

[Chairman: Mr. Amerongen] [12:11 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we come to order? Naturally, it's expected that we'll continue with our lunch while it's going on.

The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the meeting of March 4.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, before we approve them, we had a fairly long discussion at the meeting about a suggestion that people be able to give money to people to go and buy something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it didn't end up in a resolution.

DR. REID: No, but I think it could still be in the minutes of the meeting, that that type of thing was felt to not be included. We didn't have a resolution because we weren't changing the written order, but perhaps we should have something in the minutes to record the fact that we had the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A few years ago we used to have a lot of narrative in our minutes. What's happening is that we've tried to cut back on it. It simplifies the making of the minutes. It's very difficult to do a summary that everyone will accept. Even in the Fleming report there's a recommendation that we simplify our minutes. So of late we have been recording only motions, whether passed or not, and resolutions. We're sort of reluctant to get back to putting in narrative.

Had a resolution been passed in that regard, of course, it would have been there. Perhaps it would have been in order to have a resolution saying that after discussing this item, we resolved to leave the order unchanged. We could have gotten a motion on paper in the minutes that way.

DR. REID: Well, for example, we did say under item 4(d), Members' Allowances, "Discussion took place concerning a proposed Members' Services Order relating to proration of Members' allowances." Perhaps to that one we could add that the decision was not to attempt a prorating. In other words, there was a decision made, but it was not a resolution. I think the same thing applies. These are items

that may come up in the future again, and there is no real record of them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But have we authority to say that a decision was made if there was no resolution, if we didn't poll everybody on the decision?

DR. REID: I think there's much less attention paid to the Hansard transcript of these meetings than there is to the minutes. It's just a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know. We could incorporate both of those right now by a resolution amending the minutes.

DR. REID: I'll put that resolution forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's moved by Dr. Reid that the minutes of the March 4, 1986, meeting be amended as to item 4(d) by . . .

DR. REID: It was decided to add, "It was decided there should be no formal proration."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

DR. REID: Because that was the decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean no compulsory proration.

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "Obligatory" is better.

DR. REID: We were not going to formalize it all. We were going to leave it to the discretion of members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: "... there should be no obligatory proration." And what was the other amendment?

DR. REID: It isn't in here now. That was the other discussion in which Dr. Buck, in particular, got into as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we do one at a time? We have a motion by Dr. Reid. Have you got it all right, Rod?

MR. SCARLETT: Shorthand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion by Dr. Reid that item 4(d) be amended by adding that there was a decision that proration of Members' allowances for the forthcoming fiscal year be not included in the orders relating to allowances. How about that? That's as neutral as you can be. No? Too neutral?

DR. REID: We made a conscious decision, I think, Mr. Chairman, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: To leave it out?

DR. REID: . . . that we would not prorate. It was a conscious decision that there would be no proration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would not require it.

DR. REID: The decision was to leave it to the individual member's common sense, essentially.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose I say, "be not required?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right? Have you got it okay, Rod? No? Bohdan, have you got it?

MR. STEFANIUK: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to read it?

MR. STEFANIUK: Moved by Dr. Reid that the minutes of the March 4, 1986, meeting be amended as to item 4(d) by adding, "That proration of Members' allowances for the forthcoming fiscal year be not required."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

DR. REID: Wasn't that your understanding, Jim?

MR. GURNETT: Yes, exactly -- that it was left to the member's discretion.

DR. REID: Because people use their communications allowances at different times of the year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, you have another amendment in mind, Dr. Reid.

MR. STEFANIUK: Are you going to vote on this one first?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry. We haven't voted on that one. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

DR. REID: The other one, I think, would have to be 4(f).

MR. CHAIRMAN: What was the topic you wanted to add? What was the topic he mentioned that he wanted to add?

MR. STEFANIUK: Cash grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What are you going to say about that one, Ian? You can't say they were forbidden. Can you say that they were not approved?

DR. REID: It was not approved for members to hand cash to people to go and buy something; it was up to the member to acquire it and give them the article if he felt it was justified. It had to do with getting the signature on the order.

MR. PENGELLY: Purchase order?

DR. REID: Yes, the purchase order and the requisition thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would want that to refer to all the allowances because of the fact that they're transferable?

DR. REID: Yes, that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So can we say:

It was further moved by Dr. Reid that the minutes of the March 4, 1986, meeting be amended by adding 4(f) to record that the committee do not approve the use of any Members' allowances for the purpose of providing grants or donations in money.

DR. REID: In cash.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You know, it's done by cheque sometimes.

MRS. EMBURY: Why don't you just say "cash donations"?

DR. REID: I suppose by cheque is the other thing. That's right, because you may give it by cheque, in monetary form.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or we could say, "do not approve disbursements from Members' allowances for the purpose of . . ." That gets us around the cheques and cash, except if somebody wants to be technical. There's nobody more technical than people who aren't lawyers. Visit any barroom.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that in regard to this last order it is understood by all of us, from recalling the last meeting, that we are not referring to the fact that a member can make a purchase of an item within his own constituency and then be reimbursed by the Assembly.

DR. REID: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. We're trying to allow for that situation but not allow the actual cash to change hands, because then you'd have to follow it up to make sure it had happened.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we add for clarification, "This does not affect any Member's right to make presentations or donations in kind."

DR. REID: Any person's freedom to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm not sure. I think I know what you're saying, Mr. Chairman, but I was just looking at it for members who don't sit around this table. When you say now "make donations in kind," I'm afraid that might be misinterpreted. What do you mean by donations in kind?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Cash in kind.

MRS. EMBURY: We're saying that they can purchase a promotional item within their riding and be reimbursed.

DR. REID: Let's say that then.

MRS. EMBURY: We're recorded, so it will be in

the minutes. That's all I wanted: that if members read it, they would understand it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we put "cash" in there, members will say: "Okay, I'm going to give it by cheque. I'm not going to cash the cheque first and then give him the cash; I can't do that."

MRS. EMBURY: You used the term "moneys" or "monetary" or something to cover both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I said "by money." Suppose we use this expression -- drafting in committee is a difficulty when we haven't the Law Clerk here. Suppose we say -- no, I lost it.

MR. HYLAND: My twins will tell you that cheques aren't money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. They're not legal tender.

MR. HYLAND: Neither is paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not even certified ones. Could we say -- I was thinking of "transfer of money," but that might get us into trouble again.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure we need to actually address the other item, because we did that one day in a long discussion and order when we developed the purchase order system.

MR. PENGELLY: But the new members we may have won't understand that, Ian.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we say by way of "payment"? Is that a good word? That will cover cash and cheques, won't it?

MR. HYLAND: Don't we then just -- does Nigel have to see that new members have a package?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we send this out. Is that all right? Can we work in "by payment"? Now, one other thing. There were already some of those approved, because apparently it was something that had been done previous to the incumbency of the present chief administrative officer. So I was going to suggest that we might put in "further" or "henceforth" in an appropriate place. Is that all right? Otherwise,

we're going to have trouble.

MRS. EMBURY: I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. I think it's one of the things that happens. Naturally, these items come to our attention sort of after the fact. We don't want to squash an individual member's initiative or ingenuity in using his allowances. I think that's only fair. We've done that before, and I hope that would be a policy of this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, we don't spray the grass until the fire starts. Hoping that the Clerk and I can be trusted to put this in precise language, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Now, is there anything further arising from the minutes of the last meeting?

MR. HYLAND: Your shorthand doesn't look that great, Rod.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Looks pretty good. What's more, he can read it. The intent is unmistakable. We'll have no problem putting that into words.

May I just give you a little background on the next item? Before we go to the Fleming report, I thought we might go to 4(a), if you agree. There's some question about whether we shouldn't be in camera and off the record for the Fleming report since it involves or could involve personnel in many aspects of the report. So if you agree, may we go to item 4(a)? Any objection?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You may recall that the predecessor of this committee in October 1982 came out with policies relating to the use of members' allowances during an election period. That was slightly amended and carried through the election in the amended form. As far as I can tell, we had no problem with it. It worked out fine. I don't know whether Bohdan would have anything otherwise.

I thought we could abbreviate or shorten it a bit. Michael Clegg went over it, polished up a couple of rough spots, and took out a reference that is now out of date because of a change in legislation. Apart from that, they're the same guidelines we had for the '82 election. If you find them satisfactory, we can have a motion.

If you want some amendments, I'm sure they can be worked in fairly easily.

MR. GURNETT: Because it's new to me, Mr. Chairman, can I just ask — I wondered about item 7, which talks about constituency office staff. At my constituency office I have a person who is on a temporary employment program that has only a four-month term in any case. There is a fixed amount of funds for that position to cover her working for a specific period of time. If an election were called partway through, would that mean a special position like that would disappear and she'd lose the employment for that period?

MR. CHAIRMAN: As far as I know, and I'd like somebody to correct me, the policy is that when an election is called, all contract staff get a week's notice. Am I wrong or right about that?

MR. PENGELLY: I thought it was two weeks.

MRS. EMBURY: Two weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's two weeks' notice. Okay.

MR. HYLAND: I've got trouble with that, because the last time my constituency secretary didn't quit. I don't know about others, but the way that office is working, we kept it open during regular office hours in the last election, and she worked there. To stop it in total for 28 days would create a hell of a havoc.

MR. PENGELLY: Read the rest of it, Alan; you can have them on an hourly basis and not close it at all.

MR. HYLAND: Maybe that's how we did it last time.

MR. PENGELLY: That's the way I pay mine anyway.

MRS. CRIPPS: Aren't they all on an hourly basis anyway?

MR. HYLAND: Mine is paid by the month but on so many hours a month. But to close an office if it's working well — you're going to destroy it. By the time the month is up, people will be pissed off and everything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The only thing is that we have to look at the other side of the coin and ensure that no incumbents have an advantage at public expense over other contenders for the seat.

MR. HYLAND: Then what do you do once the election is called? A constituent phones you with a problem. You say: "Oh, sorry. There's an election on; I can't help you." You can't turn it off.

MR. PENGELLY: You go down to the office and phone the department.

MR. HYLAND: Yes. Go down to the DA and phone him or something; you can't do that.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, this is a really thorny problem, because there is no doubt about it: whether the incumbent is running or not, until the successor is elected, the general population, our constituents, regard us as continuing to be their MLA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the fact is that our pay continues.

DR. REID: Salary or pay continues as well, and there's a reason for that. There should not be an interregnum in the function of a parliament — I'm using that word advisedly — as a service to the people of Alberta. If you look at it from that standpoint, is it reasonable that as soon as the writ is issued, we shut every service down as far as we can for the period of the writ or at least until there is a confirmation of the election of a successor, be it the incumbent or someone else? I'm not at all sure that the philosophy here isn't flawed. These offices are an extension of the Legislature. That's how we've thought of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And, of course, there is no Legislature. It has been dissolved.

DR. REID: It may be that there is no Legislature, that it has been dissolved, but unfortunately people have difficulties with their workers' compensation or unemployment insurance. I mention those as examples of provincial and federal problems. Their problems don't come to a stop; they continue at the same rate as before. It may be that it's

worth while to consider the continuity of the service to those people, as Mr. Hyland just said. It's difficult for them to comprehend. If the most handy office for somebody in Spirit River-Fairview, soon to be Dunvegan, constituency happens to be the provincial MLA's rather than the federal MP's, that's where they go with all these problems. Suddenly it's shut for two, three, or four weeks. That's not part of the political process; that's part of the process of delivering a service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course, everything an elected member does is political.

DR. REID: Again, we're going to get into a philosophical discussion on that one.

MRS. CRIPPS: But Dr. Reid is right as far as perception is concerned. As soon as we brought in the boundaries Act, people assumed you're the MLA for whatever area is involved, especially after the nomination.

DR. REID: Exactly. I'm in that situation with a change of name. I didn't lose or gain a constituent; I just lost 54 townships. Jim's in the same situation, and I'm sure he is now having problems saying whether he is Spirit River-Fairview or Dunvegan. For example, our constituency association has been putting in West Yellowhead (Edson) or Edson (West Yellowhead). That will continue during the election period.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let's look at it from the point of view of a member of the public, a taxpayer who is politically neutral, and from the point of view of a candidate of another party or another candidate who is not an incumbent.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, let's look at it from the standpoint of Calgary North West. The incumbent is not running. The people in Calgary North West are going to be looking at my neighbour to the right as their representative until there is a new one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PENGELLY: Right.

DR. REID: So they're going to expect her to be

able to continue to deliver a service as their representative here, regardless of their individual political affiliation or the fact that they don't vote and never shall. They will still look to that person to continue that service.

MR. HYLAND: I thought you were a Member of the Legislative Assembly until the day of the writ.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. You get paid as one, but there's no Assembly. It's been dissolved.

DR. REID: The parliament is dissolved, but the function as a contact point continues until the replacement is . . .

MR. HYLAND: The function doesn't cease till the writ day, till the replacement is chosen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reason for the problem, Alan, is that until this government came to office, members weren't paid a monthly salary. They were paid a sessional indemnity. There were no members and there was no Speaker once the balloon went up.

MR. HYLAND: We're only talking two weeks anyway, because you've got to give two weeks' notice. Well, you're talking a little better than two weeks because you've got the 28-day election period or whatever it is. It's a maximum of 28 days. So you're 14 into it. You're at nomination day anyway. Then to close and go through all that for two weeks . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: I think what we did last time was give two weeks' notice.

MR. GURNETT: I was just going to say that as I listen, it sounds to me as though we move back and forth between two different things. Initially I raised the subject of people working in the constituency office — one particular case — but there's also the case we've moved onto, of regular employees in the constituency offices. The other issue is what we do as MLAs. Section 5 seems to be very clear on that in that it says, "officially no duties as M.L.A. continue after a dissolution."

The matter of whether one or more people continue to provide casework services in the constituency office, regardless of there not being an MLA doing official MLA functions, is a

different one. I think I can understand the idea of number 5, which does mean that during an election period all candidates have a certain equality, in that I'm not going to functions as the official MLA while someone else is going as a candidate. But I surely think we should be looking at the provision of services, much as we've talked about in the by-election or in the Calgary West case. People are still going to come to the office for help.

MR. CHAIRMAN: These guidelines create a greater gap in the case of a general election than we have in a by-election.

MR. GURNETT: Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, there really isn't a consistency of policy between number 5 and number 8 or 9. Particularly in a case like mine, where I'm not running again, there's an assumption here that the new candidate, whoever it may be, might want to use the same office. That's not a true assumption at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The offices aren't dropped automatically. They can be.

MRS. EMBURY: This is what's ironic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Normally, the new member gets the office. If he or she doesn't like it, then three months' notice is given. If we didn't have a provision like that and we had the office lease cancelled on dissolution of the House, we wouldn't get too many leases. This gives the landlord a three-month minimum cushion.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I think we're really making a mountain out of a molehill, because 6 covers exactly what the MLA can use his constituency office and the government facilities to do. Those are the only kinds of things we're going to do anyway. I wonder why we're spending . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You see, (d) even covers emergencies; it says something of an "urgent nature."

MR. GURNETT: The concern I have is about (c), which in a sense doesn't cover anything because of the statement "do not have any political connotation." As you said, you could

get into a long debate about what has political connotation and what doesn't. A women's centre in Fairview that finds that their source of federal funding has been frozen and needs help might consider that an emergency, but somebody else looking on might say that if I help them during an election period, it's got the political connotation that they're going to be more interested in supporting me politically.

MRS. CRIPPS: What do you know that we don't?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You could eliminate those words and put in "direct political intent." That would cover that.

MR. GURNETT: I think it would be better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to do that before we lose it?

MRS. CRIPPS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion by Mr. Gurnett that 6(c) of these guidelines be amended by replacing the words "political connotation" with "direct political intent." Okay? All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

MR. HYLAND: That gives some flexibility for some of the others, like the credit card and the travel. Who knows when the elections are called? You could be in Edmonton and then have to pay your own way home.

MR. GURNETT: Would that happen the way it is now?

DR. REID: No. We got the heritage fund committee back home one year. We were having a meeting in the two days, the day preceding and the day it was issued. We got everybody home on the credit card that day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a question there . . .

MR. HYLAND: But without adding that last thing that was added -- further in 12 it says that "no further use of gasoline credit card or travel credit card should be made" after dissolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Except to get home after the

writ.

MR. PENGELLY: It doesn't say that, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to say that?

MR. HYLAND: I think your other covers it enough, doesn't it? That's not a direct political intent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. This is a direct prohibition, though. Except to return home once after the writ.

MR. PENGELLY: When? Twenty-eight days after the election's been called?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're right, Nigel; that should be changed. We should say "after a dissolution and until election day" and then go down to Alan's concern in (b) and add "except to return home once after the issue of the writ."

MR. PENGELLY: Bohdan, supposing the writ is issued on November 1, in your administration they don't pay for any of those that come in after that, do they? November 2?

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, I think we in administration would accept, as a logical sequence of events, that if a member were in Edmonton or elsewhere and had to return from a meeting, function, or engagement on the day of or day after dissolution, obviously that expense would be a valid one.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, that's the same philosophy about the communication allowance as well. The last time around I had something going into the papers about a meeting, and the meeting had to be cancelled. Because of the different deadlines in five papers, I think there were two of them that flew anyway, so they were paid for. We managed to stop the other three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ian, if you look at 12(a), (b), and (c), each one starts with "no further." So your situation would be automatically exempted unless it's caught under (d), but I think (d) looks after it.

MRS. CRIPPS: On (c), that's easy enough to do with a credit card. But since we've changed our

telephone system so that we have a phone in our home which is charged to the government, what happens? I've been thinking about it, because if we all call AGT and have them transfer the billing to us for that month, that's an awfully complicated procedure.

MR. PENGELLY: Don't use it.

MRS. CRIPPS: Oh, yes. But it's still a rental.

MR. PENGELLY: They can pay the rent on it, but there would be no toll charges on it because you wouldn't be using it. You would use your other one.

DR. REID: What does she do if somebody phones collect?

MRS. CRIPPS: I don't mind paying for it, but I would like a mechanism so that if I use it, I can pay for it. How would we establish that?

MR. STEFANIUK: Are you talking about toll charges, Shirley?

MRS. CRIPPS: Toll charges and rent.

MR. STEFANIUK: The rent is an ongoing thing, and the telephone remains installed. In fact, it's practical for us to leave it there and pay the rental, because the disconnect and reconnect charges would amount to more than the month's rental. So logic prevails.

Insofar as tolls are concerned, the bill which lists the tolls would be sent to you, and you would be asked to identify those charges which are personal in nature and those which are to be paid out of public funds.

MR. HYLAND: That's what we did last time, isn't it?

MRS. CRIPPS: Last time we had a credit card.

MR. STEFANIUK: But this would be done with your long-distance tolls as well.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just so I'm absolutely clear and so other members can be too. A member's phone can be used, and if there are calls which are explicitly government calls, the government will pay for them. But if they are nongovernment calls, the member can pay for

them and that's no problem. I guess that's what I want to establish.

MR. STEFANIUK: What we will do is send you a copy of the invoice or statement listing the long-distance tolls. We will ask you to indicate that those tolls are chargeable to the public coffers. If they or some portion of them are not, we will ask you to remit a cheque, payable to the Provincial Treasurer, for that portion.

MR. HYLAND: I used my credit card last time during the election, and the calls I used it for were government calls. They sent the bill, and I had to sign a thing that said that these were calls helping constituents. That's all there was to it.

MR. STEFANIUK: And if they weren't, you could simply write a cheque.

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if this is not a classic example of trying to close all the barn doors before we even know which farm they're on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then losing the barn.

DR. REID: Exactly. Perhaps what we need is a general — I don't want to use the word "directive" — advisory that no public funds should be used for any purpose which is of a direct or explicit political nature and that the use of public funds should be limited to the service to constituents that in a nonelection period would be regarded as the valid function of a member of the Assembly.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, this policy statement was approved by the previous committee in response to a great number of specific questions which were originated by members, and that is why this amount of detail was in fact provided. The questions were directed to a variety of sources; indeed, they are beginning now to be directed to a variety of sources. I know that Mrs. Pratt is receiving inquiries from members in the government caucus. Certainly we are beginning to receive them in the administrative office in some considerable volume, and we are beginning to receive some of them in the executive offices

as well.

We have been relying thus far in the current period on the policy statement which was issued in 1982 to respond to those inquiries. This policy statement was distributed in 1982 to give members something as a ready reference, because virtually all the questions they were posing were answered in this policy statement. The suggestion is respectfully made that the revised version of the policy statement, which members of the committee have before them now, be distributed within some reasonable time to all members, thus facilitating answers to questions which are already arising in their minds.

DR. REID: Perhaps in that event we should add what I said onto it, because we cannot possibly write a complete book of advisories that will cover everything that will come up during that period of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before we go on to Sheila and Nigel, should we include a general statement of intent? To give effect to what you've said, Ian, do you want to add, perhaps at the beginning of this, that the intent of these guidelines or rules is to ensure that public funds will not be used or committed for direct political purposes during the period of an election?

DR. REID: The thing is that the preamble and item 1 do not cover it well enough. Item 1 refers specifically to constituency offices, and I don't think the preamble is adequate. Perhaps it could be added to the preamble. What I said will be on the tape anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we put it in as the third paragraph to the preamble. Would you be content?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to read it back, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: General statement of intent to ensure that public funds will not be used or committed for direct political purposes during the period of an election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right? Okay.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, did you want to take a vote on that motion of Dr. Reid's?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, sorry. All those in favour of Dr. Reid's motion? Opposed? Carried.

MRS. EMBURY: On page 5, Mr. Chairman, I think 12(b) needs to be changed. I think it needs a statement, something more about any credit card issued to the member by the Legislative Assembly. You could put "e.g., gasoline and airline," but there is that En Route card, which is just a little different.

MR. STEFANIUK: I think Mrs. Embury's concern with the En Route card is covered by the words "travel credit card."

MRS. EMBURY: Bohdan, "travel" indicates to me that you're going to use it for some form of transportation. The En Route card can be used for other purchases.

MR. STEFANIUK: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I think the words "travel credit card" are a description of the type of credit card. I respectfully suggest that En Route or PWA or any others are indeed in the category of travel credit cards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What Mrs. Embury has in mind is that it can be used for merchandise, meals, and other purposes. It's not just strictly a travel credit card. Am I right? Am I reading you?

MRS. EMBURY: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So why don't we say "e.g." at the end of this or, better still, put it in English: "for example, En Route and PWA cards." Is that all right?

MRS. EMBURY: I have another point. I want to get back to Jim's point, because I'm not sure if I missed something along the way. Has it been resolved about the STEP student?

MR. GURNETT: No, I don't think it has. I was going to come back to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we come back to that after we dispose of this one?

MRS. EMBURY: Haven't we disposed of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't voted on it. On Mrs. Embury's motion to add those two examples to 12(b), all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

Now, we're back to Jim. We've come full circle.

MRS. EMBURY: I have the same concern. It is a little different. If we're saying that the staff in the constituency office — it says "as quickly as possible"; it doesn't really say two weeks, does it? But I guess that's the minimum amount of notice you give.

I don't know what the contract with those STEP students states. Are we going to let them go for two weeks and still pay them? Why can't they be in the constituency office, still doing the duties of a legislator? It's awfully hard to let them go, isn't it, when they are only hired on a four-month contract?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's very upsetting on a short contract.

MR. GURNETT: The people who take those positions, Mr. Chairman, tend to be people who need at least that little bit of a job, whereas when I hired an office manager on an ongoing basis, I explained to her at the beginning that when an election was called, something would probably happen to her job. At the time I didn't know the details. But when you hire one of these seasonal short-term things, you expect they'll have their term.

MRS. EMBURY: Unless we let them go for two weeks and pay them. But I don't think that would be possible in the contract, because they have to indicate the hours they put in.

MR. GURNETT: Yes.

MR. HYLAND: I don't see why they don't stay there, just like the constituency secretary. There shouldn't be any change.

MRS. EMBURY: As long as they aren't doing anything political.

MR. HYLAND: If they do, they do it on their own time afterwards. They don't do it during regular office hours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheila, if you look at 7, at the top of page 4. Notice the second word.

MRS. EMBURY: "Should."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that cover it? The only thing is that the exception makes it look like a prohibition.

MRS. EMBURY: I understood it was a prohibition before. Did anybody in '82 keep on their ...

MR. HYLAND: I did.

MRS. CRIPPS: I didn't. I think we had her for two weeks, and then we had to close our offices down, if I remember rightly.

MR. HYLAND: We thought about that.

MR. PENGELLY: Mine was on an hourly basis, so she just stayed on.

DR. REID: My lady continued working and didn't get paid.

MRS. EMBURY: So it needs clarifying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GURNETT: I was just going to comment, Mr. Chairman, that to me "should" also implies that you'd have to work hard to try to meet what was being stated in section 7. If you couldn't, maybe you wouldn't, but "should" has more of a compulsion than I think we need. I wonder about the possibility of replacing "as soon as possible" in 7 with "as necessary" and then deleting "if necessary" later on. Then it becomes a much more neutral option.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those are absolutes, though. If you put "as soon as practicable," that would give you more flexibility, but "possible" ...

MR. GURNETT: Sorry. It says "as soon as possible" now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know. That's more rigid.

MR. GURNETT: Right. So if we simply said "as necessary" in place of ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Of course, that's a judgment word.

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know what we're trying to get at here. The other day I understood you to tell me that we kept our offices open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We kept the leases going, but we got rid of the staff.

MRS. CRIPPS: Okay. If I understand today's discussion correctly, we're saying they should be terminated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The staff.

MRS. CRIPPS: The staff should be terminated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. But you could go there yourself and use the phone and the typewriter and so on.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, there is the second half of that sentence: "they may be retained if necessary on an hourly basis to handle constituency matters . . . as in 6(c) or (d)."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, suppose we said this.

MR. STEFANIUK: I'm just wondering. Under item 9 we have the proviso that termination should be discussed with the Clerk. Could you add something like that to 7 and say that any difficulties . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's going to put you in a bad position.

MR. STEFANIUK: But you listen to a case like this, where you've got a contractor for four months or something, and you're reasonable about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose that in 7 you simply said:

Constituency office staff may be retained for the purpose of dealing with items referred to in 6(c) or (d) above.

MRS. EMBURY: Much better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will that cover it?

MR. GURNETT: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Constituency office staff may be retained only for the purpose of dealing with items such as those referred to in 6(c) or (d) above.

MR. HYLAND: Which is what they're supposed to do anyway in reality.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. That gets us rid of a contradiction, doesn't it?

MRS. EMBURY: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does somebody want to make that a motion? Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: I'd be pleased to.

DR. REID: Since you are the departing guest.

MRS. EMBURY: I've already agreed to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed?

MR. STEFANIUK: That's Mrs. Embury's motion?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. And Alan voted standing up, in favour.

DR. REID: Mr. Chairman, I have to leave for a brief meeting, but I'll be back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Generally speaking, are you content with what's left?

DR. REID: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about everybody else?

MR. PENGELLY: Just one point on 12(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Those are now out of date, aren't they?

MR. PENGELLY: Because we got the telephones after the 1982 election.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't we have to take out 12(a)?

MR. PENGELLY: 12(c).

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we don't, not for running the office. That's right; we leave it there. Item 12(c)?

MR. PENGELLY: The telephone credit cards.

MR. HYLAND: You don't need the telephone credit card one now, because all your constituency offices are on direct dialing.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, but some people still need it.

MR. HYLAND: The member might use it.

MR. STEFANIUK: The member carries a card.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Suppose we take refuge in the same device here for 12(c) and say that further use of the telephone credit card must be limited to purposes referred to in 6 whatever.

MRS. CRIPPS: I'd like to leave 12(c) as it is because it's pretty explicit. It says that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. All right.

MR. HYLAND: Pursuant to constituents' interests.

MR. PENGELLY: What about the government telephone in your house?

MRS. CRIPPS: That's the other point I raised earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But this doesn't say anything about it.

MR. PENGELLY: No.

MR. HYLAND: Why can't you add that?

MRS. EMBURY: "Or a direct line." What is it called? It's got a name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What do you call those phones, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: Government private line telephones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but they have personal private line telephones.

MRS. CRIPPS: No. They're in our name, but they're charged to the government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Suppose we say, "no further use . . ."

MR. HYLAND: Of private line telephones charged to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No further use of the telephone credit card nor of publicly provided telephone service may be made with the exception of . . .

MR. PENGELLY: Of 6(c) and (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. Is that all right? No further use of telephone credit cards nor of publicly provided telephone service . . .

MR. HYLAND: I just have one small problem with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, hell no. You're paying for it. Everybody is using publicly provided telephone service. That's no good.

MR. HYLAND: Assembly provided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Publicly funded.

MR. HYLAND: Publicly funded or Assembly provided or something.

I have one problem with it. I don't know if Shirley's got it. There are probably rural members in the country who have a party line for themselves and a private phone for the other. So what does she do now? Conduct all her election business on the party line?

MRS. CRIPPS: That's why I asked the question.

MR. HYLAND: Why shouldn't she be able to use the private phone? The way we have it worded she can't even use it.

MR. PENGELLY: You can do like I'm going to do. I'm going to drive 40 miles and use the phone in the office.

MR. HYLAND: My phone is listed under myself, and the other phone in the house is listed under my wife. If we could word it in a way that said it shouldn't be provided unless arrangements are made with the Clerk or something, so you could just say, "Look, when it's all over, we'll sort the bills out," then we could continue to use the phone.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. That was my point earlier. It wasn't a problem until a couple of months ago, because we had to give the number we were dialing from. If I was dialing on personal business, I gave my other number. But now they automatically dial it.

MR. STEFANIUK: Would this help, Mr. Chairman?

No further long distance tolls should be charged to the telephone credit card nor publicly funded telephones except calls made to pursue constituents' interests as described above.

Now that's charged to. If you intend to reimburse the public Treasury, then you're not charging to, are you?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that all right?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. That would work. It takes a month to get the telephone calls, so you have a month. But if you pay it back within the time ...

MRS. CRIPPS: The other thing you could do is charge all those calls and get them reversed to your other number, but then you pay twice the cost.

MR. HYLAND: But what happens? Then they phone. So you're on the phone, and you've got this charge on, like mine for example, 2122. The operator says, "Will you hold a minute while I phone the number?" So she phones the number, and she's talking to you on the other phone. So you press the button, put one line on hold and talk to her: "Yes." Press the button and back you go to the other call. Or if you have two phones like we had for a while — that's why we changed the other number to Diane's name; we were getting collect calls on both phones. So you get it on one number and say, "Will you charge it to 2122?" "Okay." Two seconds later 2122 rings. You pick it up:

"Hello." "Aren't you the same guy?" "Yes. It's a different phone, but they're side by side." "Okay, will you accept the calls?" "Yes." Hang up that phone; talk on this one.

MRS. CRIPPS: I've got a problem; mine is clean across the house.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is it the same topic, Sheila?

MRS. EMBURY: No, it's another one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we have a motion or a vote on this one? Could you read it back please, Bohdan?

MR. STEFANIUK: Item 12(c) is amended to read:

No further long distance tolls should be charged to the telephone credit card nor to publicly funded telephones except calls made to pursue constituents' interests as described in 6(c) or (d) above.

MR. PENGELLY: That should cover it. And if they do, they're going to get billed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to move that, Nigel? It's been moved. Discussion on it?

MR. HYLAND: I'm not sure you need to move it. I suppose it doesn't matter, but "telephone credit card" was in before. We've just replaced that with something else.

MR. STEFANIUK: No, you're leaving it in.

MR. PENGELLY: You're adding to that.

MR. HYLAND: But I mean we've replaced it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're using a broader expression.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but before that was the only vehicle we had. Now we're just doing the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But doesn't the way it's worded now cover both situations?

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MRS. EMBURY: This is extremely difficult. On this point and others I can understand how this all arose from trying to deal with individuals' concerns. But my goodness, I think we're just getting so bogged down here. Is there not a statement somewhere here that says that surely to goodness if the member is not doing something in relationship to their duties as a legislator, then they are responsible for it?

MR. PENGELLY: Doesn't 4 say that?

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes. That's what I was trying to get in the first place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sheila, what I'm afraid of is that if we just adopt a general statement like the one we added to the preamble, the Clerk and Chuck are going to be inundated with calls saying: "What about this situation? What about that situation?" Some members worry about those things.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sure all members worry about those things, but I also think that sometimes reading something is not as clear as it indicates to the person who wrote it or who had the benefit of this committee to discuss it. I look at point 5. It says something, but then it doesn't say it. It says one thing, and then it says another. So I say, "So what?" We're saying one thing, and then we're saying the other.

MR. PENGELLY: You have the option. You can close your office, or you can leave it open. Right?

MRS. CRIPPS: You can do something for your constituent, or you can say, "Well, I can't; it's an election period."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to take out 5?

MRS. EMBURY: I guess it's a good statement to say that upon dissolution the MLA has no official duties. But then all of a sudden we're saying they may have some duties. So what does it mean? There's nothing to go on from there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a contradiction there. There's no doubt. The tenor of what we've discussed here this afternoon indicates we

have continuing duties as long as our pay continues.

MR. HYLAND: Even if they stopped the pay, the duties wouldn't stop. That's just the way it is.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's got nothing to do with pay. I didn't know we got paid last time, and I still did it. You didn't either.

MR. STEFANIUK: It says "officially no duties." If a member decides to continue to help his constituents, that's duty in a voluntary capacity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. It's that word "officially." You can't really throw that out as if it weren't there.

MR. HYLAND: As long as it's enforced the same way it was in '82, we won't have any troubles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that enough to extract your grudging consent to 5?

MR. HYLAND: Bo, there weren't any troubles in '82, were there?

MR. STEFANIUK: There were odd little problems, but we were able to iron them out internally.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's another thing you could do, if you wanted to. I realize that drafting something in committee is like designing a horse and ending up with a camel. Do you want to put an overall provision that in case of doubt the matter will be decided by the Clerk or the Speaker? Then if you have a clear anomaly of some kind, and you just try to . . .

MRS. CRIPPS: The Speaker can't do it. He's no longer Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: No. The Speaker is still the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, no. The Speaker continues.

MRS. CRIPPS: I beg your pardon, sir.

MR. HYLAND: He is no longer a member of the Assembly. He is Speaker of the Assembly, but there is no Assembly. He is like the man who is a boss with nothing to boss.

MRS. EMBURY: I would feel much more comfortable. This really bothered me, that somebody will or cannot take phone calls. I realize 73 members phoning on 24 issues is an impossibility. But I might read this differently. I may not read "officially" as the key word there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The chances are that with all we've done, we've left some anomalies in there. I wouldn't guarantee that unless I...

MR. HYLAND: So what would you do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'd put a provision in at the end.

MR. HYLAND: You'd have a 15.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or at the beginning.

MR. HYLAND: No, it would have to be at the end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that if people read it and don't go on to the end, they won't know that they've got that out. That's the problem.

MR. HYLAND: Then they'll be phoning you asking questions anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Maybe and maybe not. They might just give up. If they see this prohibiting language, they might give up and not go on to the part where it says you've got an appeal or an out.

MR. HYLAND: If they're after something, most of the people that are elected will read it till the end to find out if there's an out in the end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Apart from where we put it, what about the idea itself? Does anyone want to move a motion?

MR. HYLAND: I'll move that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which one?

MR. HYLAND: Something to the effect that if a member can't fit into these, the decision will be made by the Clerk and the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about if we're at odds and he goes one way and I go the other?

MR. HYLAND: Then the member gets a vote, and we'll see which way he goes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then he decides it.

MRS. CRIPPS: All I wanted to do was clarify that I could use it, and then I could pay it.

MRS. EMBURY: For your constituency business.

MRS. CRIPPS: Yes, but I would want to use it for other things too.

MRS. EMBURY: Then ask for a receipt.

MR. HYLAND: With the motion I'm making, the Clerk can agree to that and give you the bill.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's all I wanted to clarify, that I could. Otherwise, I'm on party lines, and my party line is busy in any case.

MR. HYLAND: And everybody knows your business if you talk on it.

MRS. EMBURY: You don't want a party line.

MRS. CRIPPS: All I wanted to do was clarify that I could use the phone and the Clerk would bill me or that I could transfer the phone bill to me, which I could do, too, I suppose, but that's a lot of rigamarole.

MR. HYLAND: It's easier just to get the bill at the end and pay it.

MR. STEFANIUK: If we were to transfer the phone to you, Shirley, we would still go through a disconnect and a reconnect charge twice. The paperwork that the telephone company initiates would require that it be disconnected from the Legislative Assembly service and reconnected to Shirley Cripps' service.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's in my name now in the

phone book.

MR. STEFANIUK: I know that, but it's billed here. As soon as you change the billing, they go through this process of disconnect and reconnect. Then when the election was over, assuming you were back in again and we were putting it back in the Legislative Assembly's billing, we would do another disconnect and reconnect, and we'd be billed for all of that. We may as well leave the damn thing the way it is.

MRS. CRIPPS: Just as long as there's absolute clarification that that's fine and that I can pay for any calls which are mine and not the Assembly's.

MR. STEFANIUK: We will send you the statement, and you can say, "I certify that these bills should all be charged to the Alberta Treasury." Or you can say, "These bills should be charged, and here is my cheque for the difference because those are really mine."

MRS. CRIPPS: Fair enough. As long as that's clarified, I'm easy with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's been a motion that in case of -- I'm afraid to say "in case of doubt," because if we put anomalies in here where there's no case of doubt ...

MR. HYLAND: All appeals will be judged by the ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the safest way to put it is the way Alan is saying right now. Instead of saying "in case of such and such or such and such," simply say, "An appeal with regard to any of these matters may be directed to" -- and then you have to decide whether you want the members to go to the Clerk or the Speaker -- "... and decided."

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, why is it an appeal? To me that's again very threatening. Why not just a question or a concern?

MRS. CRIPPS: A ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. "Concerns" is good. What I'm trying to do, Sheila, is avoid an unnecessary limitation which would limit the

recourse only to cases where there was a doubt in the wording. It would not cover a situation where we had a contradiction, for example. Well, that would be a doubt, but it wouldn't cover a situation where we've done something that's not appropriate.

MRS. CRIPPS: Clarification or concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The thing is that we sit here and scratch our heads and try to imagine what sorts of situations can arise, and there's no way we can guarantee that we're imagining all of them.

MRS. EMBURY: The preamble says something about guidelines, so why don't you just say that if any concerns should arise, the members should contact the Clerk and/or the Speaker?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I think you should decide on one or the other.

MRS. EMBURY: Oh, not both?

MR. HYLAND: In this case I think it should be the Clerk, because the Speaker is going to be out campaigning as well as all the rest of us.

MR. PENGELLY: He may not be available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll be available, all right.

MR. HYLAND: Yes, but there may be a time when the Speaker isn't from Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I see what you mean.

MRS. CRIPPS: Besides, if the rest of us are campaigning in the constituency, we may be at a telephone for 10 minutes and then gone again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

With that kind of flexibility built into it, are we content to adopt the guidelines as amended by the previously passed motions? Moved by Alan Hyland that we adopt these guidelines ...

MRS. CRIPPS: Why don't you put "adopt and circulate"?

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... adopt and circulate these guidelines as amended by the motions

previously passed at this meeting. Right? All those in favour of that?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

Now, are we ready to go to the Fleming report?

MR. HYLAND: Have we got everything else? How about if we do everything else but that? What about date of next meeting, that sort of thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will that depend on how we get along with this?

MR. HYLAND: It might. I was just thinking that depending on how long we go — Jim said he has to go at a certain time; we should set a meeting date before he leaves, for example.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When do you have to go, Jim?

MR. GURNETT: I'm supposed to be at the university at 3:30. I don't have a watch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's now twenty past one.

MRS. EMBURY: How long were we to meet today? Did we set a time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, we didn't. Jim, can we leave it to you, before you go, to raise the question of another meeting?

MR. GURNETT: Okay, fine.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, do you recall what day and time — during session we used to meet on a Wednesday or something, didn't we?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The second Wednesday.

MRS. EMBURY: Now we'd have to change it to Tuesday. We used to meet the day of the meetings, and now cabinet is Wednesdays.

MR. HYLAND: Weren't we initially meeting Tuesday, and then we had to change it?

MRS. EMBURY: Of course, we don't know when all the committee meetings and whatnot will

be, but I assume it would be Tuesdays.

MR. HYLAND: Weren't we meeting in the mornings?

MR. STEFANIUK: We were meeting on Tuesdays, and then we were meeting on Wednesdays. Then cabinet came in on Wednesdays, and that put the kibosh on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MR. HYLAND: We were meeting at 8 o'clock in the morning, weren't we?

MR. STEFANIUK: That wasn't sitting well with a number of members, though.

MR. HYLAND: They'll have to get up earlier. It was okay when we changed it. On Wednesday we started running in conjunction with the other committee meetings. If we stick with Tuesday, we wouldn't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we do what?

MR. STEFANIUK: If you stay with Tuesday, you wouldn't conflict with other committee meetings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The first Tuesday during session . . . Are you running away?

MRS. CRIPPS: No, I'm going to get my report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to ask you about — the first Tuesday during session will be April 8.

MRS. EMBURY: We could have a breakfast meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want a breakfast meeting on April 8?

MRS. EMBURY: No, I meant for our subcommittee.

MR. HYLAND: If they take it, we'll have to find another date for the subcommittee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see.

MR. HYLAND: If it's needed, we'll just find a different time later.

MRS. CRIPPS: We don't know whether it's needed yet, but any day during session is crowded.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we agree that if it's needed, we'll meet on Tuesday morning, April 8 -- when? -- at half past eight. You might have sat the night before.

MRS. EMBURY: Surely the other committees wouldn't be organized that early, would they?

MR. HYLAND: No, not at that stage.

MRS. EMBURY: Let's go for ten.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten?

MR. HYLAND: Why ten? You city guys never get up in the morning.

MRS. EMBURY: That's so the three of us can meet.

MR. HYLAND: Oh, we're going to go ahead with ours. Okay.

MR. GURNETT: So we'd still go ahead at nine. Then we'd have a report for 10 o'clock; that's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed? Tuesday, April 8, at ten. Moved by Mrs. Embury.

MR. HYLAND: We'll go with ours first, and then come to this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to go to the Fleming report? Bohdan has given some consideration to what we're discussing here. He doesn't want to inhibit the discussion in any way.

MR. HYLAND: Can I move we go in camera?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Off the record?

MR. HYLAND: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Hyland. All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

[The committee met in camera from 1:22 p.m. to 3:12 p.m.]