

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[7:29 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I officially declare the meeting open. We have a light schedule tonight. We should start with a review of the hearings scheduled for Monday and Tuesday, March 5 and 6.

MR. PRITCHARD: Right. I'm just going to pass the schedules around because people may not have brought them.

MS BARRETT: Thanks, Bob.

MR. PRITCHARD: It also includes the Edmonton one in the Carillon Room.

MS BARRETT: Are you guys using . . . Is this recycled, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: Definitely not.

MS BARRETT: Really? It looks like the stuff we use, which is . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm saying that to be smart. This is actually leftover paper, and that's why it's a kind of bond or rough surface. We just get our paper from the Leg. Assembly.

So basically, if we'd like to go through this, I also want to check who's going again, although we've been talking a bit about it, and I'll do that first. On Monday, March 5, Calgary: Pat and Frank; to Hanna: Bob, Tom, and Frank; and to Wainwright: Bob, Tom, and Frank. Actually on Tuesday, March 6, Barrhead and Waskatenau: Bob, Tom, and Frank as well. Everybody else has declined for a variety of reasons.

MR. DAY: I told Bob that because of some calendar shifts some of the members are looking at right now, I may or may not be with you Tuesday, and I think I will be with you on Monday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's good.

MR. PRITCHARD: You may be available on Tuesday and . . .

MR. DAY: I'd say it's about 80 percent sure for Monday.

MS BARRETT: Can I just ask for some clarification on this, s'il vous plaît?

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MS BARRETT: I see one meeting at 8 a.m. on Monday. Now, I'm not going to be there, but I've just got to ask: did Mrs. Rita Dempsey, chair of the Calgary board of education, attempt to make a submission to us at any of our Calgary or nearby Calgary hearings?

MR. PRITCHARD: She told us she wasn't able to attend. She also said that she felt they weren't advertised well enough and because of that and the fact that the school board was the largest one in Calgary, she should have the opportunity to present to the committee.

MS BARRETT: I see. And she wouldn't be satisfied doing that in writing?

MR. PRITCHARD: No. She wanted to make a formal personal presentation. She was offered Red Deer, and she approached both Frank Bruseker and Pat Black.

MS BARRETT: Okay. I have a supplementary on this. Did the school board not get the "Dear Albertan" letter like everybody else got it?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, they did.

MS BARRETT: So they got that in November. In other words, between November and February there wasn't enough time for the Calgary school board, or at least Mrs. Dempsey, to organize to get to the Calgary hearings. I've got you.

MR. PRITCHARD: Apparently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And did we not make a presentation to the school trustees?

MS BARRETT: I thought so.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes. I forget who went, but it seemed to me Stock went.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think Frank and Tom and I. I'm trying to remember the very large group we met with. It was either MDs and Cs . . . I'm thinking back.

MR. PRITCHARD: Well, wasn't it when we were in Calgary?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was in Calgary at the Convention Centre.

MR. PRITCHARD: There was a lunch as well.

MS BARRETT: That's right.

MR. PRITCHARD: I think nearly the whole committee went to the lunch.

MS BARRETT: That's right. I wasn't there, but you had a real . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right, because we tied in our Calgary meetings to coincide with the convention.

MS BARRETT: That's right. Deliberately. I remember now. Okay, I have one more question. Are you folks flying out of Calgary into Hanna? Is that the way you're going?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, by government aircraft.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I'll be doing is driving up from home to Hanna and then proceeding on by car from Hanna to Wainwright.

MR. PRITCHARD: The plane won't kind of be over on one wing? I should be careful. Getting really brave, isn't he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the mike is on.

MR. DAY: Can I ask a question then? As I look at Monday here, in that case can we have the aircraft stop in Red Deer,

pick me up, and then drop me off when it's over?

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't know why not.

MR. DAY: Since it's flying right overhead.

MR. PRITCHARD: You'd come to Calgary as well then?

MR. DAY: Sure.

MR. PRITCHARD: Okay. We'll arrange that, and then I'll get in touch with you about the details.

MR. DAY: Okay. And then . . .

MS BARRETT: Is the timing okay, though? Is there enough time to let that happen, because that'll add close to an extra half hour, won't it?

MR. DAY: No, not to just touch down. I'll virtually leap into the cabin while it's still rolling. I think it would add 10 minutes at the most.

MR. PRITCHARD: I doubt if it'd take 10 or 15 minutes. First, we'll find out if you can for sure. I'll phone you, and then if you can, we'll make arrangements for that to happen, and the same going home.

MR. DAY: It would be great if that could happen.

MR. PRITCHARD: That would be good, then, because you'd be there in Calgary in case Pat is really in difficulty with her other commitment.

MR. DAY: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: So we're okay, then, for Monday.

Tuesday, March 6, Barrhead and Waskatenau. We're going to go in a government vehicle. We'll be leaving here at 8 a.m., getting to Barrhead at 9:30. That gives us time to set up for the public hearing at 10:30. It'll be over at 12:30. We'll have lunch, at 2 o'clock leave for Waskatenau, arrive in Waskatenau at 3:30, set up and have the public hearing at 4. The public hearing ends at 6, and then we'll come back to Edmonton. We'll provide some sandwiches and food in the vehicle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: Bob, are you coming in the van with us, or did you want to go on your own?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will. No, I'll come. Sure.

MR. PRITCHARD: Good. Did anybody have any other questions or anything on those two dates?

MS BARRETT: Is Thomas able to go on those days?

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm sorry. Yes, he is. Definitely. A definite commitment to go.

MS BARRETT: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay?

MR. PRITCHARD: To look at the next thing, I've called this Report Writing and Letter Extracts and *Hansard* Extracts. Basically, this really isn't report writing. It's just information gathering in one way. We're in the process of you getting your ideas together. This form I've handed you is what we're doing with all the written submissions that come in. We're breaking them down by reference. There are other headings on here of course, such as Verbal Hearing, Telephone, because we have had a couple where people have just phoned in and given opinions. Written Presented and Guest Speaker really don't count. We were going to do something a little differently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Bob, we'll need to give all members of the committee an opportunity to study the list and then to suggest changes in the wording or to add categories . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: Definitely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . so that we're sure we're all comfortable with the various headings.

MR. PRITCHARD: We got most of these from members, but certainly there's time to add anything else you think is important. Also, as we go through it, we're going to have the documents themselves, of course, so you can do whatever you want with those. So far we have about 90 of them. If you each want a copy, we can do that or just hand them out. Those are things to think about, and that's why I've basically handed this out. If you feel there are other headings you want or other things you want highlighted, we can do that. One of these sheets is going to be made for every written presentation that comes in the mail, and Ted Edwards is doing that now. Then he's going to take that and enter it into a computer. So with these questions that are here, if we want to know how many people who wrote in talked about urban population issues, it'll pull all those out and say that out of your 100 letters 25 people talked about that or 25 people talked about formulas or whatever it is.

Our other method of getting information out is through *Hansard*. Everything *Hansard* does, of course, is on disks. We have those disks here in the office, and through the computer they scan. So if you pull out a topic you want - you remember something that happened in Red Deer that Mrs. Smith said and it was about 18.5 percent - the computer will scan that and pull all those 18.5 percent numbers, search for whatever Mrs. Smith said or search if she spoke four times on it. If somebody said something over 20 different hearings about some topic or a number - and it can go down to a word; it can actually seek out words - it prints all those and then we can look at them and find out which ones you want, print those sections out, however you want to look at them.

What I thought we'd do in the evenings when we meet between 5:30 and 7:30, for example, because it does take a little time to do this, even with the computer - it's fast and it prints the stuff out, but it does take some time - say we were meeting on a Monday between 5:30 and 7:30 and a number of people on the committee came up with a number of questions and things they wanted referenced, we could work on that and have that ready for the next time we meet.

MS BARRETT: Great.

MR. PRITCHARD: Some of it we might be able to do right on the spot. It depends on the complexity of the question and how many times it's raised and how many times . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, who would be there to do that? Ted?

MR. PRITCHARD: Ted or Karen or, believe it or not, maybe even me, if I learn how.

MS BARRETT: What program is it that you use?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He doesn't.

MS BARRETT: Let's ask the pros. It's not WordPerfect, eh?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, it's not WordPerfect.

Anyhow, that will be the way we'll get a lot of information, because everything we've done is in *Hansard* except what is written in or phoned in.

A third thing I wanted to talk about, which is item three and sort of ties in with that, is the Tomislav demonstration. His work is almost finished. It's quite sophisticated. A couple of people have seen it. Bill Gano from Leg. Assembly has seen it, and he's quite impressed with the way it turned out, even though he was here when we originally discussed doing it. He is really pleased with it. Tomislav himself is very pleased with it, I think. It will be a tool that I think this committee will be able to use to some extent, but it's something that is going to be very valuable for the commission after, to be able to pull . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: So we would want to . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll set a demo up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . set that up for one of our early meetings.

MR. PRITCHARD: He needs about another week or 10 days of work. I've seen it and it's almost finished.

MS BARRETT: The House doesn't sit till then anyway.

MR. PRITCHARD: It's down to – he's getting some of the boundary lines in and some of the municipality lines and that sort of thing that aren't in yet. So that should be ready really early, one of the September meetings. And that will be another tool the committee can use.

MS BARRETT: Are you going to have that put right into your computer so it's here all the time, Bob?

MR. PRITCHARD: Yes, it will be here all the time. It's a little more technical to work. Ted has taken some courses in it and Bill Gano has given him some training. Bill also knows how to work it. It's a little more complicated, but we'll see how it evolves and what questions are raised. Again, the worst case probably would be where somebody asks it on a Monday and whatever you want would be ready on Thursday. Because quite often you want printed stuff, you don't just want to see it on the screen.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. When we contracted that, we contracted it so we get to basically own this program, so that when the commission is struck, it can use this program as well. Is that correct?

MR. PRITCHARD: Absolutely. The ownership is Leg. Assembly.

MS BARRETT: Great. That's actually a really valuable permanent file, you know.

MR. PRITCHARD: Actually, up to this point it's ours. It's Electoral Boundaries Commission; it belongs to this office. When we turn it over, it's Leg. Assembly or wherever.

MS BARRETT: Public works or something. Yeah. That's going to be incredibly invaluable in the long run.

MR. PRITCHARD: Anybody have any other questions on accessing information or . . .

MS BARRETT: Well, I do have a slightly related subject, and that is that you kept saying, "When we meet between 5:30 and 7:30, while the House is sitting . . ." I know what I'm about to suggest could mean delays in meeting times, but why don't we suggest 5:45 so people have time to get down from the House, put their stuff away, and answer the most urgent of the 20 phone calls that are in Edmonton there . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That's fair.

MS BARRETT: . . . and agree that when you get in there, you eat while we meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it's understood. That's right. That's a good suggestion: that we move it back from 5:30 to 5:45 and that we start with something quick to eat. So we eat while we're here, and when we adjourn at 7:30 sharp, you've still got a chance to make a phone call or two or just to walk around the building, if you wish, before we come back.

MS BARRETT: Yeah. I certainly have no objection to people sitting around and eating and talking at the same time.

MR. DAY: Absolutely not.

MS BARRETT: Manners aside, I mean, we've done it before, and you know how we're always feeling that our schedules are so crowded when the House sits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's do that.

MR. DAY: I think all of us are thoroughly accustomed to working lunches, working dinners, working breakfasts.

MS BARRETT: Hey, I'm a pro. I have a salmon or chicken sandwich every day, and I can eat with one hand and run my computer with the other – and I'm not kidding – including shift, alt, delete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing I insist on is that it be something hot. It can be simple, but many of us have sandwiches and juice for lunch and don't want to be limited to

sandwiches here all the time.

MS BARRETT: Oh, sure. No, that's fine.

MR. PRITCHARD: Would boiling water count as hot?

MS BARRETT: Hey, we should have small meetings more often. Look how efficient we are.

MR. DAY: There are many dictators who agree with that particular process. I don't know if we want that on our record or not.

MR. PRITCHARD: This is an interesting piece of stuff. I say it's interesting because I wrote it. It's some pages I just put together of a sample of a report for format, and that's all it is.

I went through and just basically put a cover – so you start with some sort of a letter, a table of contents, and some of the sections: background, preface, report, recommendations, and appendix. On page 4, for the background, break that down into history, establishment of the committee – why it was established – terms of reference. On page 5, a preface that tells some of the things that are important for Leg. Assembly, sort of requirements: detail on meeting arrangements, where our hearings were, how we did our advertising, a breakdown of attendance, presenters, and written submissions, where we went out of province, the voting procedures of the committee, the minutes recorded by *Hansard*, a notation to that effect, and a notation on copies of materials that would be forwarded to the Electoral Boundaries Commission and the Leg. Library – just sort of those technicalities in a report.

Page 6 is the one I had the easiest time writing: just "report." That's the simple part of it.

MS BARRETT: Anticipated our every need.

MR. PRITCHARD: Seven, "recommendations," was even easier.

MS BARRETT: Anticipated those too.

MR. PRITCHARD: Eight is the appendix. The appendix will probably be made up of something like: meetings with the following officials; appendix B, public hearings dates and actually the names and addresses of all the attendees and who presented; and C, a list of all the associations, agencies, et cetera, that sent in submissions.

So I just did this up as sort of a rough kind of guideline to help you start.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest at least one thing here. On page 5 under preface it shows "minutes recorded by *Hansard*." In fact, that's an actual transcript. I think what we should do is identify it as a transcript and at some point approve a motion as to, you know, accuracy or whatever, because you know how we always have the right to review *Hansard*, and if we think there's a mistake or whatever . . . That would constitute the minutes, then, once we approved the *Hansards*.

MR. PRITCHARD: Actually, that is accurate. That is a transcript; it's not minutes. I was told that I need to do a set of minutes, and I've started doing those as well. Even though it's a formality, I was told how to do it in the simplest possible way,

so they're very simple minutes.

MR. DAY: Minutes of each of our meetings and those evening meetings?

MR. PRITCHARD: Right. All our meetings. Even our hearings, a minute page should be made up. But there's a very basic way of doing it: listing who's there, what happened, why, if there were any motions passed, who was present, and signed off by the chairman, the date, et cetera, that kind of stuff. I'm going to do that. So you're right. The *Hansard* is really not the minutes; the *Hansard* is the transcript of the proceedings.

MR. DAY: And our evening meetings coming up, are they on *Hansard*?

MS BARRETT: You bet. Everything. So watch what you say, Stock.

MR. DAY: I always do.

MS BARRETT: Tone and voice imply doubt.  
That looks good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, it's a good start. Again, if we can distribute this to the members of the committee who are not here tonight so they have a chance to look at it and add or subtract.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, I'll do that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

MR. PRITCHARD: And I thought also another thing you might want to think of, which I wrote on the agenda, is the method: how you're actually going to write the report. Are you each going to do a piece of it? Are you going to sit and agonize over every word? Are you going to have somebody like myself write it, and then tear it to pieces? You know, there are different ways of doing it. So I just thought that's something you might want to think about.

MS BARRETT: I have a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS BARRETT: Well, I mean, obviously we need the whole committee here, but generally I think what we do is get to the points where we agree and those where we don't agree, if there are any in the latter category. Then somebody who's a pro, like you, Mr. Pritchard, drafts on the basis of that and then either runs it through Parliamentary Counsel or whatever to make sure the implication of any doubtful word is clear. Then we come back and approve it on that basis. Because if you have seven people trying to write a report, you're going to have seven different reports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But clearly the committee will give direction to Bob. I'm thinking of the background part of the report where he lists the history. You see, I think the history is going to take some considerable time if we're talking about the evolution from 1905 through 1990, listing how electoral redistribution has affected the province, the changes it's gone through. As long as

it's factual, that's what we'll be looking for from Bob.

MS BARRETT: Well, come to think of it, though, on that point is there any reason . . . Bob, we know that you're like politicians; you don't do any work at all, especially between 9 and 5, like the rest of us.

MR. PRITCHARD: I don't do any work at any time.

MS BARRETT: No, that's right. I mean, you're just like any other administrator, politician, et cetera, et cetera.

Is there any point in you starting to draft some things beforehand? I just throw it over.

MR. DAY: Thinking like history, for instance.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'm happy to do that. We have started gathering a few things, and sure, I can do that. I guess I just kind of want to know what you want, and I'll do it.

MS BARRETT: Well, we're not technically allowed to make decisions, but I would sure recommend that, and I doubt that anybody on the committee would mind.

MR. PRITCHARD: These are just working papers too. At least I'm sort of thinking that in the department we would do them this way. They're like a working paper, and people can argue about them when they're written.

MS BARRETT: There you go; that's right. And it would fall under your job description as opposed to a recommendation or a request from the committee.

MR. DAY: I'm comfortable with the suggested process, realizing that we can't make a motion or agree on it at this meeting. In areas like history, is there something already written that you can just transpose and drop right in there and say where you got it so you don't get charged with plagiarism?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, there isn't.

MR. DAY: The last time an Electoral Boundaries Commission was struck, did they do a history?

MR. PRITCHARD: There are bits and pieces, and the Chief Electoral Officer has done some work. So there are bits and pieces we can take from there, but there are a lot of gaps and pieces missing. We've started writing some things up and gathering some information, so I can put something together. And, yes, sometimes we can take directly out of particularly the Chief Electoral Officer's reports.

MR. DAY: Yeah. I'm just thinking of your own workload there in compiling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's relatively light.

MR. PRITCHARD: Right. I'm glad I said that about the plane.

So I'll do a little bit more work on some of the background or history, and if there's anything else you want as a committee, maybe just let me know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Anything else to report, Robert?

MR. PRITCHARD: No, that's my stuff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.  
Pam.

MS BARRETT: Are we on other business?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS BARRETT: I recall that when Barry Chivers came to meet with us when we first started, we said we'd like to have him back to make an analysis of the Meredith decision. I wonder if we could get to work on requesting that. It was already a decision of the committee.

MR. PRITCHARD: Sure.

MS BARRETT: It's no panic, because I think we're weeks away from starting really heavy-duty deliberations, but I sure would like to hear his analysis in the context of both judicial decisions.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll call him tomorrow, Pam.

MS BARRETT: Okay; great. Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. Anything else?

MS BARRETT: No. The revolution's set for 2 o'clock Monday. We're fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.  
Stock.

MR. DAY: I have an item here that I'm somewhat reluctant to bring forward since all the members aren't here and the member in question that I'd like to address this particular item to is not here. But I'll bring it forward in terms of just notice. It has to do, really, with maintaining the very integrity of our committee as I see it. A committee which is a select standing committee of the Legislature, especially on an issue as sensitive as redistribution, must maintain neutrality in terms of the decision-making process. We are out to very clearly get the opinions and the thoughts of Albertans. To speak out before all presentations are in is I think to violate the sensitivity of an all-party committee.

It's been brought to Frank Bruseker's attention early on in the workings of this committee when he made some public statements suggesting what he would like to see happen. Later on, in a meeting in Red Deer, it was brought out that something which had been discussed in camera was released by him to the public, and now we have what I find most offensive: a February 7 issue of the Rocky Mountain House *Mountaineer* in which Frank is making some particularly bold statements, which if he was not a member of this committee certainly he is privileged to do. But he is quoted as saying - let me emphasize that: he is quoted as saying - that "he sees a drop in rural representation in the Legislature of six seats, from 41 to 35," so he has already

virtually decided how redistribution will occur. He goes on to say, or is quoted as saying, in relation to "critics of the proposal to redistribute based on a 25 per cent variance," he simply dismisses those arguments. There's a direct quote here saying, "All other arguments are invalid." That is in the extreme a violation of the integrity of this process. Not only is he dismissing all arguments up to this point but all arguments in the future brought forward on one particular side of the debate. Later on in the article he's quoted as saying that he "told the members the Tories like having the larger numbers of rural seats." He says - a direct quote here: "Every seat lost' through redistribution 'is one Tory seat lost."

One of the things which I think a number of us had remarked on at the outset of this committee as we began to work and travel together was a sense that though we're coming from different political perspectives, there seemed to be this larger perspective that we were going to work together to a common goal of seeing redistribution happen in a fair and equitable manner, the whole process being fair and equitable. This attack on what he sees as a Tory perspective on rural seats in redistribution has a severe effect on the committee itself.

Had Mr. Bruseker been here and with more members here, I would have been bringing forth a motion asking for his withdrawal from this committee and his replacement by somebody from the Liberal party who is more sensitive and more understanding of political integrity in matters like this. As we don't have a full committee here and as Mr. Bruseker is not here, all I can do at this point is serve notice that I would like to address this in our next meeting, hopefully with more members and hopefully with Mr. Bruseker here.

MS BARRETT: Mr. Chairman, I'm really sympathetic to the comments from Stock. I know that the media all want to talk to us, and I know that we each have our own individual orientations on this matter, and sometimes they're not going to break on party lines in fact. But we sort of have made a commitment not to talk about what tendency we might have, where we view things. More importantly, because of that commitment we have not closed the door to other people's thoughts. So I know how important this type of committee work is, Stockwell, and I agree with you. I would like to point out, though - and I'd like to dissuade you now, if I can, from bringing forth a motion to replace Frank. I recognize you're suggesting that the integrity of the committee has been damaged, and I wouldn't disagree with that, but because the hearing process has been so integral to the committee working, I would like to on the record persuade you not to come forward with the motion unless during the next time we meet as a full committee you cannot be persuaded by Frank and other members that we'll do what we can to patch this up and work together as a nonpartisan committee.

MR. DAY: I guess my response to that, Mr. Chairman, would be that I appreciate the appeal to reconsider, and I don't know that I can. I've thought this out at length, but given the appeal from Ms Barrett, I'll give it some consideration and inform the members at the next meeting whether I'll go ahead with the motion.

MS BARRETT: Okay.

MR. DAY: You know, even in our own constituencies, and Red Deer being partly rural, the temptation is very great to stick up

for one side or the other, especially when you know your constituents are reading the newspaper while you're being interviewed. I think most of us on this committee have chosen to resist that temptation and maybe at some political question mark to ourselves in our own constituencies. So I can't overemphasize the severity of this constant breach of protocol. I'll raise it again at the next meeting, and I appreciate the comments from Ms Barrett.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm extremely distraught by what you've read. I think our first obligation as a committee is to hear from Frank directly to see whether or not he did make the comments that he's alleged to have made. I was away all of last week, and I have not had an opportunity this week because of other commitments, trying to catch up from being away. But I do have a letter from a citizen from central Alberta with a copy of the same article, and I now have two memos from colleagues of ours in the Assembly who are very concerned about what appears to be a breach of the code under which committees such as ours must operate.

MS BARRETT: I think we did adopt it too, quite frankly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We did. We spent some considerable time. I think if we check the record, we'll find that we discussed this issue back in November or December. We again discussed it as a specific item in Red Deer, and that referred to an incident in Medicine Hat. So I think our first obligation is to hear from our colleague. I think that in addition we must touch base with legal counsel through the Speaker's office as to any ramifications for our committee. We're in an area that I'm not familiar with in terms of all of the legal ramifications for a special select committee of the Legislature, so we'd better be sure of our footing.

I also feel that it's incumbent on us to meet at the earliest opportunity. Therefore, I'm going to ask Bob to canvass the members and find a time, even if it means an evening meeting, when all seven of us can be present. I feel we must address this issue and get it dealt with.

MS BARRETT: Oh, I do too.

MR. DAY: I appreciate your comments also, Mr. Chairman, in reference to asking our colleague if this indeed was said. I was careful to say in my remarks that he is reported to have said these things.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, you did.

MS BARRETT: Oh, yeah.

MR. DAY: Normally, a media report you maybe don't have to put a lot of weight on, but the quotation seems to be fairly consistent throughout the article, and it seems to run also consistently with other statements that Mr. Bruseker has made during the process of the hearings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. PRITCHARD: I suppose I might start now with the three of you while you're here. I guess you want to do this quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As quickly as possible.

MS BARRETT: Well, actually, I was going to say earlier that I didn't want to meet on March 12, the first Monday that the House sits, but that's not true. If we were out by 7:30, I could.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd prefer that we have this meeting before we go into the House.

MS BARRETT: Good luck.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why not?

MS BARRETT: Oh, okay. Well, I think the first time I've got is sometime on the 8th, and that's around caucus meetings.

MR. PRITCHARD: The 8th? What about the 7th?

MS BARRETT: If you make it evening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MR. DAY: Evening won't work for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How late for you in the afternoon?

MS BARRETT: Okay. Well, I won't know precisely until I get home tonight, but I would imagine I can leave McMurray by about 11. I have a taping to do, and I know it'll be in the morning.

MR. PRITCHARD: Are you staying two days?

MS BARRETT: No. You see, I was wrong. I'm stuck in town on - where am I here? - on the 5th. I've got a . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: But the 7th, Pam . . .

MS BARRETT: The 6th I go up to McMurray, and I've got the engagement that night. Then I do a TV taping on the 7th, and then I can come home. She said that it would be sometime in the morning, so I would assume that I could get out of McMurray by 11.

MR. DAY: I'd have to say that Wednesday is totally out for me, unless it were around midnight.

MS BARRETT: There you go.

MR. PRITCHARD: With the House opening on the 8th, is it at all possible for the morning of the 8th, like 8 o'clock in the morning, a breakfast meeting, or not even a breakfast meeting, just an 8 o'clock meeting?

MR. DAY: My calendar shows 8 o'clock on is pretty heavy.

MS BARRETT: Yeah, mine too. I'm free on Thursday the 8th between 10:30 and noon and then again from 12:30 to 1:30 p.m.

MR. PRITCHARD: Is 10:30 to noon any good for you, Stock?

MR. DAY: On . . .

MR. PRITCHARD: On the 8th.

MR. DAY: No, it'd be impossible. We have caucus that morning.

MR. PRITCHARD: What about the evening . . . Oh, Pam is not here on the evening of the 6th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The evening of the 5th.

MS BARRETT: You mean of the 5th? I'm booked for an engagement, but let me see what time it starts. Dinner at 7 p.m. and speak at 8, so I'm free before then. What time do you folks get back?

MR. PRITCHARD: We don't get back until 6 or 6:30 p.m.

MS BARRETT: That's a bit tight.

MR. DAY: How about the 6th but later in the evening?

MR. PRITCHARD: Pam's in Fort McMurray.

MR. DAY: Oh, right.

MS BARRETT: I think we need a full committee to make any decisions, you see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we do.

MR. PRITCHARD: What happened with 7 in the - assuming Pam comes back about, say, 5 o'clock on the 7th . . .

MS BARRETT: I can't imagine it would . . . It can't be later than 5 p.m., because she said morning taping.

MR. PRITCHARD: Would it be possible to do something between 5 and 6 p.m. on Wednesday the 7th?

MS BARRETT: I'm sure I could make that.

MR. DAY: I could try for that.

MS BARRETT: Okay, I'll pencil it in then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's try it.

MR. DAY: And will it be here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right here.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. Kate, would you mark that down for the next meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will contact Frank in advance and advise him so that he knows.

MS BARRETT: That's a good idea.

MR. DAY: We could probably fax him a copy of *Hansard* from this evening to give him an idea of . . .

MS BARRETT: Depends on how quickly it rolls off the tapes.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah. It's about two days?

06

MS LAMONT: We're not behind right now.

MR. PRITCHARD: Oh, you're not behind?

MS LAMONT: No.

MR. PRITCHARD: So maybe you could even do it tomorrow. Do you think you could?

MS LAMONT: I'm not sure who's coming in tomorrow. I don't know if there would be a problem with that.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll check with *Hansard* anyhow, I'll check upstairs.

MS BARRETT: It's only Tuesday. You could have it by Friday, it sounds like, for sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Anything else tonight?

MR. PRITCHARD: So, basically, it's Tom and Pat and Mike

that I have to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Frank, as well, for the time being. I'm going to call him on the subject matter, but I won't know how you're making out re the meeting.

MR. PRITCHARD: I'll do them real quick, so maybe I'll - I'll tell you as soon as I find out if everybody else can come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Anything else?

MS BARRETT: Not from me.

MR. DAY: C'est tout pour moi.

MS BARRETT: Oh, vous êtes bilingual. Are we adjourned? All right; we're adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 8:07 p.m.]