

THIS TRANSCRIPT HAS NOT BEEN THOROUGHLY EXAMINED FOR ACCURACY AND IS,
THEREFORE, AN UNOFFICIAL DOCUMENT.

Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Tuesday, September 5, 1978

Chairman: Dr. McCrimmon

10:00 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gentlemen, I think we'll call the meeting to order. We have a reasonable representation. Of the 15 members we have 11 members here, which in harvest time is not too bad. I tried to arrange a meeting on August 28 and 29, but there were too many people on holidays, it was too difficult, and we just couldn't make it. On top of that Mr. Notley and Mr. Clark had some difficulties so we put it today and tomorrow morning. So I hope that this has been reasonably convenient for you. It's a very difficult thing; it has to be called some time and it's never going to be at a time when it's a good time for everybody.

The purpose of the meeting this morning is basically an organizational meeting, so that we can set up our schedules with our meetings and the ministers, more or less our rules for the meetings. I have scheduled Mr. Leitch for this afternoon at 2 o'clock as it's his department, if that is agreeable to the committee. If we finish with Mr. Leitch, I have lined up Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Russell for tomorrow. We'll see how it goes with Mr. Leitch this afternoon. That is the tentative program for the meeting today and tomorrow if that is agreeable to the committee.

We have taking minutes Mrs. Doreen Phillips over here. She may not know all of your names, so perhaps if you hear me call out your name or something it's for the record for Mrs. Phillips. Copies of the minutes will be available through me. If you want copies of these meetings, if you would notify me. I don't know if everybody wants copies or not. Or if you want copies of the transcripts, would you notify me or my secretary. Everybody will get copies of the minutes, of course, but copies of the transcripts are a little more awkward and we will need some notification, if you would let us know.

I think each of you has an agenda, have you not, of what is the tentative schedule. I think perhaps what we should do is line up a schedule of meetings. I had the thought that perhaps a lot of you come from a fair distance to come to these meetings, that perhaps it would be better if we had two-day meetings between now and the opening of the session, if that is agreeable to the committee. Because for somebody to come in 300 or 400 miles for one day doesn't seem too reasonable. If I can line up the ministers for those meetings it will give me a better chance to line up the schedule of ministers. I will let the committee know as far in advance as possible what ministers will be on at certain dates.

We have about four to five weeks before the House goes into session, so I am at your disposal and I would like to get some suggestions from the committee with respect to schedules if we could work out for this next five weeks. I know no matter what we work out it's not going to be just exactly what everybody wants, and I am sure there will have to be some compromises made, but it is a very important committee and we probably have to adjust ourselves and our schedules to what we decide to do today.

MR. DIACHUK: (Inaudible) our Tuesday-Wednesday meeting because we could come back next week, but the beginning of the week . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't got a schedule at all right now. One reason for this meeting this morning is to set up our own schedule, because there's no sense my setting up a schedule if half of the people will not be able to come. It's whatever is most convenient for the most members of the committee. That's what we have to arrange.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think we should try to get two consistent days of the week, Monday, Tuesday, whatever; Wednesday, Thursday, whatever.

MR. TAYLOR: Tuesday's cabinet day, isn't it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tuesday's cabinet day. The cabinet will release ministers for our meetings if so requested.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, then why don't we look at using Tuesday, say Tuesday-Wednesday, or Monday-Tuesday, since the cabinet ministers are around.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about Monday-Tuesday? Is that . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: It doesn't break up the whole week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what I was thinking. If we go in the middle of the week you've got two ends.

AN HON. MEMBER: The 11th and 12th would be out because there's the cabinet tour of the Peace River country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct. Next week is definitely out because there are no ministers.

MR. NOTLEY: What about the 18th and 19th, gentlemen? Could I propose that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 18th and 19th. That's Monday and Tuesday. Anybody . . .

MR. DIACHUK: Maybe we could just keep the 25th and 26th, the following Monday and Tuesday, and stay with the Monday-Tuesday, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 25th and 26th. How does that suit the other members of the committee?

MR. TAYLOR: Will that national meeting of the provincial auditors have any bearing on this? That is on the 25th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The national meeting of the provincial auditors.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ombudsmen, you mean?

MR. TAYLOR: No, the auditors. I was speaking to our auditor in connection with some public accounts and he mentioned that all of the auditors were

coming to Alberta on the 25th, and he asked me to be available to say something on public accounts. But if it doesn't affect the other members . . . I'm just mentioning that in case there is some effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't heard anything about it, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: I'd think the 25th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I was just thinking. We're speaking about keeping the 18th and 19th, where we've scheduled that pretty well now, and keeping the 25th and 26th open. I wonder how the members would react if we also kept the 2nd and 3rd of October open, which would give us flexibility if anything happens we can't meet the 25th and 26th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps on the 18th and 19th we can go to the second meeting from there.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, but I was thinking at the same time, tentatively, if we keep thinking in the line of keeping all those three two-day periods open.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good idea.

MR. NOTLEY: The 3rd, 9th, and 10th.

MR. DIACHUK: The 9th is a holiday; it's Thanksgiving.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, that's right. Yes, that's right. Is it the 11th the Legislature convenes?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's when the cabinet tour is.

MR. DIACHUK: Oh no. The 9th and 10th of October.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've got the 18th and 19th, and the 25th and 26th.

MR. DIACHUK: And then the 2nd and 3rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we can schedule, like, two weeks ahead on the 18th and 19th, we've got the one scheduled and possibly, tentatively, the others. Would that be fair enough and agreeable to the committee?

MR. NOTLEY: So that would be the 25th, 26th, and the 2nd and 3rd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 10th and 12th tentatively.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anyone against that?

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I have a bit of a problem on the 18th and 19th. But it seems to fit the majority, so I'll go with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody else who has problems with those dates? Dr. Backus.

DR. BACKUS: I will be absent on the 18th and 19th.

MR. NOTLEY: Would there be a possibility of having one on the 10th, which is the day after Thanksgiving? I presume the Legislature is reconvening on the 11th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the cabinet tour?

MR. NOTLEY: No. October 10, and letting one of those days go, or both of them go, on the 18th and 19th, if that is a problem. It's difficult. The 18th and 19th I can come, but if it's a real problem for other members, then maybe we should just start on the 25th and 26th, the 2nd and the 3rd, and take the 10th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. I think we have a . . .

MR. KROEGER: We have committee meetings on the 10th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When is the House scheduled to open?

MR. DIACHUK: The 11th.

AN HON MEMBER: The 10th would be difficult.

MR. NOTLEY: It would? Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Various caucuses will be meeting on that . . . It's pretty difficult I think.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, with regard to Mr. Shaben and Dr. Backus. Are both the 18th and 19th difficult, or just one of those days?

DR. BACKUS: Both days.

MR. DIACHUK: Both days. I was thinking the 19th and 20th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, as I say, I don't think we're going to get dates that everybody's going to be there for, and we do have to get these meetings in before . . .

MR. NOTLEY: We don't want to run the risk of not having sufficient members here. We do have a problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there anybody that's free who can't come for the 18th and 19th? We can't go Thanksgiving weekend.

MR. NOTLEY: No, we can't do that.

MR. DIACHUK: Let's proceed with Monday and Tuesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think perhaps we'd better proceed with that, if that's agreeable to the members. Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we start that at 10'clock in the morning on the 18th, how would that be?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That gives the ones coming in on the airbus an opportunity to come up in the morning and get here. At 9 o'clock they don't have time to make it themselves. Is that agreeable? Mr. Planche, is that agreeable to you, and the others from the south? Okay.

With respect to the ministers, I'll line up the ministers for the 18th and 19th and let you know what I can arrange as soon as possible.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, there's just one suggestion I'd like to put forward to the committee, and that is: I would think at some point in these eight or nine meetings at the convenience of the Premier that we should have a session with the chairman of the committee to look at the overall. I think that that would be appropriate. It would seem to me that within the next month, on one of these dates, if you could fit that in it would be useful for this committee. When we deal with the individual ministers we're dealing with the heritage investments as it applies to department A, B, or C. But it would be extremely helpful in terms of our recommendations if we had at least one session to look at the overall picture.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, shouldn't that come after the meetings with the ministers, rather than before?

MR. NOTLEY: It could very well. My suggestion is that whether it comes after or before, at some point it should be scheduled because the Premier's a busy man and I think we have to look at his timetable. But I would like to see us do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last year we went through all the ministers that had a bearing on the report, and then we went through the recommendations. Do you wish to follow the same general procedure again this year?

MR. NOTLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, again could I suggest that -- I think the same general procedure is fair enough. I think we should deal, obviously, with each of the ministers who have responsibility for different investments made by the fund. But before we get to the recommendations, and I have no objection if it is after we have met with the ministers, I think that it would be useful for this committee to spend several hours with the chairman to look at the overall strategy of the committee with respect to not just the various segments, but how those segments fit into the overall objectives of the fund, and I think we should have the meeting with the Premier. It could very well be the last meeting we have before we get into the recommendations, but I would think that that would have to be something, as chairman, you'd have to fit in, keeping in mind his timetable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, we're beginning our sessions this afternoon, meeting with the Provincial Treasurer, and I expect he will be able to lay out for us some of the objectives that Grant has mentioned. At this stage of the year input is going to the Provincial Treasurer from all the various government departments as far as the budgetary process is concerned, and he will have a pretty thorough picture of just what is expected, anticipated, and being requested. I think that after we have held our sessions, perhaps a final meeting with the Provincial Treasurer would be useful as well, rather than with the Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other suggestions from the committee?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Chairman, why don't we think about it. Mr. Notley has just proposed this. I like Mr. Appleby's suggestion that we have a final session with the Provincial Treasurer, but I'd like to have that decision delayed until I can think about it and refer to maybe even our terms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will have the Provincial Treasurer with us this afternoon. We could bring it up if he would be available after we've completed the other ministers to make a wrap-up. Whether or not the Premier, that's . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the reason I raised it, if I may, I feel quite strongly that we should at some point have a meeting with the chairman of the investment committee. I can't imagine that this committee could really fully do its job this year -- last year we were sort of breaking ground -- but fully do its job without at least a meeting with the chairman of the committee.

I would accept the suggestion of Bill, however, that maybe this is not a decision that we have to make today. It may well be that members would want some time to think it over. But I think it's only fair to the other members of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that I should give notice of my view that we should have that meeting and that at some point I may be moving a motion to that effect. But perhaps if several weeks go by and members have an opportunity to evaluate it, we can bring it up at the next meeting. My concern about raising it now, though, is that in scheduling these meetings there will have to be some work done by you, and it's not always easy to do that, because we're dealing with busy people. But I think with that in mind we could look at either the option that Frank has suggested, the Provincial Treasurer, or the possibility of the Premier, at a further meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you care to bring that up, perhaps, at a meeting or two, and consider this as notice of motion that you will be bringing up.

MR. NOTLEY: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then the committee can consider it and think about it.
Mr. Musgreave.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say I wouldn't want us considering it this afternoon with the Provincial Treasurer. I think we should at least wait till the 18th before we sort of address ourselves to it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is correct. I think this is something that should be considered, and Mr. Notley will bring it up at a later meeting. Is that agreeable to you, Mr. Notley?

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fine. I will try to arrange, as I said, the ministers for the 18th and 19th, and let you know who we would have on schedule. It's a little awkward because we don't know how long we're going to take with each minister, but I will get the first one and then those who will be following him. Okay?

The time and the length of meetings: I think probably normally like the next meeting from 10 to 12, and from 2 to 5, or 1 to 5 as we see fit. Is that agreeable?

MR. DIACHUK: Make it 1:30 to 5, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes we (inaudible)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about the rest of the committee?

MR. NOTLEY: That's fine for future meetings, but for today can we stay with the 2 o'clock? I've already got another commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For today. I have to go and line these things up because there's no way that I could get the committee together. I hope it's agreeable the way it has been set up for today and tomorrow.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, one 10 to 12 for the first meeting; 1:30 to 5.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then 9 o'clock to 12, and 1:30 till 5 normally on the 18th and 19th. Is that agreeable to the committee?

MR. HORSMAN: I'm sorry. Did you say 9 o'clock till 12?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be the second day.

MR. HORSMAN: Oh, the second day. Yes, all right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When they're all here.

MR. NOTLEY: Maybe we could have a little leeway on the second day and make it 1:30 to 4 if people have plane connections. It doesn't make much difference to me because the plane . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can adjust this ourselves on the first day of the meeting. Of course that's up to the committee. Just so we can arrange our own schedules, that's all. Are you agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I mentioned the minutes and the transcripts. The minutes will be available to every member. The transcripts will be available in a limited number through me, if you would contact me so that I could contact *Hansard* for anyone who wants a complete set of the transcripts.

Now we come to the recommendations. I think we should have some program or set-up for recommendations. Last year we had about, I believe it was in the area of 25 to 30 recommendations. Now there are 15 members on the committee. If everyone, and this of course is the decision of the committee, is allowed to put in as many recommendations as they wish, we may be swamped. I think you all know the rules. We have to have our report in before the end of the fall session. So what are your thoughts on the number of recommendations per person, or what is your program? What are your wishes?

Mr. Notley.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that I would hope that we wouldn't set arbitrary numbers on the proposals that are made. It may just require, as it did last time, a very long meeting. I don't think that was a bad thing. We started, when was it, at 8 o'clock, and went on until 12 o'clock, but so be it. I would hate to see us limit the number of proposals which individual members can make as a consequence of our studies. In the final analysis the committee members, by majority vote, will either place in the report or turn down proposals made, and as a mover of at least several proposals that were turned down last time, I at least appreciated the opportunity of having them turned down. I think that it would be a mistake for us, at this juncture anyway, to limit or proscribe the number of proposals that can be made, because that's going to flow naturally out of our hearings. It may be that there will be very few this year, or there may be that there should be more, but I think that at this stage to proscribe the number would be crossing the bridge before we get to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, that's a decision of the committee, of course.

Mr. Shaben.

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Notley has recounted pretty well what happened last year, but if the members would respect the Chair's request to get the recommendations in early, or on a date agreed to, so the Chair has an opportunity to group them, we can move through them maybe more quickly than we did last year. There was an attempt made to group them, but some of the members didn't get their recommendations in early enough. So if all the members have an opportunity to have the resolutions grouped, we can each one of us give consideration to the other members' recommendations and move through them quickly. I don't think that the members should be restricted in the number of recommendations they can bring forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Shaben.

Mr. Horsman.

MR. HORSMAN: I just wanted to follow up on that. I agree that we would be unwise to restrict the number of recommendations, but I think we'll have to make sure that the deadline which is set for the submission of the recommendations is in fact followed, and when we do set the deadline that we

do not accept any late filings, so to speak. I think we did that last year, and I think that caused some of the problems.

Also, I think we might take a look at some editorial licence being granted to the Chairman where recommendations are similar in nature. Rather than having four or five, say, relating to provincial parks, which have basically the same intent, and sitting and deciding amongst the whole committee as to which is the most acceptable of those recommendations, that we might have those people who submit them meet with the Chairman and decide which one would go forward rather than all four or five being put in for consideration of the whole committee. If we do that, I think we can smooth out a lot of the difficult areas that we found ourselves in last year, talking about whether or not one recommendation was a little better than the other, and so on.

I think that we should not limit the number of recommendations. I think we should take a good deal of care to have the recommendations submitted to the Chairman well in good time, and that we recognize right at the beginning that we're not going to accept late recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Horsman.
Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Following out of that, I agree that we shouldn't have any limited number, but I take a pretty dim view of recommendations being presented to the Legislature that haven't been considered by this committee. I think that puts every member of the committee in a most ridiculous position. If such is done this year they should not be received by the Legislature, because that gives them a status that they shouldn't have. If we have recommendations they should be considered by this committee before they go to the Legislature. I thought I should mention that, because I certainly took a pretty dim view of that procedure last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other comments from the committee?

We have here group recommendations. The Chairman will get together with those who have submitted the recommendations of a reasonably similar nature, and bring out one recommendation in the case of several similar ones. Is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: That's fair enough.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That the committee set a deadline for the recommendations to be in: we can't set it now, of course, because we don't know our schedule, how long we will be, and so on. But is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And no recommendations to be presented to the committee that have not been submitted and discussed by the committee.

Mr. Musgreave.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Could I ask a question? What is your reaction to that sort of comment by Mr. Taylor?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, my personal comment -- I think I expressed it in the House last year -- but it's strictly that I can't see that if this committee hasn't discussed something, I don't see that any recommendations should be brought into the House that have not been discussed by this committee, because it's unfair to the committee and it's not the proper procedure.

MR. TAYLOR: It's completely unparliamentary.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I agree with Mr. Taylor's position, but I just wondered, you know, as a committee are we going to be able to convey this message?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, if it happens again I'll certainly get up, if I'm around here, and move that the Speaker does not accept such recommendations. It's just not fair to the other members of the committee. They shouldn't be accepted or received in the Legislature. If they have any merit they should be discussed here so we all have a chance to accept them, amend them, or reject them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my feeling that the committee has been established -- and this is the purpose of the committee -- to go over the recommendations, and any recommendation brought to the Legislature that has not passed through the committee, I fail to see that it's a separate subject to the Legislature as far as I'm concerned. Mr. Horsman.

MR. HORSMAN: Just to comment on that, I think that the unfortunate aspect is that it leaves an impression that the committee had rejected recommendations which may have had considerable merit which the committee had not considered. To leave that type of impression in the minds of Albertans was, in my opinion, very unsatisfactory last year. I don't think that the people who submitted those additional recommendations are with us this morning, so when we make the rule on that I think we should make it very clear that that is the opinion of the committee right now, in advance, and communicate it clearly to all members of the committee, both those who are present here this morning and those who are not with us for whatever reason.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Appleby.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I think we're getting into an area here where we're debating the question of the supremacy of the Legislature. Anything that comes on the floor of the House, as far as I can see and according to all the rules of the House, can be amended on the floor of the House. Other proposals can be brought forward; they don't have to be dealt with necessarily. But I don't think a committee of 15 members can set hard and fast rules as to what can be done by the Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you misunderstand, Mr. Appleby. We are not laying any rules down whatsoever for the Legislature. But we can lay down rules for our own committee if they're passed by a majority of this committee, if a majority of the committee decides that no recommendations will be accepted.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, but somebody has said here, if I'm not mistaken, that if such came before the House, they would ask the Speaker to rule it out of order. Now, that would have to come from another source.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that is the way. But that will have to be a House decision. We can't make that decision, of course.

MR. APPLEBY: Yes, that's what I mean. That's right. I wanted to clarify that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But we can make the rules within the committee clear to the members of the committee. And if it's clear to all the members, then that will be brought out, I'm sure, in the discussions in the House.

MR. APPLEBY: Then we're talking about no committee member bringing in a recommendation, other than what we agree on.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would hate to see that. I think members of the committee have a responsibility to bring their proposals to the committee. And if those proposals are turned down by the committee, then I think it was entirely appropriate that a minority report be tabled in the House, but only on the basis of those things that have been discussed in the committee. That was the way in which I attempted to prepare my minority report last year. It dealt with the things that had been proposed and were turned down in committee. I think that's sort of the approach we should take. It shows respect to our fellow committee members. But I would hate to ever see a situation where if a vote is eight to seven on a matter in this committee, that that could not be brought up in the House in a minority report by one of the committee members.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, just to make sure that we're clear on this, but what Grant Notley has just said is the way it should be done. And we did agree, I think, last year that you could put in a minority report, which was fine. And there were some very close votes, as I recall, which crossed party lines, which was of interest. But the point is that we should set a rule for the committee at this stage so that it is clear that if a member comes forward, following the debate on the recommendations, with a new recommendation, that that committee member is breaking the rules of the committee, while technically he may not be breaking the rules of the House, because that is something which is outside of the jurisdiction of this committee, to establish rules for the entire Assembly. But certainly, any member who comes forward, having broken the rules of the committee which we establish at this stage, would certainly, I would think, look rather foolish and rightly so. So I think we should make it perfectly clear at the outset that we do not, as a committee, favor any of our members coming forward and making recommendations to the Assembly that they have not placed before the committee first. And if we're clear on that, then I think we hopefully will avoid the occurrence that took place last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've heard the recommendation by Mr. Horsman. Are there any further comments on this? Is the committee agreed that that is the procedure that shall be followed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Against? Carried unanimously. Mr. Musgreave.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Horsman mentioned earlier that the committee members, all of us, should be advised of this resolution, including those who are not here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will, if the committee wishes, get this resolution made out in writing and distribute it to all members. Is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MUSGREAVE: The other question I was going to ask, Mr. Chairman: do the committee members think it would be advisable for us to distribute this for information to the members of the Legislature?

MR. CHAIRMAN: These are open meetings, and the information . . .

MR. MUSGREAVE: It should get there anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What has been passed here is open information to any member of the Legislature. I don't know if we should go to that extent. But if any member wishes to find out, the information is open and certainly there, unless there are other wishes by the committee.

MR. NOTLEY: I think we have every right to set rules for the committee, but there is no real need to try to make a public case out of it or seem vindictive. I'll leave it at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you agreed with the recommendation I just made?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, is there any further business for this morning?

I might add that I had hoped to have a meeting tomorrow afternoon, but it appears that there is a conflicting problem with the Auditor General, I believe it is -- the committee which takes a good many of our members -- and would make it pretty difficult. So we have scheduled the meeting from 9 to 12 tomorrow. Is that agreeable to the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I mentioned before, it's difficult to get everything gelled, in the first meeting particularly. But I hope that it hasn't been too much of an inconvenience for most of you.

Now, is there anything further that anybody wishes to bring out?

Mrs. Janet Brons, a researcher in the building, will be assisting with the writing up of the report. Mrs. Doreen Phillips will be taking minutes for our meetings through the fall schedule. And, as I said, my secretary will have minutes and we'll get the minutes out to you as quickly as we possibly can after each meeting. If you would contact me with respect to the *Hansard*, those who require it -- please don't everybody ask for a copy because it will be a little inconvenient. There will be copies in my office, available for anybody, at any time, of the committee.

Is there anything further that you wish to bring up this morning that we neglected to talk about?

The reason I asked Mr. Leitch to be first is that, after all, this report is under his cabinet position, so I thought that was the proper place to start. Now we can discuss whether or not we have to have him later on again at later meetings, and in discussion with Mr. Leitch. But that is the reason why I have asked Mr. Leitch to be first. I hope it is agreeable to the committee. Is there anything further that any member wishes to bring up? If not, moved by Dr. Backus that we adjourn until 2 o'clock this afternoon in this same room, gentlemen.

Thank you very much for your attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m.