do that. As soon as we get the materials put together, we'll get it out to you so that we're not just dumping a whole bunch of paper on you at the next meeting and saying, "Okay, here it is; let's deal with it there." No, I want the information to flow so that you have as much lead time as possible. That will, I think, be the best way of approaching it; that would be my suggestion.

MS BARRETT: Okay. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Have we discussed the revised work plan that was sent out with the materials which included that June 6 committee meeting to review the process?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I was getting to that, in a sense, with the discussion of the date of the next meeting. So we'll meet on May 10 next then.

Now, if you look down through the balance of this work plan, we know that these dates are now in place. June 6: did you have a concern with that particular date, Sheldon?

MR. CHUMIR: No, that's acceptable. I just wanted to know whether that has been agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. CHUMIR: By the way, I did have one more question. That is, this June 1 date is kind of the overflow in case there's a need for more hearings, more time?

MR. DAY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. What was the June 6 one? I missed that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: June 6 on the work plan is the committee meeting to review the public hearing process. At that stage, we will get together, and the format of the draft report would be reviewed, significant issues revisited, key areas for decision would be specified. We will also, and we should put this in the work plan, determine what additional, if any, hearing procedures we should then undertake. So it should be clear that on that date we should by then have an idea as to whether or not we've heard enough, whether there are many more demands for public hearings that we're going to have to accommodate through another process later on. That's going to be an important meeting. That will be the first meeting of the whole committee after the two subcommittees have conducted their public hearings.

MS CALAHASEN: I just wanted to know: what times do we meet on these days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the 6th?

MS CALAHASEN: On the 24th, 25th, 27th, and . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, he's going to work that out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we will set the times as we move along. The next meeting is set for 1:15 on May 10.

MS CALAHASEN: Okay.

MR. McINNIS: What about the June 6 meeting? That's a sitting day of the House, is it not?

MS CALAHASEN: Yes, it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think probably we could have a dinner meeting, perhaps 5:45 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Yes, Pam.

MS BARRETT: I think I should report a potential problem with that date, at least with respect to the New Democrats participating. Our national convention occurs at that time in Halifax. I for one will be gone for the whole week of June 6. Now, one doesn't want to, you know, cause everybody else problems because of that, but I think Barrie was also thinking of going and I don't know about Bob. So in the event that the meeting continues to take place on June 6, I guess what would happen is that we would have to submit in writing whatever we wanted discussed or our positions on certain questions that might be put. I don't know how we would handle it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the full week of June 3?

MS BARRETT: Well, I'm away the full week because I'm on a committee related to that. The convention actually starts on the morning of Friday the 7th, so I expect New Democrats from Alberta attending would be leaving on the 6th, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will all of your members on this committee be in attendance?

MS BARRETT: Oh, no. It sounds like John will be here. Bob might or might not; I don't know if he's going.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it won't be an absolutely conclusive meeting obviously, I don't expect. So if you have representation, then I think we could probably keep the date. Okay?

MS BARRETT: Yup.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions?

Thank you for your co-operation. I look forward to hearing more and gathering in more information. We're adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 2 p.m.]

