

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen]

[9:03 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum, and now we have an even better quorum. As I understand it, a quorum is a third. That means we need three and one-third members.

If we could go to the first item of business, after I welcome everybody, which I have just done. Item 2 is the approval of the minutes. Is there anyone who wants to make some observations or propose a motion?

MRS. EMBURY: I'll move, Mr. Chairman, that we accept the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed? Anyone contrary? Okay.

Business Arising from the Minutes. Item 3(a) is very, very brief. There's background material available. All it is is that sometime after the 1982 election, when we found that our proceedings in the House would no longer be fully televised from those two permanent posts we put in, we thought of ACCESS possibly doing it. They said they couldn't afford to do it without a substantial subsidy. Members weren't happy about that, and it was suggested that at some convenient time we would invite Peter Senchuk of ACCESS to come to discuss this question with us. We've been putting it off, waiting for a suitable time. My suggestion is that if we don't fix a time now, we should drop it and not carry it forward in our agenda. Then when someone thinks about it in the future, we can bring it back.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, could I make a suggestion that we schedule this meeting for June 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That we hold a meeting in June?

MR. KOWALSKI: Our regular meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That we invite Mr. Senchuk to our June meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried.

Item 3(b). At meetings of this committee over the past year or so, we've had a number of references to insurance, and I thought it might be useful if we had Mr. Clegg here. There's no supporting material in the book. Instead of that, Mr. Clegg is handing out a summary of the information he is about to summarize for us.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, with this summary and some comments which I have summarized on the bottom the sheet, I hope it is now possible for me to report to the committee such that the committee will understand that the insurance coverage present now is the same as for government employees. I have perused all the policies which affect government employees. Although the way in which Legislative Assembly members, officers, staff, and contract employees were covered in various ways by these contracts was not ideal, nor even particularly satisfactory in some cases, because it was done by endorsement, by addition, by addendum, by implication, there was no doubt between the negotiating parties -- in other words, the risk management people, PAO, and the insurers -- that the intention was that we should be covered. Nevertheless, to repair this deficiency in the manner in which it was done, it has been agreed that in every case, in all the insurance policies which affect personnel and members, the basic definition of the named insured, which is the very first item in any insurance policy, should be rewritten so as to clearly include members, officers, and staff of the Legislative Assembly and the Legislative Assembly Office itself.

This is in the process of being done, and the people responsible for the administration of insurance are going to advise me in writing when it has been. They have assured me that both they and the insurers are quite happy to make these changes. When this has been done, not only will the spirit and intent of the insurance policies be clear but it will be abundantly clear from the very most basic definition that there is coverage.

That covers the issue of how those policies are drafted and drawn. I'm not an expert on insurance law, and I cannot, as it were, give an opinion as to how that insurance coverage would compare with the kind of insurance coverage normally taken out by organizations to cover

their employees. That expertise rests with the government of Alberta, who negotiates the insurance. They have assured me that they are satisfied with the insurance coverage they have, and I am satisfied that it extends to and covers the members, officers, and staff of the Legislative Assembly Office, and the office itself as a legal entity. That will be covered down to the fine detail when these definitions have been changed.

As to the actual coverage which is intended to be carried out, this chart shows, in summary form, what the coverage is. As you will see from the bottom right-hand side, due to the caution which is proper with respect to insurance matters, I have put a note to say that it is merely a summary to give an overview of general coverage, and for precise and detailed information it is necessary to consult the policies and the official summaries issued by government on these matters. This chart should not be relied upon by anybody as a final authority as to who is covered. That kind of fine detail should be looked for elsewhere. But this will give members an overview of what the actual coverage is.

The first column shows the coverage for accidental death and dismemberment. There are a number of complications here which are not dealt with in the chart so as to make it readable. The only complication with respect to ministers' coverage is that some parts of the premium are paid by the department and some parts are paid by the Legislative Assembly Office, or that has been the case in the past. That is in the process of possibly being changed, but it doesn't affect the coverage; it only affects the accounting for the premium.

The second column shows the life insurance coverage, not relating to accidental death and dismemberment or not restricted to accidental death. That would cover all causes. The ministers and members are covered pursuant to the terms of the group life insurance order passed by this committee last year — which, as you will recall, gives members the option of picking up a certain level of coverage. Officers and staff are covered by a formula which relates to salary level and gives certain options.

The maximum is slightly different for management than it is for nonmanagement. Management can acquire coverage in a mixture of ... The basic is one times salary to a maximum of \$60,000. In addition to that, they

can pick up an extra two and a half times optionally, to go to a maximum of three and a half times salary, with a maximum of \$120,000. Nonmanagement staff have the same kind of formula, except in their case the maximum coverage is \$100,000.

Contract employees: it depends on the terms of the contract. In most cases the contract provides that the employee has the option of taking the life insurance coverage which is available to permanent staff, but in some cases that is not provided for. The standard form of contract we have gives the person who is negotiating the contract or recommending its content with respect to that particular employee, how many of the benefits that that employee should properly be able to have. That life insurance is paid for by the employees and, therefore, is not a subsidized benefit.

Generally speaking, one is either covered or not covered by long-term disability. Ministers are covered with respect to their ministerial position and their ministerial salary. MLAs are not covered for long-term disability.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we interrupt? I think Ken has a question he'd like to ask about something you've already said.

MR. KOWALSKI: On the last point you made, the not covering Members of the Legislative Assembly. I was under the assumption that members of the Assembly were covered. This comes as a bit of a surprise to me today.

MR. CLEGG: Members of the Assembly are covered by pension but not for long-term disability against salary, although ministers' coverage relates to their ministerial salary. I was advised by PAO that long-term disability generally relates to permanent staff. Until recently, long-term disability was funded only by payment by the department on whose shoulders it fell. If a member of the staff of a department had to go on long-term disability, that person's reduced salary was charged to that department for the rest of the time, but there wasn't a premium involved.

MR. KOWALSKI: What's the situation today if a Member of the Legislative Assembly were to have a heart attack and a stroke and were physically incapable of continuing in the service?

MR. CLEGG: There's a provision in the MLA Pension Act that says that where a member is unable to continue in office because of illness -- I'm summarizing this, because it's a pension issue and we were dealing with insurance issues. My best recollection is that in this particular case, the member is deemed to have retired as of that date, and there is a restricted pension available. But that is a different issue. If you want me to advise on the pension provisions, I'd have to look at that separately. I haven't briefed on that in detail. It's a separate thing.

MR. KOWALSKI: Reviewing that might be a matter for a future meeting.

MR. CLEGG: As far as long-term disability insurance as such, there isn't coverage for MLAs against their indemnity; there is for ministers against their salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I also ask a question regarding long-term disability? With regard to a contract employee, the chart says "Only for length of contract". Does that mean that if an employee is on a two-year contract and becomes permanently disabled, the disability payments are made only for the rest of the contract period?

MR. CLEGG: Yes, that is the case. There are exceptions, but the general intention is that the contract employee is not a permanent employee. The concept is that his relationship with the Legislative Assembly or the Crown is temporary, and therefore the Crown does not see the justification in incurring a liability to look after that person for the rest of his life, should he become disabled during his working time. An employee in that situation would normally carry insurance at his own expense to cover the possibility of becoming disabled for a time which would go beyond his contract period.

The standard form of contract which we have developed for use with staff provides precisely this: that long-term disability is a benefit which is available only to give payment during the life of the contractual term. It is a payment which would be charged to the department for the rest of that person's life in the case of a permanent employee. For example, if I were to suffer a stroke and become incapable of work, or to take an

example of a permanent staff employee of the Assembly -- somebody who is on permanent staff and not a contract employee -- that person's salary would be charged back to the Legislative Assembly until that person reached retirement age, in which case the pension plan would take over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chart says that a minister is covered.

MR. CLEGG: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean for the rest of his days?

MR. CLEGG: Yes, until his pension becomes available. He's covered with respect to his ministerial salary, not with respect to his MLA indemnity, because disability relates to salary level. It's a proportion of salary level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "officer" is used in the first column. Is that more or less interchangeable with "management"?

MR. CLEGG: Yes. In this particular case it might have been a bit more useful if I'd put in the words "management staff". I started off with this chart saying "officers and staff" of the Assembly and at the last minute discovered there was a distinction in one particular aspect, so it got split that way. But really it's a distinction between management staff and nonmanagement staff. There are one or two people on the management staff of the Assembly who are not, strictly speaking, officers of the Assembly. It should really be management staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What would the members think? It seems to me that it would be a useful thing if the Clerk's office were to circulate this among all the members. It seems to me that this is information the members would like to have. We could perhaps change that "officer" to "management staff", but apart from that...

MR. KOWALSKI: I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. In addition, I'd like to see the Clerk, or one of the people associated with the Clerk, undertake a review to see what would be required to have coverage for members for long-term disability included: the implications

of it, the costing factor, what has to be done, and how we go about doing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we do that after the House rises?

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes.

MR. CLEGG: I think it would be useful to combine that with an overview of the pension consequences if a member becomes unable to continue in office and has to resign because of sickness. There is an interrelationship there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it agreed that we get that information out and circulated among the members, with the additional rider that Michael Clegg has just mentioned? Okay.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to know what's involved in covering the constituency office staff with compensation?

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the constituency office staff, my understanding is that it was the wish of this committee that they should not be treated as employees and should be treated as independent contractors. As the committee knows and as I have said, we may have some battles with the federal government on this, because they feel that they should study the actual nature of the employment rather than what the contract says. But leaving that aside, they are described at the moment as independent contractors, and workers' compensation does not cover independent contractors for compensation because they're not employed by government. The government has no employer/employee relationship, which is basic to workers' compensation liability. If we were to cover them, it would be a precedent for covering somebody who is hired on a fee basis, but not as an employee, to cut the lawns or do electrical work in the department, a lawyer who is hired to do legal work for a department of government but remains in his private practice, messengers who carry messages, and many other people who have contractual relationships to do work.

MRS. CRIPPS: Can you tell me, then, how the employee just above that is covered?

MR. CLEGG: Oh, yes. They're covered completely.

MRS. CRIPPS: But it says "contract employee" — "covered".

MR. CLEGG: But a contract employee is not the same as an independent contractor. The word "contract" is confusing. The distinction between an employee and an independent contractor is this — and this applies whether the employee is on permanent staff or on a contract. An employee is a person who is regularly directed as to his manner of work rather than just told, "you have to achieve this, and when you achieve it we'll pay you \$1,000." Generally, they're paid on an hourly basis rather than on a rate for fulfilling the task. An employee is provided with a place of work and the tools of his work, whether it be a typewriter or an office or secretarial staff, is part of the organization of the employer, and is subject to the administrative discipline of the employer.

An independent contractor is somebody who is retained to give a service or carry out a physical task, and is paid on completion of that work. The manner, the timing, the place where the work is done, and the tools required to do the job are provided by the contractor. In that particular case, Canadian law says that it is not necessary for the person contracting those services to pay UIC, CPP, or withhold tax. The person is self-employed and has contracted himself as an independent contractor. That is the distinction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But there are situations where the tools or equipment are provided to a contract person and that person is still under contract.

MR. CLEGG: Oh, yes. There are many exceptions to this. The criteria I have given are — the status is viewed as a sum total of viewing all of these. But the most important thing is whether the person is directed about how to do the job or whether that's his concern, whether he is merely given the objective — the objective is to do this thing — and left how to do it themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Our constituency staff, as you know, have a very large degree of independence and go about doing things, in

many ways, as . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: Not without direction, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, they're given some direction, but they are expected to be quite . . . In any event, the position we have taken with regard to constituency staff is that they are independent contractors. If we're going to change that, we've got to create about 60 new positions and go into all sorts of deductions and other things that are done for people who are under contract or are permanent employees in the public service.

Is that enough for that? If it is, I'd like to thank Michael Clegg for all the work he has done. To produce a summary of this kind is not easy, and reading life insurance policies is not a form of relaxation unless you use it instead of counting sheep.

MR. CLEGG: It's very similar to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As he has explained, in a number of cases the existing policies are patch jobs, which is quite common in the life insurance business, where you glue on endorsements through existing policies. Michael has explained that there is now in process the revision of these policies so that instead of having all kinds of add-ons, what would ordinarily be an add-on is being incorporated into the text so you get an ordinary, smooth-running contract that you can read from beginning to end.

So I'd like to thank Michael for this work and for this chart. If he could change that "officer" designation, the Clerk has agreed to send copies to all members.

Now, could we go on. Item (c) is very, very brief. It's just a report item. Everything has been approved there, and the frames for the photographs have been ordered. I don't know whether they've arrived yet.

MR. CLEGG: I shall be available in my office if you need me for anything else during the meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you.

So it's just a matter of when they arrive from the printers, and they'll be put into use.

Can we go on to item (d), which relates to employment contracts. There was a concern there. For example, we have our constituency

office staff on employment contracts. We thought we might need an order to exempt these contracts from the operation of some orders in council. But on further thought and examination, it was found that this committee has already passed such an order, in fact on June 13, 1983. On still further thought, it seemed to me that we might perhaps improve the text of that order to make it clear that constituency office staff are covered. We now have it exempting people who are officers or employees of the Assembly. We're taking the position that constituency office staff are not employees in the ordinary sense. Therefore, I suggest that we consider and, either at this meeting or perhaps at the next one, amend that order by adding at the end a text so it would read, "position as an officer or employee of the Assembly or a person providing services to a member under contract." In that way we would make sure that the order extends to and includes constituency secretaries.

Would you like to deal with it now, or would you like for us to come back with a draft of a revised order at the next meeting?

MRS. CRIPPS: Do you want to say that again? How would it be reworded?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know if I can remember it.

MR. KOWALSKI: "Or a person providing services to a member under contract."

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Services under contract to a member" would be a better way of putting it. It depends; you've got a modifier that travels around there. We might have to give it some further thought.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'd like to see us deal with it at the next meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. We'll bring in a draft of the order as it would read as amended. Okay?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[A portion of the meeting is not reported]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item, (f), is simply a report item. You've already heard it

mentioned by Michael Clegg; that is, whether constituency office staff people are covered by workers' compensation. The answer is they are not. If they want to be covered, I think they could be by paying and making their own arrangements directly with workers' compensation. In that event, you might wish to reflect the cost in your payment to constituency office staff. If there's any follow-up the committee wants on that score, please let me know.

The next one is (g) . . .

You see, there could be constituency secretaries — I'm getting some help in my constituency, and the person is providing her own typewriter, just like an independent contractor.

However, coming to item (g), that resulted from a query that was raised by Alan Hyland some time ago. He thought that a certain person was being engaged under caucus funding and was doing other work. We followed through on that, and we were given the assurance that it was indeed caucus work that was being done. Subsequently, a simple form of contract was shown whereby the caucus of what is now the Representative Party was engaging this person under contract.

That raises a policy matter which I would very much like to take up with this committee. As I see it, when caucuses make contracts with caucus staff, that is no business of the Legislative Assembly Office, which is the entity constituted by the Legislative Assembly Act and consists of the Clerk and me and a few other people. It's my view that the budgets are passed by this committee and the House, and if caucuses decide to spend more on salaries and less on printing or whatever, that is their own business as long as they conform to their budgets in a way that will satisfy the Auditor General.

The limit of the responsibility that the Clerk and I and the staff of the Legislative Assembly Office have is this: we have to ensure that the contracts that are made will not lead to legal liabilities on the part of the Clerk, who is the other contracting party. Of course, he doesn't make contracts unless they're recommended by the caucuses. But he is the other contracting party. There has to be some legal entity to be a contracting party, and caucuses are not legal entities; they're not bodies corporate.

So I'm saying that our responsibility is

limited to simply this: we must ensure that any of these contracts that are entered into will not result in financial liabilities on the part of the Clerk which will exceed the budget authorizations. In other words, if there is an unbreakable contract — assuming such a thing could be made for personal service, which really it can't. Well, there could be other contracts that run for, say, five years. Now, we don't know what the budgeting is going to be in future years, but these contracts tie the Clerk to financial obligations for five years to come. We would have to refuse to sign such a contract, because of our obligation to see, as far as we can, that the Clerk's obligations will not exceed what is authorized in budgets.

If the committee doesn't agree with that position — and may I repeat it again for simplicity: as I see it, whatever agreements caucuses want to make for the spending of their money, they are free to make. We will not second-guess; we will not assess the adequacy or superfluity of salary amounts — and in this case the salary is quite high, incidentally — or the period of notice, or anything else in the nature of services caucuses agree with staff people to provide. We will have nothing to do with that, but we will draw the line at a place where the contract would result in the Clerk undertaking financial obligations in excess of authorized budget amounts. We've discussed this; we've thought about it, and that is the position I'm proposing to take on this. If the committee disagrees with that, wants to modify it — if the committee, for example, wishes to put on us the obligation of assessing whether pay that's agreed upon is too high or hours are too short or anything like that, then it's for the committee to make those guidelines, and we'll endeavour to follow it.

By way of information, a copy of the Norwood contract is attached. It involves public funds. It's a contract made by the Clerk, and in common with any other contracts made by the Clerk in his service of members, the members are entitled to see those contracts if they want to. I do not think they are confidential between caucuses and caucus staff.

Are we back on the record? Good.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, I have no difficulty at all with what you're saying, and I think that's the appropriate way to go. For clarification of this one particular issue,

because it was raised by a member of Members Services' Committee some time ago -- in perusing the pink sheet, the contract, we're talking about one Brian Norwood as being the executive director of the caucus of the Representative Party, not the executive director of the Representative Party. That's the clarification our absent member was after.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's clear from the contract. We did have some negotiation over this contract. I'm not saying this to cast any aspersions on the Representative Party caucus, but there was originally in it the provision -- and I'm sure it wasn't their intention. But when you looked at the text, there was a wide-open authorization to incur travel expenses. When we pointed out to them that we couldn't sign it that way, because that could lead us to having to pay expenses which were beyond budget, they agreed right away and it was taken out.

MR. KOWALSKI: One additional point for clarification. If I heard you correctly, it would not be your interpretation that there would be responsibility on your part, or anyone associated with you, to look at the actual dollar sums or anything else in these contracts. That was simply a negotiable item between the leader of the caucus and caucus members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As long as it doesn't put the Clerk in the position where he may be legally obliged to pay beyond budget amounts.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay. I guess it's just really a peripheral question associated with it. While there is a guideline that would apply to the public employees of the province, Mr. Norwood would not be viewed as a public employee. I do note that there is going to be something like an 11 percent increase forwarded to the gentleman as of April 1, 1985.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's right in the contract.

The next, 3(h), is a simple but important item. We received notice, and I think most or all of the members are aware, that henceforth we would have to cover the cost of long-term disability insurance out of Legislative Assembly Office appropriations. We had not made provision for that when we were dealing with our estimates.

We were told that the cost is \$21,000. We

relied on that calculation and amount. Then -- and I think I discussed it with some of the members -- we put it in the estimates, which have been printed, in the hope and expectation that this committee would approve that amendment. It's \$21,000, and it's to cover the cost of the item you see in the third column of Michael Clegg's summary on insurance. If we could have a motion approving that, it will regularize what's been done in the printed copy of the estimates.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I so move.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any discussion? Is it agreed? Anyone contra? Carried.

MRS. CRIPPS: Can I ask a question on the estimates? Will the percentage increase for members, which we talked about earlier, be shown in the estimates as zero?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it was taken out. The committee said to take it out if there wasn't going to be an increase.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's what I meant. It is out?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that was done some time ago.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't mind living with it, but I don't like to see it shown in the estimates as being there when you're not getting it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It reflects the intent of the committee. The committee indicated in advance that if certain things happened, they wanted that taken out. That's what we've done.

MRS. CRIPPS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we go on to item 3(h). I think the ball is in the hands of Sheila and Ken.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you mean 3(i).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

MRS. EMBURY: Ken is going to give the report.

MR. KOWALSKI: Mr. Chairman, it's probably

appropriate to give all members of the committee an update on this. I must say at the outset that I'm really pleased with the positive approach taken by the Clerk and Clerk Assistant in this regard, and want to thank them for the professional manner in which they approached the whole subject and the excellent performance with respect to the implementation of this project.

Perhaps I can bring members up to date on a number of the sequences that occurred. NBI was designated the favoured vendor, and that recommendation was accepted on December 19, 1984. Orders were placed with NBI Canada Ltd. on December 21, 1984, and the necessary hardware was delivered by January 19, 1985. Both the Clerk and Clerk Assistant then had to deal with the manager of Government Centre and the superintendent of the Legislature Building, and construction, site preparation, was commenced in mid-January and was completed by February 25, 1985. It certainly was the wish of members of the Members' Services to have this equipment provided and on stream by March 1. The system really kicked into place on March 4; that is close enough for our interpretation, our request, and our direction.

Just one minor item in terms of one piece of equipment that still hasn't been provided; that is, the acoustic enclosures for the printers. There is an alternative to that, and I believe delivery is expected by the end of March this year.

Training of staff was also co-ordinated with NBI Canada Ltd. and took place in Edmonton between February 11 and March 4. It was cycled with the minimum amount of disruption to the services provided to members, as the secretaries were given an opportunity to participate in five half-days over that period. I'm also very pleased that part of the arrangement was to have a troubleshooter lady, by the name of Sheila Unger, to be available to all the secretarial staff throughout the buildings to look at system co-ordination and in-house support. I'm also very pleased in terms of the costing factor and the manner in which this came in within the anticipated amount.

So all in all, I just want to say thank you to both the Clerk and the Clerk Assistant. There is no doubt at all that over the next several months a number of little problems will arise, because they always do. But I'm very confident they will be met through a one-to-one

resolution process, that they will kick in, and that everybody will be very happy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I'll certainly make sure that the vote of thanks comes to the attention of Mr. Bubba.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add one thing. I think it was an agreement between Mr. Kowalski, Mr. Bubba, and I that we would keep the system in place as it now is, functioning, and possibly look at an assessment around June to see if it's all ironed out pretty well and people feel familiar with the equipment, and then what our next stage is. We did talk about further stages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that enough for that item?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 3(j) is related to item 5(c). As you know, as a result of a sad occurrence last fall we had a temporary vacancy in a constituency, and prior to that we did not have in place guidelines as to what would happen in a constituency office or with constituency office funding during such a vacancy. We did develop guidelines for vacancies in all constituencies resulting from dissolution of the House and the calling of a general election. We had those in place in October 1982, and a copy under item 5(c) of your support material shows what that is.

I think what we need here from the committee, at least for the time being, is another declaration of principle. As I see it, the subject of the principle would be whether, in the case of a temporary vacancy in a constituency, the administration of constituency office funding and of the constituency office should be parallel to what is done in all the offices in the event of a general election.

We've looked at what is done in other provinces, and of course there is limited information available in that regard. In Ontario, if I have correctly understood what I read, they cut everything off at once in the event a member resigns or dies, but they don't do the same thing in the case of a general election. It seems to me that we do have some ongoing functions in constituency offices during

a general election, barring of course any kind of party activity or material.

It would be my suggestion that the committee might adopt in principle the application of those guidelines, with whatever necessary variations there might be for an individual case since it is all the offices; in other words, the same principles that apply when there are vacancies in all constituencies should apply when there is a vacancy in only one. If the committee agrees with that, I'll try to work out an adaptation of the general guidelines and bring them back to the committee.

MRS. CRIPPS: Are you suggesting that, until a by-election is called, the constituency office operates as if there were a member, because of course there are continuing services. Once the by-election is called, then the constituency office would operate as if there were a general election?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I wouldn't make any distinction between the start of the vacancy and the calling of the by-election. I'm suggesting that we do the same -- I see what you mean, because when the vacancy applies to all constituencies, they result from the calling of an election, whereas when the vacancy occurs in one constituency, it results from an event, such as a resignation or death, that precedes the calling of an election.

MRS. CRIPPS: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll keep that distinction in mind, but I'm suggesting that for the whole period, from the death or resignation of a member to the completion of the by-election, we should parallel what is done and follow what we do when all the offices are vacant when a general election is called. There is no need for the committee to commit itself to that right now, but if you think that that is probably the direction you want to go -- because I don't want to waste my time -- I'll work out guidelines like that and send them around to members prior to the next meeting, or as soon as I can get them done. In any event, I'll circulate them before the thing comes up at a meeting.

MRS. CRIPPS: What happened in Mr. Notley's case?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In Mr. Notley's case, we felt that, in the absence of guidelines, the constituents of Spirit River-Fairview, the same as the constituents of Three Hills or wherever, just because their member happened to die, should not be deprived of ordinary services to the extent that we could provide them. We therefore reached an understanding, and it was based on what you might call the honour system, that enquiries or requests or representations, and so on, coming to that office during the vacancy would be handled by the existing constituency secretary, and that in each case people bringing those problems or enquiries to the office would be asked to whom they wanted those things referred: did they want them referred to a neighbouring government member or to another NDP member or where? Those would be respected.

Sure, we did it on the honour system, but of course it is a thing that could readily be checked because you could send a plant into the office and say, "Look, this is my problem." And when asked "Where do you want it referred?" "I want the Conservative Member for Tunerville to get it." Of course, you could easily check and see whether the honour system was being honoured. In any case, that's what we did because of the absence of guidelines. I think that caused minimum disruption to the constituents of that constituency while the vacancy was in effect.

I think we've been forewarned, and we should now have guidelines developed before something like that happens again.

MR. GURNETT: Mr. Chairman, being a constituent in that constituency, I would sure endorse your suggestions of going this direction with it. I know that for me personally, and it was certainly the indication from people in the constituency, that ongoing provision of services was valuable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the constituents have a sufficient loss in their member that you shouldn't compound it by cutting everything off.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate that too. I guess I would have even left out the clause about putting in the stipulation you did: that people would have the right to say who they wanted to speak to.

That's optional; I don't care. But I think it's a constituency office. We all have our offices for the benefit of the constituents, and we don't ask who we want something to go to, or whatever.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, but if there is no member — you see, that was the whole thing. There was no member, and it had to be referred. It seemed to me that it was democratic and proper that the person with the problem could make a suggestion as to where the referral should go.

MRS. CRIPPS: That was the intent of my original question. I believe the constituency office should operate as normal until the by-election, if at all possible, with the least disruption. Then these guidelines will automatically go into effect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I read between the lines, what you're saying is that if a Conservative member dies, that member's constituency secretary would refer enquiries and complaints to other Conservative members.

MRS. CRIPPS: No, I'm not saying anything implicitly. I think the constituency office should function as it has, until the by-election is called. Then these guidelines come into play.

MR. PENGELLY: Shirley, that means it would be closed the last two weeks before the by-election, the same as in the event of a general election?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've forgotten if that's in the general election guidelines.

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't think it's closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have the general election ones under 5(c). I don't think it closes.

MR. KOWALSKI: Nigel, I believe the only area the two weeks applies to is our secretaries in the city of Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One of the factors is the disruption. In many cases the member is re-elected. If you were to close that office and the space were lost, for example, and the member were re-elected and had to scramble for a new office . . . This way, true enough, if

another member is elected they are sort of stuck for a little while with the office the previous member chose. But it seems to me that is not that catastrophic. All our leases have a three-month notice period. After three months, if they don't like that office, they could get themselves another one.

If the committee is content, that disposes of 3(j) and 5(c). We haven't any visitors, have we? We have one. Are there Concerns of Visitors? No? Okay.

Other Business: report concerning the management consultant. Remember we discussed this several times, and if you've had a chance to look at it, you'll find among the material you received — not here; it was sent directly to your various offices. We were fortunate in getting Robert Fleming, the director of administration for the parliament of Ontario, to undertake this study under an arrangement which I had previously discussed with the Speaker there, John Turner, whereby the Legislative Assembly of Ontario is continuing Mr. Fleming's salary and any work he does for us during ordinary office hours is paid for by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario and we pay only for his overtime, travelling, and living costs while he is here. He has been here twice, and he is due to come back next Tuesday.

The impression among the officers of the office of the Legislative Assembly and myself is that he has gone about it in a very effective way. He has had extensive interviews with staff. Senior staff have co-operated very fully with him. We made it clear at the beginning that this was not in the nature of an inquisition but rather in the nature of something that would show us what we're doing right and help us in what we might improve. It's working out very well. I've had three meetings myself with Mr. Fleming, and I must say that he has gone about things in a very thorough and systematic way.

I sent you some background information about him, which indicates that he is indeed a respected administrator. He has been asked by other — I know that just after we made the arrangements, the Legislative Assembly of New Brunswick came to him for advice. He is probably unique in Canada in his qualifications, and we're very fortunate to have him. As you know from your supporting material, it is agreed that the cost will not exceed \$10,000, of which \$5,000 is for Mr. Fleming's overtime and

\$5,000 for travel and living expenses. Mind you, these trips are arranged on fairly short notice, and he can't come by excursion fares. So we have that ceiling on it, and I think that's reasonable. We may be getting a \$20,000 or \$30,000 study courtesy of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, for a cost to us which won't exceed \$10,000.

It has been a long time since a study has been made of our administration. I think it was in the early '70s. We had it done by a civil servant. It wasn't terribly conclusive, as a matter of fact. Anyway, that's the stage at which we are. I expect we will have a report possibly in May but more likely in June.

The next item is quite brief. Pacific Western Airlines came to members or the Clerk with a proposal that we could save on airfares if we paid for six fares and would thereby get seven. Being anxious for bargains, we took a serious look at this, but it appears it is not appropriate for us. It commits the members to buying the six trips, and there's a question as to whether they'll be used in one fiscal year or whether they'll overlap. It just didn't seem a sound sort of thing to do.

But we have done something else which I think you're all aware of. We got some Air Canada credit cards, which are honoured by all the carriers members use. I think that should work out reasonably well.

If there is nothing further on that, we can go to item 5(d). That's a very simple one. Concern was expressed by some members that school groups were coming here, sometimes from considerable distances, and the members have a golden opportunity -- they may not always have opportunities to visit them at their schools -- to spend a short time visiting with these pupils, sharing information with them, and so on. There's no place to do it. You're down there at the foot of the stairs, and there may be two or three other student groups waiting to have their pictures taken. They're lively, as all children are, and the fountain is going in the background, and you can hardly hear yourself shout, unless you shout the way I do.

In any case, a wish was expressed that we might try to find some space in the building where members could take such groups. So far I haven't any ideas. I would be glad if somebody else would have them. You can take them into the galleries. I don't think there is any harm in doing that.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, I've done both. I usually just go up to the Carillon Room, and if that's busy, I may speak to them in the members' gallery when they're in there looking at the Legislature before 2:30. I haven't found it a problem to find space.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Some members have, and that's what brought the thing up. It wasn't our idea.

MRS. CRIPPS: I use the Carillon Room too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe members could spread that information among their colleagues, and we won't have to do anything about it.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last item is also very simple. We had indications from some members and staff people concerning the quality of the food downstairs. It so happens that we have, in the person of the Clerk, someone with some background knowledge and experience in this kind of thing, especially in previous employments. I thought it was a pity that members shouldn't get the benefit of that kind of expertise. Just as in the case of Mr. Bubba we happen to have a staff person -- it's not part of his job description to be an expert on word processing equipment, but he was there and I'm very grateful that he put that expertise very effectively at the service of members. I thought we might do the same thing as far as the Clerk is concerned in the food service downstairs. However, the minister didn't seem to welcome that suggestion too much. He said that if the Clerk has anything to say about that sort of thing, what is it? I had suggested they consult with the Clerk; I thought there might be some informal exchange.

However, I did have the temerity, following that, since I thought the committee might be interested -- I know that more and more members are going over to the Haultain Building. It seems to me that if this committee has any terms of reference and if the Clerk and I have terms of reference as to what we do, one of them is serving the members. Serving the members as far as meals is concerned, when they're under this dome, seems to me has to rank fairly high. So presuming that to be one of our terms of reference, I asked the minister to

provide me, for the benefit of this committee, with a copy of the contract that is in effect with the present supplier downstairs. I haven't had an answer yet, but I was only about two or three weeks ago.

Is there any other Other Business? The Clerk has something, and Ken.

MR. KOWALSKI: As a result of a letter the Clerk received from the Secretary of State, government of Canada, the Hon. Walter McLean. It deals with the distribution of monthly lists of individuals who have been granted Canadian citizenship. I wonder, Mr. Stefaniuk, if you might bring us up to date on the procedure we will be dealing with in that matter and when it might kick into effect.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I have no replies from members.

MR. KOWALSKI: Were members asked? Are members even aware of this?

MR. STEFANIUK: I think the information was circulated to all members.

MR. KOWALSKI: I never received it. My letter is a result of the minister of External Affairs corresponding with me in this matter.

MRS. CRIPPS: My letter was from Joe Clark's office.

MR. KOWALSKI: I have received nothing from your office.

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, the letter did go out from External Affairs. I'm trying to recall this without the benefit of having my file before me. The Speaker and I discussed it, and we wondered about our ability to comply with the minister's request for confidentiality or restricted use of the lists.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see, the condition was made that it might mean that we may not use the names except for one purpose, and that is to send congratulations to the new citizens. The Clerk and I discussed the practicalities of it, and we don't know what form those lists are going to take. So I believe we're asking him to send them, aren't we?.

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If they are lists for the whole province -- and I've seen these lists in the past; we used to get them. We would get one list from the Edmonton Citizenship Court and another one from the Calgary Citizenship Court. Copies went to all members, and I know I used to go through my lists and pick out the addresses that were in my constituency. Then I would send congratulatory letters.

What we don't know is what form those lists are going to be in now. If there is one whole provincial list, it's going to be unwieldy to send to all members. It may even be unwieldy to send the northern and southern ones to members. On the other hand, it's going to be a lot of work for somebody to go through and pick them out constituency by constituency so that each member gets only the names in his or her constituency.

So I think the practical thing to do is to see what the lists are going to be like and then decide how we are going to handle it.

MR. KOWALSKI: According to Mr. McLean's letter, and I quote:

Since only one list of all new Canadians in your provinces can be produced [I guess this was sent to all governments], it would be the responsibility of the receiving provincial department or agency to determine and provide constituency lists to each requesting member.

It seems rather clear to me that there would be one package.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question in my mind is, what is the extent of it? It seems to me that the volume of citizenship applications and grantings has gone down very considerably. If that one list for the province is going to be fairly short, perhaps we can send the whole darn list to every member. If it's going to be a long list, we will have to confront that question and see how we're going to break it up into constituencies.

MR. KOWALSKI: My question basically is: where are we in the procedure? Again, I'm just looking around -- Mr. Stefaniuk, you indicated that members had been sent some information on this. I for one have not received any.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm sorry. I think that was in error. What we have decided to do, on a temporary basis, is to request the lists from External Affairs, evaluate the lists in terms of the length for the purpose of determining, as the Chairman said, whether it is practical to send the entire list to all members or, alternatively, designating someone in our office to identify the constituencies in which the new citizens are resident, and then altering the list to the extent that it is broken down and only a listing of a given member's constituents are sent to him or her.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is another alternative. We could simply make three copies of the list, send them to caucuses, and let them deal with the location according to constituencies.

MR. STEFANIUK: In either case, Mr. Chairman, it's a question of identifying available staff to perform that breakdown function. I'm sure the shortages in caucuses as well as in our office have to be taken into consideration.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty following the issue per se. It's just hard to make a decision. I'll have to leave it up to my colleagues, I guess. You're obviously waiting to see what happens.

Frankly, this is one thing that I had always perceived and understood and learned about as more or less what we call a political issue. That's the way it was handled. I thought that one obtained these lists from their Member of Parliament. I thought that was just a straightforward, back-and-forth issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We got those lists for years, but we didn't have the condition tied to them that has been attached in this letter. It seems a little silly that you get somebody's name and address and can congratulate them on being Canadian citizens, but the following week you can't send them a copy of the Alberta Fact Sheet. However, it's not our idea. It may be that if you think the restrictions are impractical or inappropriate, we can make representations through our Members of Parliament and say, "Look, get this guy off this."

MR. KOWALSKI: Have we received any list at all to date?

MR. STEFANIUK: Nothing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not yet; just the offer.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, the one issue I have concerns pensionable service contributions for members. Some members receive, in addition to their indemnities and tax-free expense allowances, a variety of fees for serving on committees, boards, and commissions. For example, members of this committee, when it meets outside session, are entitled to receive a fee for the service rendered to this committee. Of course, some members receive fees from a variety of sources. It could be a variety of committees, but it could be other sources as well. The question arises as to the pensionability of those fees, whether or not they should be considered as pensionable.

The fact is that, yes, all those fees are pensionable. At the moment, the procedure is such that, in co-operation with the Controller's office and Personnel Administration, at the end of any given year we scramble to compile information as to the amount of fees any member received and then communicate to the member the amount he would be required to contribute to have those fees considered as pensionable service. There is some difficulty meeting deadlines for that purpose, in the Controller's office and Treasury and our office.

Our question to members is whether they would be agreeable to establishing a policy whereby those fees would be pensionable at source. In other words, a deduction for pension contributions would be made at the time the payments are made to the member, thus eliminating the need for a scramble at the end of the year to compile the amounts and the need to search out the member to advise him of the amount of contribution he must make in a lump sum in order to have those fees considered pensionable.

MR. KOWALSKI: For clarification, in terms of what we're really talking about here. You're saying that \$100 a day for service on the Members' Services Committee is a pensionable item?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes, it is.

MR. KOWALSKI: As is legislative committee work?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's right.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's complete news to me; absolute, total news to me.

MR. STEFANIUK: It is pensionable.

MR. KOWALSKI: That has never happened in the past.

MR. STEFANIUK: We are advised it is pensionable. I should add that there are perhaps some sources from which a member may receive additional fees, such as the Water Resources Commission or the Grain Commission, for which payments are not made through the government's accounts payable system, and we would still have to track those manually. But certainly it would be easier to track those few things from those few agencies than it would be to track all payments members receive through the government's accounts payable system.

MR. KOWALSKI: I'm pleased to hear this today. This is the first time it has ever been brought to my attention. I don't know what the view of my colleagues is about this.

I have a follow-up question. If it qualifies for pensionable contribution, presumably it must also qualify for a retroactive thing. It would affect a number of members, basically going back to 1971.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm not sure about retroactivity. Perhaps it can be retroactive, in which case the member would have to make the appropriate contribution.

What I should add as well is that it would not be intended that any deductions other than the pension contribution be made at source. I am told that we need not make any deductions for income tax or unemployment insurance or Canada Pension.

MR. KOWALSKI: One additional question. Of course, it would apply the same way as the MLA pension plan applies: it's a voluntary thing. The member either chooses to do it or not.

MR. STEFANIUK: This is the problem. There would have to be universality to make this practical.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why we'd like to ask the committee to decide whether we don't do it for everybody or whether we do do it.

MR. KOWALSKI: We've already made a decision to do it for everybody in terms of the fees.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you?

MR. KOWALSKI: We made that decision a year ago, in terms of those members of the Legislative Assembly who serve on boards, agencies, or commissions. We made that decision a year ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't recall that.

MR. KOWALSKI: Yes, we did.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I won't deny it.

MR. KOWALSKI: Okay. Certainly, it applies. As an example, I sit on the board of directors of Syncrude Canada Ltd. We had that discussion a little over a year ago.

MR. CHAIRMAN: About deductions being made?

MR. KOWALSKI: They're made right at source. They didn't originally, in the first year, and then I got a nasty letter from Revenue Canada, saying that you have to pay these things. So it was all done at that point.

I think it's a good idea, and I think we should have more information on it so we can deal with it.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Chairman, does that apply to all committees?

MR. STEFANIUK: It doesn't, because those are fees payable.

MR. PENGELLY: I think I was asked to send in \$28 or something because I had received money for serving on the Senate Reform Committee. You mean that the other ones are deducted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. KOWALSKI: There's confusion. Senate Reform is a standing committee of the Legislature. I didn't get one for being on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund Committee. That must be different.

MR. STEFANIUK: It may well exist now, at the request of the member or a request that the member had established with our office at some time. The member may have indicated that he wishes all his payments to be considered pensionable, while others had not. If we are going to make pension contributions at source for all additional payments made to members, there must be universality because, as you know, we're dealing with computers, not only in our operation but certainly in Treasury. Apparently, Treasury has to be able to push one button which will effect the entire group.

MRS. CRIPPS: For 1984 you would have to do the contributions manually, I assume. Can that be done before the end of March, so 1984 is included? From then on, I assume it would be automatic.

MR. STEFANIUK: I can't answer the question whether or not it can be done before the end of March. I have some doubts in my own mind because of the workload with which we are presently confronted, facing year-end at March 31, as you are aware. This is rather short notice. Perhaps that could be caught up at some later date. In fact I would have to say, in all honesty, that we do not have the manpower facilities, considering everything else we're dealing with now, to comply with such a request before the end of the current fiscal year.

The question really is, do we want to put the deductions at source into effect as soon as possible, in co-operation with the Provincial Treasurer's department, and to consider whether we can manually catch up with other deductions.

MRS. CRIPPS: If you don't do the deductions for 1984 before the end of March, they would not apply. Is that right?

MR. STEFANIUK: They could perhaps be claimed in another year as past service. They could be claimed for 1985, so there wouldn't be

a loss as such.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's all I wanted to clarify.

MR. KOWALSKI: Would it be [inaudible], when Mr. Clegg comes back, to review the item on pensions, so we might have a further discussion on this matter with some clarification on the one or two items that have been raised?

MR. STEFANIUK: As I follow this discussion, the item that has been raised relates to past payments. The second question is whether or not this committee wishes to record a motion which will authorize universal application of the type of program which has been described to be put into effect as soon as possible.

MR. KOWALSKI: I guess there is one little point of clarification with respect to that too, Bo, that will probably be necessary. It is my understanding that the MLA pension plan is a voluntary one. Members choose either to have it or not to have it. I wonder why that principle could not apply in terms of these fees, if it is the same people in Treasury who are administering it.

MR. STEFANIUK: As I understand it, the administrative work resulting from the ability of members to opt out would create some difficulty for Treasury.

MR. KOWALSKI: But if a member has already opted out in terms of -- first of all, I don't know if anybody has. But I understand there is the option.

MR. STEFANIUK: I haven't heard of any opting out. I understand all members participate in the MLA pension plan.

MRS. EMBURY: I'd like to suggest that we take this back to our caucuses and have a little discussion on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you think we could be assured of getting some reaction in time for the next meeting?

MRS. EMBURY: Can't promise; we'll do our best.

MR. STEFANIUK: In any event, Mr. Chairman,

I'm happy to have made the information available to members. Perhaps, when the committee is ready, it can give us some direction.

MRS. CRIPPS: And can you give us more information on 1984?

MR. STEFANIUK: In the meantime, we will check to determine whether we can calculate fees for all past services.

MRS. CRIPPS: Since we're approaching it, though, in the 1984 period. I'm not worried about going back beyond 1984, but I believe '84 should be included because we're talking about it now.

MR. STEFANIUK: Ken has raised a question back to '71.

MR. KOWALSKI: Certainly in the event of some members who may choose not to seek re-election in the next several years. If this now becomes a reality -- I emphasize again that I had never heard of this being possible before -- I'm sure that we as the Members' Services Committee have a responsibility to them to answer that question.

MR. STEFANIUK: We can certainly determine whether that would be possible. In that case, Mr. Chairman, shall we await further direction from the committee as to whether or not the system can be produced for the future?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's what appears to be the wish of the committee.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sure, by his statements already, that the Clerk has given this some consideration. I think it would be valuable for us to have an indication, when we discuss this again, of what type of additional staff might be necessary to carry this out.

MR. STEFANIUK: It wouldn't require any additional staff for us if the program were accepted on a universal basis. In effect, the work would be done in Treasury. Our requirement would be to claim the fee as an item separate from other payments resulting from attendance at a meeting. In other words, the fee would be treated as an income item and

would be claimed separate from the expense items which relate to travel, accommodation, and subsistence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Members services.

MRS. CRIPPS: On the item of 1984, Bo, I can't see any problem with it whatsoever. We all have our T-4 slips, on which there is a section -- H or whatever it is -- that says "other committee work". So it's already calculated. The only thing that would have to be calculated is the amount of pension payments due. That would be the only new calculation that would have to be made. So if there's an advantage to doing it by March 31, personally I can't see any problem at all. That's already on the T-4 slips.

MR. STEFANIUK: What I'm saying to you is that we don't have the manpower resources to do it between now and March 31.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, I'm quite sure I could do it in two hours if I had those T-4 slips.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For everybody?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. There are only 79 T-4 slips, and you already have a calculation on there of additional ...

MR. KOWALSKI: It doesn't make any difference when it is done anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You also have to find out, member by member, whether they want to do it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can't just go ahead and do arithmetic.

Is there any other Other Business? Next meeting?

MR. KOWALSKI: What's the date on our rotation? We agreed once that we would try to have ...

MR. PENGELLY: Every second or third week?

MR. STEFANIUK: The second Wednesday of the month is the routine thing, but I think members may want to consider that that could

be an Easter break.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's hardly an Easter break, but we might not be here.

MR. STEFANIUK: We have no indication at the moment what the House is going to do in terms of an Easter break. Therefore, we don't know whether members will be in the city or not.

MRS. CRIPPS: I move we have the third Wednesday in April.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be the 17th.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, to be sure we don't have any possible conflict.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that those who work during the Easter break won't have to interrupt their work.

MR. KOWALSKI: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I got the message from Ken.

MR. PENGELLY: At 9 a.m.?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If that's all right. We're all in town anyway. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I won't check on whether the agenda is important enough. We'll just send out the agenda when it's ready and have the meeting. Okay. We're adjourned. Is there a motion?

MR. PENGELLY: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any opposed? Carried.

[The committee adjourned at 10:55 a.m.]

