

1:31 p.m.

Monday, October 21, 1991

[Chairman: Mr. Ady]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the meeting to order and welcome all of you back for the 1991 hearings of the Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

We would like to especially welcome our new member, the Member for Edmonton-Beverly.

MR. EWASIUK: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is your first term on this committee, isn't it, Member? I could just give you a little background on some things that have happened that have affected the committee. Specifically, we customarily have had investigative visits carried out by the committee prior to the hearings, and as most of you know, we had planned to visit Prince Rupert and the facility there, Ridley Grain. The legislative secretary, Corinne Skura, did a lot of work in preparation for our visit and all the arrangements were made. Then, because of some difficulties with labour strife as it affects transportation and access, the decision was made that we would postpone the visit. An attempt was made to go at a later date, and again the same type of labour strife arose simultaneously. I'm beginning to wonder if we were the cause of it. At any rate, the time frame became too short to get it organized a third time and we had to cancel it. I hope the members can appreciate Corinne's efforts in preparing that. There was indeed an effort made, and we intended to go. I suppose the best thing we can do at this point is plan for that perhaps next year.

We'd also given some thought to visiting the Husky upgrader, but it is about 13 months away from completion, and perhaps there wouldn't be that much for us to see. We could put it on our list for next year as well. That left us empty-handed as far as investigative visits for this year. However, we have visited most of the facilities, with the exception of those two that I mentioned, so the committee has had the advantage of that.

Moving on to discuss the annual report, we fared better.

Yes, Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt. I just want to correct the marital record of our secretary. You may wish to reconsider how she was named by your good self.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My apologies. Thank you.

Now, if I could move on to the annual report. We were able to get the annual report out about one week prior, so we are in better condition this year than last year. It gave the committee an opportunity to spend some time on the report. Hopefully, when the Provincial Treasurer appears tomorrow, you will have had a reasonable amount of time to prepare questions for him and for subsequent ministers that will come before us in succeeding days.

Are there any questions or comments on the business so far?

Okay, we'll move on to the process we normally carry out during the organizational meeting. Historically, we've allowed each member one question and two supplementaries, and then their name goes to the bottom of the list if they wish to speak again to the particular person appearing before the committee. I assume that would be acceptable, and if it is, could I have a motion to that effect? Then there could be discussion on the motion if members please.

The Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: I so move that on recognition of the Chair each member is allowed one question, two supplementals, and if further questions are required, they drop to the bottom of the speaking order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

Any discussion on that process? It seems fair to all?

I'm sorry, Calgary-Mountain View. Did you have your hand up?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yes, I did, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess my thoughts about the process are such that . . . You know, I've been here for some time, and different ministers approach it in different ways. Some ministers decide to come in and spend maybe 45 minutes with opening comments and take a great deal of time to answer individual questions, which cuts into the ability of the committee to ask questions and enter into any kind of meaningful dialogue with the minister. Now, that may be intentional, to restrict that from happening. I can't say, but I think that's the effect of the approach that has been taken from time to time. I'm not particularly concerned about one question or three as much as if that's the sum total of the interaction, it can often be very frustrating and nonproductive. I'm just wondering whether it's going to be part of your intent as chairman to ensure that not only are the questions succinct and to the point but that the responses are too so all members can participate and in fact there's perhaps an opportunity for us to get to a second round of questioning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Calgary-Mountain View, would you be agreeable to us dealing with that as a separate item of business immediately following this? I'm not sure it impacts on this process of the question and two supplementaries, but I'll be glad to come back to it and we can deal with it as a separate issue. If the committee's not comfortable with that, we'll deal with it in conjunction with the motion.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Okay. Fair enough, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Back to you, Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Fair enough, Mr. Chairman. I guess the only other approach that would be reasonable would be to sort of set aside a certain time limit for each member. You know, if there are 14 members of the committee, there would be - I don't know - five or 10 minutes for each one to enter into a dialogue with the minister. That would be the only alternative I could suggest. In both instances, though, my concern is that if the responses are long and detailed, it doesn't allow for much of an interaction in any event. I'm just saying let's recognize there are those restraints on us. My concern is that three questions often don't allow enough time to get into an issue, but then I'm not expecting any one member should be given time to dominate the proceedings and eliminate the participation of other people as well.

I know we've done it this way in the past. I think what's really important, though, is that we allow for succinct answers as well as putting limits on ourselves as committee members in asking questions. There should be some quid pro quo for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think your comments are fair. Would it satisfy the member if the Chair made an undertaking to draw to the attention of the ministers when they come that we welcome their introductory comments but perhaps they would not make them extensive for the reasons you cite? I think the members of the committee here have heard your comments about long questions, and perhaps with an unstructured effort we can achieve the goal you desire without having a structured time frame for everything. If the member's willing to go along with that, the Chair will give an undertaking to try to satisfy your concern.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lacombe was in first, then the Member for West Yellowhead.

1:41

MR. MOORE: Just on this question raised by the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, I think in reviewing the time frames utilized within the heritage trust fund hearings, you'll find the majority of the time is taken up by political speeches before questions. If people would come out directly with a question with no preamble, you would see there would be considerably more time than what is lost by the minister giving an overview, which is useful to all of us, and giving a detailed answer to a question. I think we are our own worst enemies with our political speeches before we bring questions. In fact, I've noted on occasion that the Chairman had to ask people what the question was because it got so long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll just accept that comment.
Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, you've addressed a couple of the points I was going to make.

In terms of the ministers' introductory remarks, I would certainly support you, Mr. Chairman, in getting the message across to ministers appearing before the committee that we are looking for succinct introductory remarks and that committee members have great interest in questioning and dialogue with our guests. I know there's great variation in approaches taken by ministers that appear before us. Some, as I recall, say two or three sentences and then away we go to questions. Others sometimes have a very long presentation. I can't help but mention, though, that on one occasion I believe the presentation went on at great length but was of such quality that members of all parties commended the person on the presentation. But that is probably a very unique situation.

So I would add my support to the undertaking you've made to the committee, Mr. Chairman, to impress upon our guests that we're very interested in hearing them, dialoguing with them, and if at all possible, their introductory remarks should be as succinct as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

The Member for West Yellowhead, followed by Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lacombe mentioned that the Chairman had to cut in. Indeed, it's the Chairman's obligation to cut in if he doesn't feel things are going in the right order for the Chair. I appreciate your direction over the last term and look forward to this term.

But, Mr. Chairman, I see that the meetings with ministers are held for two hours. Will there be any length given if questions to

those ministers are not answered, or will we be precise in finishing at 12 o'clock and 4 o'clock?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The process has always been that it will be a two-hour session, and it's worked reasonably well. I wonder if the member could enlarge on what he's really suggesting.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, quite often members and, of course, ministers have spoken at great length and some members have not had the opportunity to get their questions in. Would it be the feeling of the committee that if several questions were not answered, we could request the minister to stay just a bit longer? I know they're busy and time is perhaps hard to accommodate, but there have been occasions when we could not get our questions in when, in fact, we felt they were important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, perhaps I can answer it in this manner. The Chair has given an undertaking to try to preclude the problems that have been outlined. Hopefully, that will solve the problem.

Secondly, we have scheduled the ministers for that time and probably they've filled the time slot immediately following their meeting. Our one option is to call the minister back if we can find the time to fit it in and he can fit it in. That's the option left to us. But hopefully we can satisfy your concern by having the ministers be more succinct with their introductions, and the Chairman will be watchful of long preambles to questions in an effort to keep things concise. We should be able to get in an acceptable number of questions. If the member will bear with the Chair in his efforts to accomplish that, I'll certainly have it as a priority.

The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not sure I'm happy just leaving it with you. You have done very well, and I think you're cutting down the preambles the Member for Lacombe is worrying about. You've done a good job of running the meetings. But I'm not too sure cabinet ministers are paying any attention to you in either rescheduling or cutting down preambles, because we went through this before a time or two and nothing happened. I think we should put in some sort of process so the cabinet minister realizes it's nonproductive to go into a long speech. In other words, I think cabinet ministers should have to return or stay until each member has had a chance to ask two questions; then there will be no incentive for cabinet ministers to keep talking. I know the ones that will ignore you and go ahead and talk. Consequently, there should be some way — rescheduling doesn't work. It doesn't seem we can ever get it in. So I think they have to know that they have to either stay here or reschedule and we don't consider the hearing with that cabinet minister over until each member has had a chance to ask two questions. Now, if some people want to waive theirs, that's fine too, but they should each get a chance to ask two questions. Two questions from a member to a cabinet minister is not too much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, with respect, I believe if you were to review *Hansard*, you would find there has been an improvement in the amount of time the ministers have been taking because of the effort we as a committee have put forward to reduce it.

MR. TAYLOR: Don't get me wrong, Mr. Chairman. In most cases it has been done very well, but there are some outstanding

ones, without giving names, and they're the ones I think we want to question the most. Maybe they feel they're going to be questioned and that's why they talk on and on. Don't get me wrong. Nine out of 10 . . . How many cabinet ministers have we got? Twenty-eight?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not all of them will appear.

MR. TAYLOR: They're not all here.

They do a pretty good job, but some of them in my neighbouring constituencies – if you pump them full of air, they don't come down until the meeting is over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the Chair is hesitant to really structure this thing because, in fairness, some portfolios have a bigger impact on the heritage trust fund than others and it's appropriate that they take a little more time than others. However, the Chair agrees that it cannot go on without some limitation, so the Chair will put forth a renewed effort to be sure the introductory remarks are kept to an acceptable level.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't mind being impolite; it's part of my tradition. I think you should get that message across in neon lights to the hon. Minister of Public Works, Supply and Services and the minister for finance. I'm going to finger those two, if you'll pardon me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is prepared to do that, to take the undertaking from the member.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Can we have the question?

MR. MOORE: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour of the motion? Opposed? Carried.

Is there a question?

MR. GESELL: No. I wanted to introduce another motion. Go ahead, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Later on in the process we will be dealing with recommendations. Our hearings are scheduled to end November 7. Perhaps we could have a motion, if it's acceptable to the committee, to have the recommendations in by that date. Would that be acceptable? Could I have a motion: 4 o'clock on that day?

The Member for Lloydminster.

1:51

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chairman, I will make that motion, that at the end of the day of November 7 all recommendations be submitted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the member be prepared to make that "at 4 o'clock" as opposed to "at the end of the day"?

MR. CHERRY: At 1600 hours on November 7.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We're having hearings that same day. To get our recommendations in within two hours of the last one doesn't seem reasonable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, recall the process previously as being that you can bring a recommendation in at any meeting as we're . . .

MR. TAYLOR: I agree, but sometimes it should wait. It's kind of insulting to the last minister that we're going to put recommendations in before we listen to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, we would have to schedule an additional meeting to avoid that. If it's the feeling of the committee that that should be done and it's necessary, we could open a discussion on that point.

The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Might I make a suggestion on this, Mr. Chairman. We usually debate all the recommendations over a period of a meeting or two, and then at some subsequent time we come back and vote on them. First of all, is there a necessity, a requirement, that on all occasions the recommendations have to be read into the record? If they were submitted in writing after the 4 p.m. deadline on November 7 and subsequently added to the list before the debate took place, could they be explained by the member at the time?

I think the point by our colleague from Westlock-Sturgeon is well taken. If the hearing with Mr. Fjordbotten ends on Thursday afternoon at 4 o'clock and we want to make any recommendations as a result of discussion with him, we're basically out of luck, because when his hearing is over with, that's the deadline for submitting recommendations. Even in the morning with the Heritage Foundation for Medical Research, there might be some questions that arise in the presentation. I noticed one of last year's three recommendations that had to do with them was eventually adopted by the committee.

I'm just saying that it seems quite limiting, and if there were some alternatives we could think about that perhaps would avoid actually calling an entirely new meeting just to have one or two recommendations or half a dozen recommendations read into the record – if there's some other way we could accommodate that, I'd welcome it. If we could have them submitted and they could be read into the record or dealt with at the time we begin our debate on the various recommendations, that might be okay too. I realize we have to set a deadline at some point too; I also accept that. I'm just saying it seems a bit limiting that even before our hearings are over or at the point at which our hearings conclude, we have to have our recommendations in. I'm thinking of that last day in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Chair could make an observation, the proceedings of the committee are recorded in *Hansard*, and I believe we would be out of order in making a decision that part of them would not be in *Hansard*. So if it's the feeling of the committee that they need a time space following the last appearance before the last recommendation has to be in, it would be necessary for us to call a succeeding meeting. I believe to be in order we would need to do that, because all our formal proceedings are recorded in *Hansard*.

Further discussion? The Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: You've made the point, Mr. Chairman. However, also appreciating the point made by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, I was going to suggest another meeting date to receive any additional recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I believe that's the alternative.

Member for Lacombe, did you have . . .

MR. MOORE: Well, we've followed this same procedure ever since I've been on this. They set the date as the last day. It seems that nobody had any problem up to this point getting recommendations in. In fact, we've always had 60 or 70 recommendations. I appreciate what the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon says about, you know, that last day, but we have the financial statements from the heritage trust fund. We know what those last two departments involve, and usually, in most cases, those departments provide us with material ahead of time on how they've handled the heritage trust fund money. I think it does not curtail anyone's ability to put in recommendations on that last day; it hasn't in the past. I just can't see us as a responsible group — every one of us is concerned about taxpayers' dollars — bringing a group such as this back on another day just to accept recommendations that we know in the past have been accepted on that last day and have worked out well. I would think that would be not a proper use of taxpayers' dollars.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it would be proper if the Member for Lloydminster withdrew his recommendation, because I don't think it's fair that we would meet with the minister of forestry — indeed, I wouldn't believe that the chairman would have put him at the tail end so that we couldn't make any recommendations. Perhaps after hearing the minister, we might have more recommendations other than what we have, because indeed the people of Alberta are concerned about some heritage trust fund money going into his particular department for certain projects. Indeed, the Official Opposition will be making some recommendations, and we would prefer to do that after the minister has spoken at the hearings. In fact, it would not be a waste of taxpayers' money but perhaps a saving of taxpayers' money if it were necessary to record one more meeting to make recommendations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: My contribution, Mr. Chairman, is more a question than a recommendation. Are we as a committee required to convene formally in this place with *Hansard* simply to accept one or two or a comparatively small number of recommendations resulting from the activities of November 7? I'm wondering if we can have our cake and eat it too; that is to say, accord the members the additional time they requested. It seems like a reasonable thought; you know, another 48 hours to reflect on the two meetings of the 7th and to submit their recommendations, perhaps by way of an original to you and copies to other members of the committee, and then have these read formally into the record on the next occasion we meet as a committee, rather than convening a separate committee meeting, with all the costs that would incur, for what appears to be a mere formality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Without checking the House rules, it's quite likely that the suggestion made by the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek would be workable. The one caution the Chair would offer is let's not extend this time very long or we're going to have a problem with members not having proper time to prepare their debate. It's the intention of the Chair to leave a reasonable time in there for the preparation of the debate. We're heading in this direction, it would seem. Are there any comments about that direction?

The Member for Calgary-Mountain View.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I concur with our colleague from Calgary-Fish Creek. I think what we're trying to do here is accommodate, and any recommendation that's made at that particular point, in any event, will be at the bottom of the list. Certainly it's going to take the committee some meeting time, I suspect more than one two-hour meeting period, in order to discuss and debate the various recommendations, so that by the time we get down to those last recommendations at the bottom of the list, some time would have elapsed in any event. If there'd be some willingness to be flexible, even if you wanted to put a caveat that it was for the last four topics that we discuss — Technology, Research and Telecommunications; Health; medical research; Forestry, Lands and Wildlife; or something that might pertain to that — I think it would be helpful and would facilitate the business of the committee. This might all be academic in any case. It may be that there won't be anything in particular that members want to bring forward by that point. This is just to facilitate it if members of the committee want.

2:01

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Chair will make this suggestion, and then we'll open it up for discussion. Would the committee be prepared to accept a process based on the Member for Lloydminster amending his motion that recommendations for the guests appearing on November 7 pertaining to that portfolio and responsibility be delayed until 10 o'clock, Tuesday the 12th? Does that seem reasonable to the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon, who brought forward the concern?

MR. TAYLOR: It's half reasonable. That's as much as I ever get. I would have liked the last four meetings, but the last two is better than nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair accepts that as half a concession, which is usually about the amount of concession received.
Is there further discussion on that?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, just a technical point. Perhaps into that motion should go the stipulation that for the purposes of the record, they would be read in as the first item of business when we next meet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct.
The Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, we still have a motion on the floor by the Member for Lloydminster.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I'm calling on him to amend it.
Is the Member for Lloydminster prepared to amend the motion in that manner?

MR. CHERRY: Yeah, I'll amend the motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. So the motion will read that the last two meetings, on November 7, could have recommendations submitted pertaining to them by 10 o'clock, November 12, and they would be read into the record as the first item of business in the next formal meeting called by the committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has been called. All in favour? Thank you. Any opposed? The voting was unanimous.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion pertaining to subsequent meetings to conduct the other business that will be necessary for the committee, and I would like to make the motion and then briefly comment on certain features of it.

I would move that

the committee, after receiving recommendations, next meet on November 26 at 10 a.m. until 12 p.m. for the purpose of receiving amendments to recommendations; that on November 27 from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. we debate recommendations; and on November 28 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. we debate recommendations; and further that on December 3, if necessary, we meet to consider or debate recommendations from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. and 2 p.m. to 4 p.m.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I would move that

if debate on recommendations and voting is not concluded by the end of the day on December 3, we meet again on December 10 from 10 a.m. to 12 p.m. for the purposes of voting only.

Now, in supporting my motion, Mr. Chairman, one additional feature here that I think has been a matter of concern to all members of the committee from time to time is that perhaps our work would be facilitated if there was some opportunity – certainly it would help with debate; mind you, I think it has to be a precise period of time – to make amendments to recommendations which are submitted after there has been time for those recommendations to be considered by all members of the committee. That is my reason for stating that the agenda for our November 26 meeting should be the time to receive amendments that members may wish to make to their recommendations.

The other comment I would make, Mr. Chairman, is that in the schedule that I've outlined, there is a half day of additional time to the usual two days that we spend debating recommendations. I do not wish to imply that I think that two and a half days have to be filled if in fact it is the wish of the committee to proceed to voting earlier, but as usual I think we have to set a day aside a little later to make sure that the voting is conducted and dealt with in an expeditious manner.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Chair could just make a comment. I do welcome the suggestion in your motion having to do with a day for amendments. I recall that last year the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon had a concern that we were cut off on an opportunity to make amendments too soon because he wanted an opportunity for both sides' recommendations to be in and then be able to consider them for amalgamation or amendment. I can only assume that that's your reason. It seemed to me, without checking *Hansard*, that there was some concern on that same issue from the member of the Official Opposition. However, Calgary-Mountain View wishes to speak. Perhaps he'll speak on that particular . . .

MR. HAWKESWORTH: This was a question I'd like to put to the mover, Mr. Chairman, and that's the notion: would it be an opportunity for any member to amend any other member's motion, or would this be for an individual to amend their own motion, their own recommendation? Which of those two was the mover contemplating?

MR. JONSON: The mover was contemplating two factors, actually, because they are the issues that the mover understands came up at previous meetings. One was that the mover would have the opportunity to amend his motion, and secondly, there would be the opportunity to combine the thrust of recommendations on a mutual basis.

2:11

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to clarify then. It's not the intent of the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey to suggest that a member could amend another member's motion; that's not the intent.

MR. JONSON: Correct. I was asked, Mr. Chairman, as to what my intent was, and that is clearly my intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Just to be clear on that.

Calgary-Mountain View, are you clear on his intent? All right.

The Member for West Yellowhead, followed by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I wrote down the dates the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey mentioned: November 28, 2 to 4 in the afternoon, and December 3, 2 to 4 in the afternoon, I believe. I was wondering if the member as Deputy Speaker is indicating to us that there will not be a fall session and that in fact we'll be free to sit these days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the member can make that assumption. Other than that, in view of the fact that there has been no fall session announced, we have to go ahead with our best judgment to get our meetings scheduled. That's what we're doing with holding this meeting and trying to get something scheduled. If there's a fall session called, then I suppose all bets are off and we'll have to rework our schedule probably into January.

MR. DOYLE: Perhaps the motion should read, Mr. Chairman: "if there is no fall session."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey agree to that?

MR. JONSON: Certainly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. That's agreed. I'm not sure that the Member for West Yellowhead got the dates exactly right. Perhaps we should read the correct ones.

MR. DOYLE: Could we have those dates?

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Perhaps our legislative secretary could just read them into the record.

MRS. DACYSHYN: The motion was:

that the committee meet for the purpose of amendments only on November 26 from 10 to noon, on November 27 for debate from 2 to 4, November 28 for debate from 10 to noon and 2 to 4. Then if further dates were needed, December 3 from 10 to noon and 2 to 4 for debate, and then December 10 from 10 to noon for voting only.

MR. TAYLOR: The 26th and 27th are just half days, afternoons?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: The 26th was . . .

MRS. DACYSHYN: Ten to noon, and the 27th . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendments only on the 26th in the a.m.

MR. TAYLOR: A.m.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Well, that's 10 a.m. till 12.

MR. TAYLOR: And the 27th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: P.m.

MR. TAYLOR: P.m. only?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: And all the rest of the time both morning and afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. TAYLOR: I just want to support the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey's motion quite strongly where the mover can amend the motion. I think it will speed up a lot of the committee work because we can negotiate between ourselves and amalgamate motions and amend them around, but certainly they shouldn't be trying to amend someone else's motion and cause debate. I think it's a very good idea. It will speed up the committee process and stop us wasting a lot of time discussing the same motion over and over again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair doesn't think it should be the purpose of the Chair or the committee to try to preclude good recommendations from coming forward, and if this initiative, which I commend the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey for bringing forward, will allow us to bring in good, well-thought-out recommendations, then I think it's a well worthwhile change to our process from what we've had in previous sessions.

Has the question been called?

MR. MOORE: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question's been called. All those in favour? Opposed? The voting was unanimous.

Now one more item of business. Earlier in the year . . .

Does the Member for Calgary-Mountain View have a point?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: One point of clarification; I don't have these motions written down. If we take the previous motion and apply it to one that's just passed, can I assume, then, that on the morning of November 26 at 10 a.m. the first item of business is: if anybody has a recommendation they want to make on the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research or on the Department of Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, that would be the time at which they could read that recommendation into the record?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. It is the understanding of the Chair that the recommendation would be submitted prior to that, probably to the chairman, and then it would be circulated by our secretary to all members so that they would all have an opportunity to study that recommendation or those recommendations. Then they would just be held in abeyance waiting to be read into the record. Perhaps by, say, 10 a.m. on November 12 they could be in to the chairman's office, and then they would be read in subsequently at our first formal meeting where *Hansard* is in attendance. Okay? So everyone would have access to all of the recommendations shortly after November 12 to give them a good opportunity to

study them and prepare their debate prior to us entering into the debate on them.

The Member for West Yellowhead.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, we are in the part now where we're discussing the business of the committee; is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has one other item of business, and then I'll be glad to recognize any other miscellaneous items of business.

MR. DOYLE: I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As the members know, there was a delegation from the committee that traveled to Juneau, Alaska, to spend some time with the people of the Alaska Permanent Fund. Three members did go. A report has been prepared, and we've been able to receive concurrence in the report by all three members. The Chair would like to table this report for consideration of the members of the committee at this time. I'll have the clerk distribute that, and while she's doing that, I'll recognize the Member for West Yellowhead with his item of business.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, last year for the term of the hearings I was trying to get the information on the commercial investment division. The most recent one I could find was for 1985-86 in the library. I had, in fact, asked yourself. It was legislation tabled in September '87. I would ask the chairman if he could provide committee members with the investments of the commercial investment division as soon as possible so that we can properly address questions that may arise as we interview ministers throughout this proceeding this fall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will investigate the possibility of obtaining that material for the member and for the committee.

MR. DOYLE: As to where the investments went.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Any other business? The Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: I'll move that the meeting adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. All in favour? Opposed? Thank you; it was unanimous.

[The committee adjourned at 2:19 p.m.]