

1:23 p.m.

Tuesday, October 29, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Horsman]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; I'd like to call the meeting to order, please. We have the agenda before us today but not a great deal of time in which to deal with matters affecting the select committee that are on the agenda, because at 2 o'clock we must adjourn to meet with the aboriginal groups in the round table discussions which we have arranged. So I'd like to quickly move into getting the technical matters dealt with.

The minutes of the meeting of September 5: has everybody had an opportunity of reviewing these? If so, are there any errors or omissions that need to be brought to the attention of the committee? If not, perhaps I could have a motion to adopt them.

MR. SEVERTSON: I'll so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; Gary Severtson. All those in favour? Opposed, if any? Carried.

All right, the next item on the agenda is a matter of some considerable urgency that we ought to deal with. As you know, the federal parliamentary committee has now been established, and it consists of 30 members of the House of Commons and the Senate. They have approached me and, working with our officials, have indicated that the available date for them to come to Alberta and to spend three days is during the week of November 12, immediately after the Remembrance Day holiday on November 11. You will see a proposal, which Garry has put before us now for our consideration.

Firstly, on the morning of November 12 a joint meeting between the parliamentary and Alberta committees would take place on the floor of the Legislative Assembly. That would be done with the permission of the Speaker, and that has been sought and obtained. In addition, it would have live broadcasts of the event both from the parliamentary channel or Newsworld - I'm not sure; one of the national channels - and of course the coverage that we already receive in terms of our own sessions. There's a suggestion here as to how we'd be seated, but we'll come back to that.

Then in the afternoon the two committees jointly would hear four interest groups. Now, we have to talk about that as well.

In the evening the joint parliamentary committee would break into six groups to conduct town hall meetings in Edmonton, St. Albert, and Leduc. We are going to have to discuss how we would participate in those town hall meetings, as to whether or not we wish to do so.

Then on November 13, all day, the parliamentary committee would break into six groups and conduct town hall meetings in Fort McMurray, Peace River, the Jasper-Hinton region, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, and Red Deer. On the 14th, in the morning, we would continue the town hall meeting concept in and about Calgary, and in the afternoon there would be a plenary wrap-up session in the McDougall Centre. During that time a spokesperson from each of the six subgroups which toured the province would provide a summary of findings to the plenary group. Again, we have to determine how and in what way we would want to participate in that process.

So for three days they would be here. It is, of course, an all-party group of the federal Parliament, and my discussions with the co-Chair, Dorothy Dobbie, indicated they have held meetings now in Prince Edward Island and are in the process this week of meeting in Ontario. In that particular case their meetings are being co-chaired, I believe, including the chairman of the Ontario select committee, Dennis Drainville, whom we met with here, you

will recall, in our discussions at Government House earlier on this year. I haven't had an opportunity of viewing that - I don't know if any of you have - and so I'll not comment on it.

In any event, I think we now have to take a look at just how we would want to participate in this process. There is attached a federal government document, which is a proposed itinerary of the special joint committee, using their terminology, and copies of this have been sent to Senators and Members of Parliament from Alberta as well as to our select committee. I've just seen this document now for the first time myself, so we would have to take a moment or two to look through it and see what we think about it.

First of all, on the proposal for November 12 in the morning, does anybody have any concerns about what's being suggested here?

MR. McINNIS: I think, Mr. Chairman, we're agreed as far as a joint meeting in the Chamber is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'd like to deal with these step by step as proposed, because I think we may want to take a different approach with some of the suggested steps here.

MR. McINNIS: Do we have an agenda for that meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. I think we'd have to talk amongst ourselves as to how we would want to deal with it, but it struck me that during the time we might want to follow the format that we utilized in our discussions with the Ontario select committee members when they were here. That worked pretty well, as I recall.

Yes, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Well, that's true, but it would appear, looking at the members of the committee that's coming to Alberta, that they are all MPs from Alberta . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no.

MR. ANDERSON: That's the distribution list.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This was sent "for information to the following."

MR. POCOCK: And I think the federal parliamentary committee is hopeful that the various MPs and Senators from Alberta will attend their town hall meetings.

MS BARRETT: I see. Because if you look at Thursday, November 14, the very last page, this is what convinced me. It shows in Calgary the participants as Johnson, Kindy, Andre, Richardson, Sparrow, Hawkes, Hughes, Feltham. It looked by this that they were striking a committee consisting of Alberta-based MPs and Senators to come to do the Alberta hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Let's get that very clear.

MS BARRETT: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are participants who, in addition to the parliamentary joint committee itself, would want to be there either as observers or participants.

MS BARRETT: Okay. I get it. Well, in that case, then, I think your assumption is good that the same format that we used with the Ontario people would be appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Sheldon, and then Bob Hawkesworth.

1:33

MR. CHUMIR: Quite frankly, I have some problems with the Ontario format. I didn't think it was particularly good. I found myself from time to time at odds with the numbers of statements that may have been made, but not wanting to bring internal squabbles or differences to the floor, other than from time to time the odd thing that was irresistible. So I think it's very important for us to have another meeting and determine what our format will be; for example, to ensure that there's an identification of items that we would want to perhaps present if there is a consensus that these reflect the particular view of Albertans generally, and then perhaps have an assessment of how we might deal with some of the issues. Perhaps there might be some differences. There'd be some formality and we'd not be on the spot at a particular point of time of hearing someone make a statement and then finding that there is some desire to quibble or totally disagree with that.

I think we do need a meeting in the interval, very definitely, to formulate the agenda. I would not be happy with that informal, unchoreographed process of Ontario. I did not think it was a great success, personally.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob Hawkesworth, and then Barrie Chivers.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: This is maybe a more general concern I have. That is, since the release of the federal proposals I'm just wondering to what extent the proposals are open for change or amendment. I guess I would like some opportunity to either question the federal members or have them talk about what they see the process being. As I see what's being proposed here, it's sort of two committees jointly hearing presentations. What I would like to get out of a meeting - I should say I welcome the committee coming to Alberta, and I welcome the opportunity for the two committees to get together. But I would like for myself to have a much better understanding from the federal people what they see the process being and to what extent they feel the federal proposals are open for amendment or change and some of their thoughts about how they see that process at work. I don't know whether there is really any opportunity for us to have that kind of discussion with the committee, as has been suggested here, and I'm just wondering whether I could put that out there on the table for some consideration or further discussion as to how we might have a dialogue between ourselves as well as public hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Perhaps I can just respond to that. When I talked to Mrs. Dobbie - I've talked to her now on two occasions - I indicated to her that we didn't want, I think, to have a meeting where we just made set speeches on either side of the committee but that this should be a dialogue between members of the committee along the nature of a round table type of approach so that that would allow for more flexibility rather than a structured, set-piece type of meeting. I understand - somebody who watched the meeting may want to correct me if I'm wrong - that that's what's been taking place in Ontario. Is it not, Garry?

MR. POCOCK: I haven't been able to watch Ontario.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who has been? Yes, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: I watched some of it last night. I guess that was the general format, though I think people tended to speak from notes as they went along.

Personally, I support the idea of a round table. I don't disagree with either Bob or Sheldon. I think if we have some common positions and issues that we want to press that we can agree to, that would be helpful, though I also think we want that free-flowing format that would allow us to explore issues. I have the same question Bob does. You know, to what degree is there flexibility on the Senate proposals in particular? They're fairly general in their application, but they're more precise in what they say the committee should consider. I don't know if that's necessarily what we want considered, so I'd like to explore that question, in any case, as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Barrie wanted to get in, but then, Sheldon, you want to get back in, right?

Barrie.

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, speaking only of the morning session on November 12. If recollection serves me correctly, the meeting that we had with the Ontario committee was an in-camera meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it wasn't supposed to be. It's just that no press showed up.

MS BARRETT: Was it recorded? Was *Hansard* there?

MR. POCOCK: Well, minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, minutes were taken.

MR. CHIVERS: My question is whether this is anticipated to be in camera. It's not, then, I take it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, no. On camera, I think, Barrie.

MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. They've obviously televised the rest of what they've been doing, so I'd assume that's their assumption.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the question you wanted to ask, Barrie?

MR. CHIVERS: That is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheldon, you wanted back in?

MR. CHUMIR: Well, as part of this, I guess I'm wondering whether or not this is it vis-à-vis the committee, or are they coming again? For example, are we just going in to have a nice little schmooze and kind of express a few ideas and maybe they go back and say that Jim Horsman said X or Chumir said Y and that generally seems to represent what Alberta wants? Because we haven't got a report yet; we don't have a position. I'm concerned that they're going to come through, we'll have this schmooze, and that will be it for Alberta. I wouldn't be very happy with that. We don't have our polling. We haven't had our discussions *entre nous*, as they say. So what is this? I'm a little apprehensive that maybe this is it because of the time frame straitjacket that the committee seems to be in. I mean the federal committee when I say the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I don't think this would be considered to be their sole and only approach to discussing the issue with

Albertans or with us. If I could just give you another factor which you should keep in mind. You will recall that at the Premiers' Conference in Whistler in August, the Premiers agreed unanimously – at least, the nine who were there and the territorial leaders – that we attempt under the chairmanship of British Columbia, as the Chair province of the current Premiers' Conference, to assemble in British Columbia all the provincial committees that have been in operation to discuss what they've been learning and hearing about the views of their own provincial citizens, and out of that meeting perhaps the committees would get a better understanding of how different issues were being viewed in different parts of the country. That's another step in the process that has been agreed to by all Premiers.

Now, of course, with the two new Premiers on the scene since that event took place, I'm not certain whether or not the Premier of British Columbia, as Chair of the Premiers' Conference, will be proceeding with that particular proposal or whether or not there will be a new approach taken somehow or other. It strikes me that by meeting with the federal counterparts and eventually meeting, before the end of the year, with the counterparts in other provinces, we will then be in a much better position to write our own report.

MR. McINNIS: Mr. Chairman, I'm tempted to say that the Liberals and the New Democrats are of a like mind on this, but I wouldn't want that to be misunderstood. I think Sheldon's got a good point: this could be our only opportunity to send a message to the federal committee. So then perhaps we should consider, if we can arrange time, whether we do have a message that we would like to present as a group to the committee. I appreciate that probably means yet another meeting, which is difficult for all of us, but we don't have a lot of time today, unfortunately.

Sheldon, I don't know if you agree, but that might be one way to handle this.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I think that we have to have that opportunity to make a formal presentation, and I'm very concerned these guys won't be back. They're going to be writing a report for the end of February. By the time we have our report on the table, I presume they may be able to consider it in writing, but we certainly won't have the opportunity, I'm suspecting, of making that presentation to them. I think that's a very serious problem and defect in this global process, but at the very least, then, I think we have to focus our minds in terms of the two categories for this next session. What do we collectively agree is a common denominator for everybody that we think Alberta definitely supports? Then I think we need some process if there are differences amongst ourselves, as individuals or otherwise, to have an opportunity to perhaps red flag those and indicate that there is a dimension amongst Albertans that has concerns X, Y, and Z, that obviously they differ amongst them.

1:43

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, while I don't disagree with anything that the new coalition has said . . .

MS BETKOWSKI: Don't make any assumptions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Careful. No partisanship here.

MR. ANDERSON: . . . I would argue that there has to be some flexibility to such a meeting. I wouldn't want to see us go in there and only be making presentations as such, because I agree with what Bob had said earlier, that there is a fair bit to explore,

I think, in terms of where the flexibility is and what the process will be. I suspect from watching the federal committee thus far that they are asking some of those questions themselves. We may be able to evolve it with them, but if we're too structured on it, we could be in trouble as well. So if we can agree to some common themes that we'll use, great, but I also think we need time for that less than very formal discussion with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pam wanted in.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. The time for this meeting is quickly evaporating. I would like to suggest that if we're agreed that we want to get together again to talk about the agenda for our meeting in the Chamber, fair enough, but do we have an idea if we want to travel with these people? Because if we do, we should tell them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to get beyond the morning of the first day.

MS BARRETT: Exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're not making much progress on that, but I think there is merit to determining with more precision just the format of that morning meeting. Can we get agreement first of all?

Yes, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: Well, I just wanted to suggest in terms that there's a fair number of items, different approaches that we might want to meld into that meeting including commonalities, individual differences, and, as Dennis was saying, broad exploration. Ten to 12 seems to me to be a fairly short time. I'd like to see if we can get that from 9:30 till 12:30 so that we can have an opportunity to have give-and-take. That's a very large committee; we're a very large committee. The difficulties are, you know, that you get a few people speaking and you get very few points of view across. Two hours is negligible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see that luncheon is not scheduled, however, until 12:30, so I don't think we'd have any time for expanding into that half hour.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHUMIR: What about starting a little earlier?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Starting it a little earlier too: we could make that suggestion.

Without dealing with the precise format of the meeting, do we agree that we will meet en bloc with the joint parliamentary committee on that morning?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed. We won't need a motion, I don't think, on that.

Now, in the afternoon . . .

MR. CHIVERS: Mr. Chairman, before we go on to the afternoon, it would really assist us in focusing our discussion when we do meet if someone would put together a proposed format so that we have a discussion document to begin with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; I think we have to come back to that so that we have a better idea.

Now, the afternoon: I have a concern here. If they're going to suggest that we jointly hear four interest groups, the question is: how do we determine which particular groups are to be heard? One possibility would be for the federal government to propose which groups would be heard on the basis of the groups from within Alberta that have already asked to meet with them. Alternatively, we could develop a system whereby jointly we might determine which interest groups would be given the opportunity of meeting with us in that setting. Does anybody have any views on those two alternatives?

MR. CHIVERS: I tend to favour the first alternative. It seems to me that this is the federal committee's road show in Alberta. I think it would be difficult for us to pick and choose amongst the people who have presented to us and give them a higher profile. If they had made an application to present to the federal committee, perhaps that might be different, but it seems to me that it would make sense to let the feds do the selecting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can say that as chairman I tend to agree with that approach. Why should we put ourselves in the position of saying yea or nay to somebody? Are we agreed that we would tell our federal colleagues that they can make the choices of the groups that we meet with?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, then, in the evening – and this would apply, I think, for the balance of the process where there will be these smaller groups – the question is there. We have to determine whether or not we will participate in those town hall meetings.

MRS. GAGNON: Given that we decide we will, could we just leave it open to individual members to indicate to Garry which ones they're available to take part in, what town and what time kind of thing?

MR. POCOCK: I guess part of the question is: if committee members wish to participate, do they wish to formally meet with the committee as they are conducting it, or do they wish to attend as observers? Two separate solutions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The federal people have told us that they are very open to sitting down with us beside them, permitting us to be part of the discussion process, and they'd want to make it appear and make it factual that it is not the type of thing where there are formal presentations; you know, the written brief thing. It's more the round table dialogue approach that they're aiming for. So I just thought I'd better put that out there for your understanding.

MS BARRETT: I favour being actual participants so that we have the right to question or engage in discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any dissent from that notion? Nancy.

MS BETKOWSKI: Just an observation. It describes here more of a facilitator in a workshop environment, in which case it's quite different from a round table. If that were the environment, it may well be useful for us to participate as a member of a workshop and get some of our views out to a facilitator.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right.

MS BETKOWSKI: It may cause a more open kind of discussion, that kind of format.

MS BARRETT: There are a couple of different formats, though, you see.

MS BETKOWSKI: Yeah, I know. They've got several.

MS BARRETT: There's presentation by interest groups, and what I'm advocating is that we MLAs who go on those groups be part of the listening and questioning group. I mean, when you talk about the facilitation, I don't know.

MR. ANDERSON: I agree with what's already been suggested, that we do participate in the sessions. I think it is an opportunity to get our perspective across. Having it known that we are being invited into the process I think is helpful, but I think we should be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that seems to be the general consensus.

MRS. GAGNON: I'd just like to reiterate we're also there to listen to the people that are present, but I would like to do it on a personal availability basis rather than say that we will have four people go to wherever – Fort McMurray – or that kind of thing. It's got to be left to people's schedules and whatever. We just inform Garry if we're available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that's a useful suggestion, quite frankly.

MR. CHIVERS: I agree with that as well, but just a word of caution. To the extent that we're presenting views, I think we have to make it clear that they're our personal views and not the views of the committee, because there isn't going to be any balance in terms of representation at these. I think as long as we all go into it on that basis, that if any of us tread on dangerous ground expressing opinions, we should make it clear that we do so as individual members of this committee and not in any way binding any of our colleagues . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that's a very, very useful observation. Thanks, Barrie.  
Yes, Dennis.

MR. ANDERSON: Can I, Mr. Chairman, also say that while going along with Yolande's suggestion, maybe Garry could still co-ordinate. If some of us are available to go several different places, we try and not all be in Red Deer and nobody in the other ones as much as that's possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I think that's a very useful suggestion too.  
Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: It occurred to me that it might be possible for us to travel with the committee as we break into teams, but it also appears that they wind up in Calgary. That's a potential logistic problem unless, of course, one tends to carry on through to the end.

1:53

MR. CHUMIR: What's wrong with that?

MR. ANDERSON: It's a reasonable place.

MRS. GAGNON: There'd just be Sheldon and I there. Great.

MR. McINNIS: Good place to wind up, eh?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think if we get into the logistics of this, then we'll . . .

MS BARRETT: Go crazy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we should leave the logistical issues to the staff to work out. They're all very capable, as we know, of making sure that there will be somebody in each of the places. Also, I think that since the federal folks are inviting MPs to maybe be part of the sitting in and discussing with people, we should also extend that to all the other Members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly. So, for example, in Red Deer we would advise the MLAs in that vicinity that they could, if they wished to, also participate.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: This is sort of just off the top of my head, but when it says here for our joint meeting in the Assembly, "Meeting to be opened by Speaker," I'd presume that's our Speaker, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just saying: welcome to the Alberta Legislative Assembly; good-bye.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I don't expect an answer, but is this being conducted under the auspices of our Standing Orders or the federal Standing Orders?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I hope you're saying that in jest. I think ours. It's our building, our circumstances if we get into that issue.

MR. McINNIS: Along those lines, I did wonder how you would have a round table two sword lengths apart.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, just that the Ontario one was quite informal that way. It seemed to me that they kept a speakers list, and both committees went through dealing with it. It was their Ontario chairman who looked after that speakers list, at least from what I could see on TV.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, it's a unique experience for joint discussions between the federal parliamentarians and legislators. It's new ground. All of us, I think, will learn from the process as we go through the discussions.

I don't know if you've got the list of the membership of the federal parliamentary committee attached here too. I think we've probably had that circulated to you before, but it is once again, as I mentioned at the outset, an all-party committee, and so far as I'm aware, there's been a good rapport amongst them, aside from one little dustup they had about the technical aspect of something. We hope we should be able to do the same thing.

All right. Now, we've run out of time almost, and we have other issues we have to look at here. The suggestion has been made that we gather again before these meetings. We have to look, then, at next week, don't we?

Yes, John.

MR. McINNIS: I'm just going to try this out quickly. I think there may be a solution to the problems that we've had over this poll. The Angus Reid Group has very kindly consented to in effect allow us to go one question over the line at their expense, which I think is a fine offer. In the spirit of that I think we should take the most expensive question, which leaves us only two questions over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just before you jump into that issue, I think we have to try and find the date. From my perspective, and I have a major difficulty in terms of my calendar next week, the only day for me would be on Tuesday the 5th. That would mean missing part of a Treasury Board meeting, but I would have to do it that way. How does that date sit with you folks?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Sorry; which one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next Tuesday, the 5th.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: That's the school trustees' meeting in Calgary. The minister sponsors a luncheon over the noon hour, and I suspect a considerable number of MLAs would be there if past experience is any indication.

MR. SEVERTSON: How about Tuesday evening? It wraps up later that afternoon.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yeah. That's possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have an evening meeting on Tuesday?  
Yes, Sheldon.

MR. CHUMIR: I'm unavailable. Up until Wednesday evening I'm busy. I'm out of town, in other parts of the province, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. That may be an unhappy reality. How's Yolande's schedule?

MRS. GAGNON: I could be here Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I can't. In the afternoon that day I've got to . . .

MR. McINNIS: This is an unhappy coincidence; I'm unavailable until Wednesday evening as well that week.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm unavailable certainly from Wednesday to Friday.

MS BARRETT: This is why we never, ever, ever book meetings on short notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

How many people could not be there Tuesday evening? One, two, three.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm not sure. I don't have my book with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Yolande, you could be there Tuesday?

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah, I guess so. I have something else, but I could reschedule it.

MR. CHIVERS: How about Tuesday morning, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I said Tuesday.

MR. CHIVERS: Early morning I'm thinking though, because it might be possible to have the meeting and get down to Calgary.

MRS. GAGNON: Yeah; 8 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, 8 a.m.?

MS BETKOWSKI: Seven-thirty?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Seven-thirty breakfast?

MR. CHUMIR: I'm glad I'm not going to be there.

MRS. GAGNON: Seven-thirty. I don't know if there's an airbus that will get us here that early, but 8.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: The 7 o'clock airbus, if it's on time, would for sure get us here about 10 after 8 by the time we get a taxi from the airport.

MS BARRETT: Is there an airbus around 11 so that people can get back down for the ASTA lunch?

MR. CHUMIR: There's a 6:55 airbus.

MS BARRETT: No, but I'm asking about Edmonton to Calgary, Sheldon.

MR. ADY: At 11:45.

MR. SEVERTSON: The lunch is at 11:45.

MR. CHUMIR: There's an 11 o'clock airbus.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: There's one at 11 o'clock; there's one at 10 o'clock.

MS BARRETT: Ten o'clock. So it would be an hour-and-a-half-long meeting.

Can I ask a stupid question or what may be the obvious one; I'm not sure which. Is there any reason why we can't spend an hour tonight at the supper hour and get this dealt with?

MRS. GAGNON: I think the supper hour is meant to socialize. We have guests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we have native groups meeting with us over supper.

MS BARRETT: Well, why don't we try, you know, 8 o'clock, 8:15?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. ADY: What happened to Tuesday evening?

MS BARRETT: Too many people couldn't do it.

MRS. GAGNON: With all due respect to my colleague Mr. Chumir over there, what precisely would be the purpose of that meeting? I think we can identify quite easily let's say 12 major issues in the federal proposal that are common, that have been

reiterated over and over by our presenters. Without determining what the position of the group is, at least if we've identified the issues with a little explanation or something, that's what we'll discuss and explore with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we have to still deal with this polling issue, which we're going to have to put off today, unfortunately. I'm sorry.

MRS. GAGNON: Oh, I'm sorry. It's the poll. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're going to have to deal with the remaining items on the agenda, because I really feel that it now being 2 o'clock and we've invited the aboriginal groups, I just think we must adjourn to take in that business.

MR. SEVERTSON: Can we have a quick vote on how many can't make it Tuesday morning, Jim, and then we'll go either Tuesday morning or evening?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who cannot be there Tuesday morning? Three. The same number.

MRS. GAGNON: As long as it's early.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; well, let's say 8:30 Tuesday morning, and we'll adjourn for certain to permit people to get the 11 . . .

MRS. GAGNON: So adjourn at 10:30. Two hours is good.

MS BARRETT: Well, they're going to have to catch their flights at 10 o'clock, aren't they?

MR. SEVERTSON: At 11. It's 11:45 for luncheon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry about this, but we have to go upstairs now to 512.

MS BARRETT: Is there an 11 o'clock flight though? There is? It would get you there just at noon, which is close enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've all received your briefing books for the meeting we're going into now. I think the key thing for us to do is listen and have dialogue and discussion with them and make it the round table type of approach that we sought to do when we invited these folks. I'm very pleased that the Indian Association of Alberta has indeed agreed to meet with us and the other groups at the same time.

[The committee adjourned at 2:02 p.m.]