

[Chairman: Mr. Bogle]

[6:35 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that we've moved out of camera and we've completed reviewing the final draft of the report of our committee, there are some amendments to be made. Some are rather minor in nature, and two stand alone because of their significance. So shall we deal with the minor amendments first, which can be dealt with in an umbrella motion?

MS BARRETT: Yes. I'd like to do that, and I hope I'm doing this properly. I move that where in our recommendations the word "should" had appeared, the word "shall" shall be substituted so that it is understood as not an idea or a hope that you do this; it is an instruction, a command.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any discussion on the motion? Are you ready for the question? All in favour? Carried unanimously. All right.

Any other motions to be put forward at this time? Mike?

MR. CARDINAL: Okay. I have a minor motion to make. On page 2 of the report, at the bottom, there are seven different areas listed. Item 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under which section, Mike?

MR. CARDINAL: It's under the section where it says: at least 95 percent of the 83 electoral divisions shall meet plus or minus 25 percent. Item 4, where it reads: community and diversity of interests. I would like to change that to: community and diversity of interests of the inhabitants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We're adding three words: of the inhabitants.

MR. CARDINAL: Yes.

MS BARRETT: Fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any discussion on the motion? Are you ready for the question? All in favour? Opposed? Good.

Any other motions?

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, under that same section, which is the section dealing with criteria for special consideration, point 7, for purposes of clarification. It now reads: "sudden and dramatic loss of population, due to economic factors." I'd like to amend that by adding: as indicated by comparing the previous and current federal census.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Again an addition. Any further discussion on that?

MS BARRETT: It's fine with me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question? All in favour? Opposed? Carried.

One other motion might be in order. You'll recall that in our discussions we've agreed that any committee member who wishes may come in and look at the report again before it goes to the printer later this week, and I believe it was the intent of the committee to authorize the senior administrator to correct a typo

or a spelling error, anything of that nature, without calling us all back to a formal meeting. Is that the intent of the committee?

MS BARRETT: Yeah. Actually, I'd like to put that in motion form so that if one of the committee . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I was hoping someone would do.

MS BARRETT: If one of the committee members chooses to review the final, final draft before it goes to printing, finds something that appears to be wrong, the senior administrator be authorized to change it unless the senior administrator believes that instruction would change the intent or content of the report. In other words, you've got the right to cross t's or dot i's properly but not alter the intent or substance of the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Taken as a motion. Further discussion? Are you ready for the question? The question is called. All in favour? Carried unanimously. Thank you.

Any other business to be raised?

There is one other matter I want to raise, and, Frank, it relates to a letter you sent me October 31, which I received yesterday. I don't know if you wish to read it into the record or not.

MR. BRUSEKER: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're questioning what remarks I might have made at a recent political meeting regarding proposals of our committee. Okay; I'll read it into the record.

MR. BRUSEKER: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's from Frank Bruseker, MLA Calgary-North West, to myself.

Dear Mr. Bogle:

I have received a report that, during the recent weekend Conservative Party policy convention, you spoke formally, in detail, to a very large group of delegates about the proposals of the Electoral Boundaries Committee.

Please confirm in writing whether or not this report is true.

I await your earliest possible response.

And it's signed.

Committee members will recall that we've discussed on several occasions the need to maintain confidentiality. We've formally placed an embargo on our minutes and on the transcripts of our meetings. We've gone to some lengths to protect the integrity of the committee. In fact, one of the recommendations made and supported, I believe, by everyone around the table was that there be more all-party committees. That's not going to happen if there isn't trust and respect for the process. I have consistently through this process reported at public meetings, at smaller sessions, and to anyone who would listen things we have heard as a committee, and I believe a number of you have done the same. In fact, I think as a committee we decided that was the fine line between getting into the kind of situation you were in, Frank, with the Liberal group in Rocky Mountain House, where you may have been drawn into speculation, and reporting on what we have heard.

So I wish to confirm for the record that, yes, I indeed have reported publicly, not only at the recent party policy conference but on other occasions, on things we have heard. I have never strayed past the line into speculating on what the final con-

clusion of the report might be or a final decision of our committee. That's all I have to say.

MR. BRUSEKER: I appreciate your comments, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; any other business? Are we ready for a motion to adjourn?

MS BARRETT: To dissolve ourselves?

MR. BRUSEKER: A question. We are going to send this report to the printer Friday?

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. BRUSEKER: Then we're looking at two weeks afterwards. I guess the question is: when it finally gets printed, when are we looking at presenting it to the Speaker and the ultimate distribution?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've asked Bob to keep me apprised of the time line and keep it as short as possible. As soon as I know, I will let each of you know, because the process we'll follow – and I've discussed this with the Speaker – is that our first obligation is to present the report to the Speaker, who in turn must ensure that each of the 83 members of the Assembly have a copy of the report. Obviously, in a number of cases that means the report will be placed on their desks. I can't guarantee that it will go into the hands of each of the members. Once the Speaker communicates back to us that that has indeed happened, that the report has been delivered to the offices of 83 members, we then have an opportunity to make the report public.

I would want to ensure that all members of the committee have an opportunity to respond to the media. We should discuss in a more informal sense whether you wish to do that as a committee or, for those who have differing views, whether you wish to do it separately. Clearly it's the intent of the Chair to ensure that all members know and have the same opportunity to communicate their views through the media to their constituents and other Albertans.

MRS. BLACK: On that point, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. BLACK: I think it's really important at this stage, as it has been all the way along, that we are under an embargo on this report under the decisions made by this committee, and we have an obligation as a committee under privilege of the House to keep that embargo until this report is actually received by the Speaker and the Speaker distributes it.

There have been leaks on some of the committee deliberations that have appeared in the press. I would hope that from this point we have an assurance from every member of this committee, because the only place any leak can come from is from a member of this committee, that this report be kept under embargo until the Speaker releases the report. I think we have to stress that, and I think there has to be a full commitment from every member here, because already information is out there going all over the place and I think that's wrong.

MR. DAY: Since it's been raised, I'd just like to add a couple of things. When material is leaked, as has happened here, especially a fairly major leak, if we can call it that, which went to the *Edmonton Journal* whatever the date was, a couple of weeks ago following our evening meeting where we were sort of giving a summation of what we were going to be doing, immediately a cloud of suspicion hangs over a number of people. There are certain employees who are not committee members who will be looking for future positions. I'd like it to go on record that in my opinion no cloud of suspicion whatsoever hangs over those employees, mainly due to the fact that some of the communications which were in the *Journal* the next day were things that had only been verbalized, only in this room, only with the committee members here. So for their own personal work records, should they ever need to use something like this, I'd like it to be known that in my opinion they are absolutely absolved of any suspicion in terms of leaking that.

I think your comments are fair, Mr. Chairman. I think that as we move more and more towards participatory democracy throughout Canada and the democratic world, we will see more all-party types of committees, and I do look forward to that. I was speaking at a conference not long ago, and a lady at the conference said: why don't you have more all-party committees? I shared with her that there are some real benefits, but part of it is working toward removing the suspicion that other people around the table are out to either embarrass you politically or somehow put a mark on your career. That does inhibit the positive synergy which otherwise could develop around the table. In fact, it did happen with a major leak. That's regrettable, but I personally won't use that experience as a dampening effect in terms of what I believe are the positive benefits of all-party committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anyone else?

MS BARRETT: Well, I guess I have a question. After the last leak I got a barrage of phone calls from reporters, and I said that I couldn't comment on the veracity of the statements, but during the next couple of weeks if that happens again – let's just say, I don't know, that the contents became clearer – what do we do? Just keep saying that we can't comment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah.

MR. SIGURDSON: The report should be available in two weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We must follow the rules of the House. While it's regrettable if one member feels that he or she must make things public . . .

MS BARRETT: Not "she." Not me. I didn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . and violate the stated rules which we as professional members are all to abide by, we still must follow the rule: no comment until the report is made public. Then, of course, in the political arena and process that we're involved in, members are at liberty to report events as they see them and to comment, but because one member chooses to break the rules, that cannot be condoned or used as an excuse for others to do the same.

MR. SIGURDSON: Tell them that you've given the scoop to a weekly and they'll have to wait until next Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's a very sad way to end a process.

MS BARRETT: So actually the report could be out by the 23rd, just a few days before we sit. That would be good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've asked Bob to ensure that it is out before we sit.

MS BARRETT: Good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's absolutely imperative that we get it out that week, and the sooner we can get it out the better.

MS BARRETT: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In fact, I even asked at one point if the printer could begin printing now some of the maps and pages where we knew there'd be no changes.

MR. PRITCHARD: Yeah, I checked, but unfortunately they can't, because it's two-sided and larger sheets of paper that they use to put it on, and then it's folded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The key is to get it to the printer on Friday and get it out just as quickly as we possibly can.

MR. PRITCHARD: I've already booked time and asked them to put a priority on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Good.

MR. DAY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go on record, too, as

thanking you for the considerable extra work that's involved with being a chairman on a committee like this and just to extend thanks to you and also to our senior administrator, Bob Pritchard, for duty far beyond the regular 9 to 5 hours. It helped us to complete our appointed tasks.

MR. PRITCHARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, I want to echo what Stock has said, and Pam and others. The extra efforts Bob and Ted and people in *Hansard* and others have performed during the past number of months have really been outstanding. I mean, consider last evening: we worked on this until 5:30 and had a lot of amendments, a lot of changes. I know I came down this afternoon a couple of times and saw how Bob and Ted and Wendy and others were working. They had papers scattered around. I quickly sensed it was not a time to interrupt, so I backed off quietly. They really have worked well.

MS BARRETT: Agreed. Right on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So on behalf of all of us, thank you.

MR. PRITCHARD: Thank you.

MR. SIGURDSON: It's been quite an experience.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; may I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. DAY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Stock. All in favour? It's carried unanimously.

[The committee adjourned at 6:51 p.m.]

