

2:45 p.m.

Thursday, April 1, 1993

[Chairman: Mr. Gogo]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will call the meeting to order. There are a couple of things we could do.

Bettie Hewes had to leave yesterday prior to our getting to the election of the Speaker, but I think you were here for our finalization of the ad, Bettie.

MRS. HEWES: Just about, Mr. Chairman. Not quite. I'll just have another look at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd just make a comment. Other than correcting the spelling of Kurt's name, which I'm sure has been done, I think it's an excellent ad. Did we resolve the Zenith thing to the 1-800? Does that solve that problem?

MRS. DACYSHYN: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's super. I find it confusing when I try and dial RITE trying to find those damn things. At least the numbers on your phone are big. It's the letters that are small.

MRS. DACYSHYN: I can change that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I'm sure most people . . . I think that's just an excellent ad. Only one might cause a little bit of rumbling, and I'm sure Louise will hear it if it's going to be rumbled. The Speaker of the House is elected now, but I'm sure everybody will understand what we mean when we say: election of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. I know David Carter is very touchy about this.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: Yeah, I know. That's why I mentioned it yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll send him a personal note. Last Saturday night on television, as a matter of fact, I said that the Speaker is elected now but the point is to elect him or her by secret ballot.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: There's more than one way to conduct an election, and those are the different options we're looking at.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well done, Bob. You're so diplomatic.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, the lead-in paragraph says "topics under examination." We're examining the form of the election of the Speaker. I don't think Dr. Carter is going to be concerned about that. It isn't suggesting that he isn't elected or that he is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, yeah. Bob is right on the money. It's the form in which it's done, but I think Louise knows what I'm referring to, because he's made a point of saying that before.

We then get on to the question of that very item, election of the Speaker. We don't want to repeat old ground, but for Bettie Hewes' benefit, Kurt and Bob, I think we should very quickly go over comments that were made yesterday vis-à-vis who would conduct the election. We touched on the longest serving member of the House, and if there were two members who had longest service, there was a way to resolve that. Bob had another suggestion, as I recall. Why don't we just open the discussion on

that basis before we proceed? That would bring Mrs. Hewes up to date.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Before we go any further, can we get a motion to adopt the ad?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought we adopted the ad yesterday.

MRS. DACYSHYN: I'd like a formal motion.

MR. GESELL: I'll move that we adopt the ad.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Kurt Gesell. Seconder?

MRS. HEWES: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Carried. Thanks very much.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, before you leave item 3 then, there was another page that Rich circulated yesterday regarding the letters and so on. Was that finalized as well?

MRS. DACYSHYN: That was actually my list. I'll bring a new one tomorrow. I'm working on it ongoing, and I'll bring you a new list tomorrow so you can make the changes or add to it.

MRS. HEWES: All right; fine. Thanks. We didn't make any final decisions. I wrote a couple of notes. I thought it was his list.

MRS. DACYSHYN: No, it was my list. You can give me your suggestions if you'd like to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that point, the sensitivity of leaving out somebody, as Derek Fox pointed out, it's not an exclusive list. It's an awkward kind of thing, so any suggestions you have I'd appreciate you sending them to Corinne.

Kurt and then Bob, do you want to bring us up to date on where we got to yesterday?

MR. GESELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, I'm going to initially sort of indicate, you know, that we still have to listen to Albertans. We need not prejudice in any way, but we've just discussed some opinions that we're holding.

I suggested that perhaps the way the election of the Speaker proceeds in the House of Commons might be a suitable model for us to emulate. Then there was some discussion with respect to how that process might occur and who might actually Chair that portion of the meeting. The discussion was that everyone would be eligible to be nominated, that they would have to declare perhaps a day in advance of the election whether they would want their name to stand. There was some discussion then also about whether ministers, opposition party leaders, or House leaders would be eligible. The discussion by the Chair was really that everyone should be eligible and that those people that might have those conflicts would choose whichever way they might want to go perhaps.

As far as the chairing of the portion where we elect the Speaker, I suggested originally that it might be the longest serving member in the House. There was some discussion about perhaps the Clerk, who has assumed that responsibility in the past; now our Legislature would do that. The discussion also was around whether that person would be eligible to be the Speaker, as part of the secret ballot. There was some suggestion that perhaps it should be the

longest serving member who has declared his intent that he does not want the job of Speaker, who would withdraw from that nomination. I think that's a reasonable suggestion. If there is a conflict between members – or among members, perhaps, because we may have a number of people that have commenced their service in the Legislature in the same year; there might be three or four – then that might be resolved by taking another variable such as their age into consideration.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that basically summarizes the main portions of the discussion. I may have left some portions off. If you want to supplement, I'd appreciate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point I attempted to make was that every elected member of the Assembly should be eligible to be chosen by his or her peers. That was point one.

The other point I feel very strongly about, Bettie, particularly for the next Legislature following the election. A lot of new members are going to be elected. I think it's grossly unfair to let a novice person be put in the position of chairing of question period so immediately. We talked about this yesterday; I hope we can spend a little time on it. When members are sworn in to the Assembly, that's the first gathering of members. The legal thing would be a 30-day appeal period to the results; I think the Act says that. On the day they're sworn in, members could be assembled in the House to choose its Speaker, and then there would be a month or so until the House sits for a training period for that Speaker. I'd like us somehow to discuss that and deal with it, because I think it's grossly unfair for the novice person to come in and be expected . . .

We haven't talked about the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. Bob Hawkesworth spoke to that yesterday, but Bob should now speak, following Kurt, before we get into discussion. Bob in many ways said, "You know, it would be resolved with just the Clerk of the House handling it," as I recall. I don't want to put words in your mouth.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: At this point, on this and any of the topics that we've got on our agenda, I think all we can do is maybe have some preliminary discussions about them. I wouldn't want to make some final decisions before we've even got the ad in the paper and received submissions from the public. So I think this is a very interesting discussion and an important one in terms of us getting our head around the issue, but I wouldn't want to be put into a position of making a final decision yet.

The only comment I think I made yesterday was that at the moment the Clerk has an important role to play in the formality of opening day. I just made the observation that if you're going to have as the first item of business the election of the Speaker, that changes things from the traditional practice where we elect the Speaker with all the guests assembled ready and waiting to hear the Speech from the Throne. It's been a relative formality, just because of procedure and custom that we've followed in the past, for the Premier to nominate his selection. It's a fait accompli. We install the Speaker and move on to the Speech from the Throne. So if we're to go to a genuine election of the Speaker, not preordained, it would mean that we would do that one day and then do the formality of the Speech from the Throne subsequent to that. That would be the following day, or our chairman suggested maybe a couple of weeks after that happened.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you for filling me in on it, Mr. Chairman, Kurt, and Bob.

I just have a couple of things. First of all, a sort of generic question: yesterday did we agree – and Bob has touched on this

– that we would have some discussion on these subjects and others, perhaps understanding that these are not final in any way, just sort of opening up the discussion, laying out some of the options or alternatives or some of the things for further consideration? Is that what we're doing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we weren't restricting ourselves to the bullets.

MRS. HEWES: Right.

2:55

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a shopping list of about 37 items. I think as a committee we're at liberty to pick and choose. As you recall, we prioritized eight of them that we thought should be important ones to lead us off. That did not mean we would not be dealing with the other ones. I took it as a given that the first item we would discuss at any length would be the question of the election of the Speaker of the House. Is that really your question?

MRS. HEWES: No. My question is: in having these discussions and recording what is said here, we're agreeing to leave each one of these on the table for further input? That's the understanding. We're just opening up the discussion on each of these items.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. I think it's critically important. Remember the point Bob made, and that is: we want the views of Albertans. So we don't want to be decisive on anything. We're going to reach a point where a member of this committee is going to say, "Look; we must get an interim report into the House." I know that's going to be done. Somebody's going to make that comment at some point, whether it's April 25, 28, or whatever. We'll then have to make that decision: have we heard from sufficient people in order to do that? That will be the debate then. I would not like to see us as a committee of the House, representing all Albertans, making a definitive decision on anything without hearing their views.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you. I just wanted to be assured that had taken place.

To the specific then: I agree that the methodology generally used in the House of Parliament is the logical one, that everyone is presumed nominated unless they withdraw.

I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, that I would agree that someone who is a novice member could not put their name in. It occurs to me that some of those people may in fact have tremendous parliamentary experience and might be more than competent, so I wouldn't like to say from the outset that they could not. I would anticipate that each caucus would be in a position to advise their members as to the kind of demands upon the function.

Having said that, who conducts the election, and how do we deal with the opening? I think there are probably some other options. Did we talk about perhaps having the chief justice do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MRS. HEWES: That's another option that we might have available to us, and it might be an easier one. In fact, we might ask the chief justice to fulfill the role of Speaker for that first day, which would accommodate both factors. That is, the Speech from the Throne could be heard; the election of the Speaker could be held. I don't know the legal requirements, and there probably are some legal hoops that might have to be gone through, but that or a justice might be a methodology we could use. If I read you

right, it's getting over (a) the election and (b) the tradition of the opening of the House with the reading of the throne speech, which I like. I think we need more rather than less tradition in our lives.

Maybe Kurt can tell me: in the House of Parliament, how do they manage that transition? I'm trying to recall the Speaker before John Fraser. What was his name? I'm trying to remember. A Toronto member and he didn't last.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It started with a B. [interjection] No. It was a B, though.

MRS. HEWES: He didn't last, did he?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bosley.

MRS. HEWES: Bosley. That's right. He was a Toronto alderman before. Okay.

I'm not sure how they do it, Mr. Chairman. Kurt, do you know?

MR. GESELL: No, I can't answer that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By parliamentary principle nothing can be heard in the House until the Mace is in its place. The Mace cannot be in place until the Speaker is elected.

MR. GESELL: That's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll get the parliamentary encyclopedia.

MRS. HEWES: That's the legal handicap, the legal barrier. Okay; let me rethink that then.

MR. GESELL: Bettie raised the point of having the election and having the throne speech. I feel very strongly that there needs to be a time frame between the election of the Speaker and when the House actually starts sitting. When we start sitting, it's normally the throne speech and then we're right into the debate of the throne speech. There needs to be a gap there, because when we have an open election by a secret ballot, that Speaker needs to be prepared for all the members of the House once we get into the formal process. The chairman raised that yesterday. It is essential, because if we have a person elected as Speaker that is not completely familiar with the rules of the House, we might have some difficulty. There may be some errors that we commit that could be avoided if we left a little bit of a time period for that Speaker to become acquainted with the tradition and the rules of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We've never had that problem in the past because the leader of government in striking his cabinet would always end up choosing a Speaker, not pro tem, in a telephone call, which would be a week or two or three or four weeks prior to the fact. I recall as Deputy Speaker immediately being informed as to who the Speaker was. Then we met for two weeks prior to that day. So I was able to read; I was able to do a lot of things so the House would resemble a decent government when it got under way. I think this is a critical point.

MR. GESELL: Yes, it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess the only thing I'm saying: if members could be called to be sworn in – ignoring the appeal period for contested elections – and members then assembled chose a

Speaker, then several weeks between then and the opening of the House would be critical to the new Speaker for a training period. Now, what we don't know is: if you get 300 people in the gallery for opening day, and it takes 14 hours to elect your Speaker – Bob, I think you made that point yesterday – how do you deal with that?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: You don't want all your guests there. Well, we tried it out with the Deputy Chair of Committees, I guess a trial run, earlier this session. If there's going to be a voting place in the middle of the Assembly floor, obviously you can't have that and the place filled with guests. You couldn't have people other than the members in the Assembly when the vote was being carried out.

MRS. HEWES: I think you're quite right.

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, you're suggesting that the election is held June 1. On June 6 the people are called to be sworn in.

MR. GESELL: Well, I think they have to be sworn in first, Bettie; wouldn't they?

MRS. HEWES: Called only to be sworn in, not called for the opening.

MR. GESELL: Oh, I see.

MRS. HEWES: Okay. They're called to be sworn in. Then they're sworn in, and an election for a Speaker is held right there. Then two weeks later the House opens.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Yeah. I don't know whether we can prejudge what a future Assembly might do. If they want to elect a novice, they're entitled to elect a novice. Any Speaker, I'm sure, has to learn from experience. It seems to me that if I just read what the House of Commons standing order says:

At the opening of the first session of a Parliament, and at any other time as determined pursuant to section (2) of this Standing Order, the election of a Speaker shall be the first order of business and shall not be interrupted by any other proceeding.

So I presume if the House after the Speaker is elected chose that they were going to stand adjourned for a week or two weeks or three weeks, that would be their privilege at that point. Or if they decided they were going to get at it the next day with the Speech from the Throne, that would be their privilege at that point to do it too. Anyway, I'm just thinking that we may not want to encumber future Assemblies by putting down too onerous a requirement in our Standing Orders or in the Legislative Assembly Act. If they chose to stand adjourned for two or three weeks to give the Speaker time to get accustomed to the role, that could be their decision, or if they felt that it was essential to proceed immediately, that could be their decision at that point too.

3:05

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're presupposing a couple of things. One is the nominating process. As I said earlier, I'm of the view that every member elected is eligible to be Speaker of the House as opposed to being nominated by a member, so there would have to be a mechanism whereby each elected member is informed of his or her eligibility to be Speaker of the House. It could be done and probably would have to be done by mail or something from the Clerk of the Assembly with some parameters. There's no question

in my mind that two-thirds of the members so elected would not be interested in that role; I'm fairly confident.

If we look at the other way, that they must be nominated by a member, the House must be assembled even to do that, so I think that makes it a little bit awkward. Frankly, I don't see the difficulty in having the members assembled choosing their Speaker several weeks before the opening of a session. Some may make the argument that there's the cost involved – there's *Hansard* involved; there's staff involved – and they have a valid argument. I think we have to approach this very carefully, and I would agree with Bob that we don't want to bind the hands of people by attempting to put something in stone. Our job, I think, is to end up making recommendations and let the House decide as to how they want to . . .

Go ahead, Kurt.

MR. GESELL: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm along the same lines that you're discussing, and that is that every member that's elected should be eligible unless they withdraw. Just going by the last time around, in June of '89, all the members were sworn in. Cabinet was sworn in afterwards, so then there's a decision for those that are selected for cabinet to make. That comes afterwards. If we hold the election of the Speaker as the first item of business after swearing in, the Mace not being in the House or draped, everyone is in fact eligible at that point in time unless the decision for cabinet has been made previously, but normally that is not done. The swearing in for those ministers comes afterwards.

At the swearing-in ceremony we have the Lieutenant Governor who is in charge, and I feel that we could then go into the election of the Speaker as the first order of business. If you then adjourn until the time the throne speech is actually read and we're into the actual Legislature session – the government produces the throne speech and we go on with the discussion – there can be a time frame of two, three, four weeks, or whatever. I think if I were in a position where I had to assume that Chair, heaven forbid, I would want a sufficient period of time to become familiar with what the rules are so that I would be at least reasonably comfortable in guiding members in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I draw your attention to Ontario, which is one of the most recent ones. It's under tab D; I don't know what page it is. You might take a minute to look at that. They have His Honour in the House before they choose the Speaker.

Bettie.

MRS. HEWES: That's what I was going to ask. What do we know from the experience elsewhere? How well does it work as well as how does it work?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Attachment 5 under D, Ontario – they discuss their nomination process.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Chairman, just one further point I wanted to make. If we go with the process, the alternative that every member is eligible, there may be considerable members who will let their name stand, and the election may take some considerable time.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Mr. Chairman, this is a fascinating collection that our staff has put together: the Standing Orders from the House of Commons in Ottawa as well as the House of Commons in Great Britain, including what looks like the *Hansard* transcripts from their most recent election there. If we were to accept your principle that every member is eligible to serve as

Speaker of the Assembly, I think that's encapsulated by the House of Commons in Ottawa where, as I read it, you have to proactively indicate in writing that you don't wish to be considered, and if you fail to do that by the deadline, then you are eligible to be elected Speaker along with everybody else. Is it fair to say, then, that any member who's in the Assembly could receive a vote from any other member in the Assembly in a handwritten, secret manner?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could just interrupt, the House of Commons is the only system I know where you can be elected by default; i.e., if you don't withdraw from the above.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Well, I gather that's also how the Pope is chosen. Never having been in any of those conclaves, I can't speak with any authority, but that's what I understand is the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we have no smoke in the chimney, but at least he does, as you know.

As the Chair, if I could just interrupt. For such a high-profile committee, I feel in many ways that I felt more comfortable with someone with vast experience – I don't want to say Mike Ritter – sitting at the other end of the table who would save us a lot of trouble in terms of trying to read all the material by highlighting each system, if you hear what I'm saying: a resource person. It's not fair to Louise and it's not fair to Frank Work. You know, we're ending up doing all this amongst ourselves, waiting to hear what the public's going to say to us. It would have been great to have sort of the Bob Pritchard of the boundaries thing, if you know what I mean.

Bettie.

MRS. HEWES: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Ontario: I couldn't remember; it's some time since I've read it. Ontario does it the next day, which gives some validity to your notion that it can be the next day or the next week or whatever it is we decide. We come together; His Honour calls it. He leaves; we elect. Then it is determined that we're going to convene in another week. What I said before and what I'd like to know is: does that work okay? Is that an all-right system? Have they had reasonable success, or has it produced a lot of difficulties for them? That shouldn't be too hard to find out, I wouldn't think.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, if you think of it, His Honour arrives in the House. The government's determined, obviously, by the number of seats. The Government House Leader says that the business as such cannot commence until the Speaker is chosen, and thereby, according to this script, "will inform the House that His Honour will not declare the causes for summoning the members until a Speaker has been chosen, but will do so" – in this case it being Ontario – "tomorrow at 3:00 p.m." whatever date they choose.

MRS. HEWES: And that's the date for the opening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes; it's in that context.

I really think we have a golden opportunity to be unique while at the same time honouring parliamentary history. As an aside, Bob, I've never forgotten the minority government in Ontario and Bill Davis, who chose Mr. Jack Stokes, the NDP member – in those days it was the NDP – as the Speaker of the House without casting any political innuendo. Jack Stokes was one of the finest Speakers any province in Canada had. There you had Mr. Davis with his minority government and so on, and the ND Speaker,

Stokes, whom I had the honour of knowing. It was kind of remarkable. That's why I think the principle that any member elected is eligible is important, because we might be in for a surprise.

3:15

MR. HAWKESWORTH: If I may make the observation, Mr. Fraser's tenure as Speaker of the House of Commons has been exemplary as well, and I suspect part of the reason he's been able to handle Parliament as effectively as he has has been the recognition that he has come from the members and that the members supported him. He has a mandate and authority that would otherwise not be there. The process has conferred on him standing and authority that he otherwise wouldn't have had, and I think that's helped make him a very fair and effective and highly regarded Speaker of the federal House of Commons.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, if I can just be permitted a little humorous aside to your comments. Bill Davis came from the same town outside Toronto that I did. In fact, I grew up with him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Brampton?

MRS. HEWES: Yes, Brampton. His house is still across the street from the house in which I was born, so I knew the family well and knew the circumstances well. He in fact was born to be the Prime Minister of the country, which he never achieved. He did manage to make it to Premier of Ontario, but that was what he was there for; that was his legacy.

With respect, sir, knowing Bill Davis to be an intelligent man with a minority government, I expect he probably couldn't afford to have one of his own as Speaker, and likely it was also beneficial to have somebody from one of the other caucuses to maintain his numbers. That is always there; that is, you take from your own caucus if you have a minority.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the history of Ontario of course is unique. It's the only jurisdiction in Canada that had son follow father as Clerk of the House. It was said, and we learned this from Mr. Frost, that when you wanted advice as Premier, you sought the counsel of the Clerk of the House as to when the House should sit and on other matters such as choosing a Speaker. That's a rumour, but I think we all know, or you've heard from my comments, that back in the 1600s the Speaker was the agent of the King. That's why the Chairman of Committees has always been elected by its members and not by its Premier or Lieutenant Governor or the Queen, et cetera.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: You were asking about the experience of Ontario. Just reading this news article that's included in our documentation, there's a little sentence here I find intriguing: "In exchange for the right to elect the Speaker, MPPs relinquished their right to challenge the Speaker's rulings." I wonder if we could have somebody brief us on what is the quid pro quo there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I read that, too, about when Warner was chosen, and you can read a lot of things into it. That was one of the things we were going to find out if we ever got to Queen's Park. You can only challenge a Speaker's ruling in our House by a substantive motion, as I recall, can't you? In our Standing Orders, I think you need a substantive motion.

I don't know what the public's going to tell us about this matter, but certainly the technical details are up to us and not the public. The principle of election by secret ballot would be something the

public would probably insist on; the process format would be how we would recommend it be done. Maybe I'm hung up too much on this business. Bettie Hewes might be right in saying: hey, if you can't take the heat, you shouldn't be in the kitchen anyway, and if you're prepared not to withdraw your name, then you'd better be prepared to be the Speaker. I mean, that's your point. I'm just trying to base mine on my experience.

MRS. HEWES: I think your comments, however, Mr. Chairman, are prudent. This is our first time out, and probably in the final analysis if we would be recommending this type of methodology, it would say that it could be one day or it could be seven days, leaving some flexibility open from one session to another.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same topic, could we give some thought to the following, because it's under the same heading on our agenda. As you know, our legislative Act spells out how a Speaker is chosen. Our Standing Orders spell out how a Deputy Speaker or Chairman of Committees and Deputy Chairman of Committees are chosen, the inference being that the Speaker cannot perform in our Standing Orders. The Deputy Speaker is, in fact, the Acting Speaker. We've got to know him as the Deputy Speaker, but he's known as the Acting Speaker. I think that's perhaps for administrative purposes, for signing Louise's paycheque. I'm not sure why they use that terminology.

Of those who seek the office of Speaker, whoever is chosen is the Speaker. Do you think there's any merit in considering the next person on the run for Deputy Speaker, or should it be held as a distinct, separate election? Is there merit in discussing that as a . . .

MRS. HEWES: In doing it all at once?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. In that case we could take all three. Is there any merit to that; i.e., one, two, three? We could eliminate the whole thing in one election, as long as the understanding is that if your name is in the ring, you may end up not as Speaker.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Number two or number three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. As long as you understand that, I think it's a pretty good way of doing things.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: It's interesting.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: If members find they're not going to be Speaker, would they have a chance to withdraw, or would they automatically . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: They could resign. It would be somewhat embarrassing, but . . .

MRS. HEWES: The Deputy Speaker is in no way constrained from his obligations and responsibilities as a representative in the House; that is, he is not expected to restrict himself in his activities?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not as an elected member, no. Remember the traditions that we have in place: the Speaker does not attend the caucus when discussing proposed legislation. I mean, there are some of those traditions around that David Carter and Amerongen honoured. There are no such constraints on the Deputy Speaker or the Deputy Chairman. I'm just thinking that rather than three separate elections – is there merit in us even thinking of that?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: It would seem to me . . .

MR. GESELL: Go ahead, Bob. I'll follow you.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: We're just sort of brainstorming here. It would seem to me that the likelihood of the Deputy Speaker or Chairman of Committees coming from a party other than the government party – the chances would be greatly enhanced in an election of that nature that they would then have a role to play.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bob.

DR. ELLIOTT: I've already looked at those, Mr. Chairman. In my mind, the guidelines here are that we want to have a system that is fair to everybody involved, including the electorate, and that at the same time will make for a system that is functional and works and will provide a mechanism that will make sure that the House runs smoothly. We also want to make sure that we don't cause an embarrassment somewhere along the line either to the elected Speaker or the Deputy Speaker or whatever with respect to the time frame; in other words, putting somebody in there who may or may not have all of the qualifications.

One I'm just thinking of here now: where are we headed in our Assembly, in our Parliament, with respect to language requirements for the Speaker, for example? Is that going to be a component that we have to consider somewhere down the line? You know, we're going to be referring to the Ontario and Ottawa deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we passed a law here, of course. It said we're English only.

DR. ELLIOTT: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I don't want to prejudge.

DR. ELLIOTT: That's where we're at today, and I guess under those circumstances we can let that one rest.

Having a Speaker prepared, though – the discussion with respect to the time lag between the time of election of a Speaker and the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees and the time when we open and have the throne speech with our Assembly full of invited guests: we want to make sure those things run smoothly, and having that experience is important. If you don't have experience, then we'll have a training period. As I understand the rules of the House, we can recess for a week, two weeks, or whatever we choose. I've heard you say yourself sort of, "You know, we are in charge of our own House here, and we can do this." I think we're on the right track.

3:25

MR. CHAIRMAN: As chairman, I don't want to muddy waters, but what I would like to ensure is that the parameters of the debate are such that we can get everything into it. For example, yesterday we heard Louise say that according to our Legislative Assembly Act the Speaker of the Assembly is Speaker until midnight of the day before a successor is chosen. I think they were your words, Louise.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I don't think it's in the Act. It's been the custom. That's what happened when Mr. Amerongen did it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh. I think our Standing Order says the Speaker is there until – unlike the Deputy Speaker. The Deputy Speaker dies the day of the writ.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So I think the Speaker's unique, and that, I think, is for administrative purposes.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before Bonnie speaks, the other item is that if you're going to be the least bit interested in being the Speaker of the House, are we being fair if we call members to assemble for swearing in and then conduct the election without allowing any time for people who want to be Speaker to campaign? Bob, am I being out of order? If you hear what I'm saying, the way it's been done to date is the divine right of kings approach; i.e., the Premier chooses, the opposition seconds, and it becomes unanimous. Because of this, if we call members to Edmonton, some who have never been in the House before – Dick Johnston had never darkened the Chamber prior to election. You may not even know where the washroom is. Understanding that within two hours or so you could be the Speaker of the House – I mean, that's a pretty dramatic change. Should there be any opportunity for people to say . . . Of course, they could do that if they're informed by the Clerk that members are called to assemble in the Legislative Assembly for swearing in as members of the Assembly on a given date and the following will take place, and a little kit. Now, if they want to campaign on the telephone, that's their business.

Bonnie.

MRS. B. LAING: Well, I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, the swearing in is a sort of formal thing where you often have family members here. That could be on one day, and then have the Assembly come in the next day to do the election of the Speaker. I mean, you're here anyway, and I think when you're just beginning, there's so much to learn that even if you were here a day or two, there are lots of things you can be doing. Even if it's just setting up an office, there's a lot of work that could be done at that time.

I was wondering about the Chairman of Committees. That's a little bit different in a way. I wonder if it would be a good idea to have them go one, two, three in the final ballot order, if that shouldn't be a different election. It's a little different role, I think, and people perhaps might not want to be the committee chairman. There might be others who wouldn't want to be Speaker but wouldn't mind coming in and being the chairman. So I kind of wonder if there shouldn't be a line drawn at looking at the order of one, two, three on the ballot, the final results.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. We shouldn't attempt to prejudge. I've known two Speakers in Canada, one who's extremely active in the Canadian Parliamentary Association who only attended about three or four days of the complete sitting of his own House, and the Deputy Speaker was de facto Speaker. That's their business; it's not my business. But to play such a prominent role . . . It was in the Amerongen era, I remember, and it wasn't Alberta, that one House . . . In those days they didn't even pay a Deputy Speaker. I can remember some of the rumblings through Mr. Amerongen as to the problems because the Speaker so chosen wasn't even chairing his own House.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I don't know that this problem has arisen in these Assemblies that have gone into an election by secret ballot, but would you see there being a provision for recall if the members of the House were unhappy with the performance of their Speaker? Alternatively, would this election occur once every year, so that you'd elect a Speaker for a year, or would it be for the life of the Legislature? I'm just questioning. You've raised a problem that might occur and has occurred in the past.

DR. ELLIOTT: So what do we do about it?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I don't know. So far it appears not to have been a problem with any of the Assemblies where the Speaker has been elected by secret ballot. Perhaps the sense that having been elected and therefore you're accountable to the House, as opposed to having been appointed by the Premier and therefore accountable only to the Premier – maybe there's a different attitude and this wouldn't be a problem anywhere in the future. Maybe there's some need there or maybe not; I don't know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On this point, Kurt.

MR. GESELL: Well, talking about your point, Mr. Chairman, the merits of electing a Speaker, Deputy Speaker, I believe it has a lot of merit to do them right at the beginning. As a matter of fact, the election of Deputy Speaker is one of the requirements under our Standing Orders to be the first item: "At the commencement of every Legislature the Assembly shall elect . . ." But I have a concern there, sir. The concern is that there's a voting paradox that occurs in the way certain votes are taken. My point is that if you have one election and you choose a Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and so on on the one ballot that is cast, those results might be considerably different than if they were . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Separate elections?

MR. GESELL: Yes. That's where I'm getting into this voting paradox. Now, let's be straightforward about this. When I choose a Speaker, even though there may be a second-place position available, my concentration is going to be on that first place, for the Speaker. I'm not going to be concentrating – well, not exclusively – on the Deputy Speaker and so on. I believe that if we elect a Speaker and then go to a balloting process to elect a Deputy Speaker, my choice might be different, and I believe other members' choices might be different. For instance, if it's a government member that might be Speaker, I perhaps might be inclined that maybe an opposition member be Deputy Speaker, and my vote might be accordingly. I believe that it's good to have those elections at the beginning, but there should be separate ballots for each individual position. Then we get away from this voting paradox to some degree.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I'm inclined to agree with Bonnie and Kurt, and I'm not sure why. It's perhaps instinct as much as anything that these probably should be separate elections. As I say, I'm not exactly certain of all the arguments. I'm sure I could work them out if I had some time to put my mind to it, but I'm inclined to think that there might be a real difference in what you would do on that first ballot for one officer and what you would do if you were in fact going for three.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see it being applied much easier to Chairman of Committees and Deputy Chairman of Committees in one vote; i.e., the first one is recognized . . .

MRS. HEWES: Yes. That could happen in one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know I keep reading through this, as to how other jurisdictions are doing some of these things. I've really not come to a conclusion in my mind other than I'm committed to the principle, and that is that a Speaker is chosen by a secret ballot. I think the example of our Deputy Chairman of Committees was an excellent example. It causes some beats in some people's hearts when a Deputy Premier nominates a government member and it goes to a second ballot. It caused you to think. That may have been rectified last evening, by the way, at the nomination. I don't mean that in any derogatory way. I'm just saying that it kind of tells you something when government nominates one of its own and it takes two ballots. To me it's the test of democracy. I really endorse that system.

Bob, you've got a chart worked out there.

3:35

MR. HAWKESWORTH: If you're going to have a seminar here, this is what I just thought of as a time line. First of all is the election night, and 83 members are elected from all over the province, in this case from three different political parties. The tradition has been that our caucuses get sworn in on separate days, so I presume over a period of three days, and it's at that point that you actually become a member, I think, in a legal sense. Then once you've become a member, the Premier selects the Executive Council, caucuses select their leadership in the form of party leaders, House leaders, and the whole business. I would presume that those groups would not then become eligible, and the first time the Legislature would convene as a whole, they would select amongst who's left. Some time after that would be the Speech from the Throne, and the business of the House would carry on. That's my picture of what I think we're talking about.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask a question? I know that the members of different caucuses are sworn in at different times, and I'm just wondering if there's a tradition behind that. To me they're all members of the Legislature. Why do we swear them in on different days? We seem to be drawing party lines right there in the House. They're obviously there, but we're all equal in the House.

MRS. HEWES: Why not alphabetically?

MR. GESELL: By whichever way, yes, and have them all sworn in on the same day. I feel that that is not right perhaps. You should be swearing in all the members that have been elected. The people of Alberta have chosen those members to represent them. They're of the same value in the House.

MRS. HEWES: Some tradition I expect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: That may be. I know that in our case they allowed us to fill two galleries with supporters, friends, and workers in our campaigns to sort of witness us being sworn in. I presume that was the case with both the Liberal and Conservative groups, but there's no requirement that we have to be sworn in separately. Maybe that's a good point. I think a number of us in the Assembly bemoan the fact that it's become far too partisan. Partisanship isn't necessarily part of democracy and essential to what we do here, but every good thing can become a negative if it's pushed too far. Maybe that's what we're doing, taking



partisanship too far. Maybe that would be one way to set a new tone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My first swearing in was in the rotunda of the Assembly at the bottom of the stairs around the pool, not in the House.

MRS. HEWES: Can I ask, Mr. Chairman: was it done government members and opposition members?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I remember that there were groups of four: Getty, Ghitter, Gogo, Harle. It was done in the rotunda in groups of four, whatever the size of the caucus was. It was a huge caucus then. It was a logistical thing: four at a time because of the Lieutenant Governor and the Clerk.

I've always thought all members should be sworn in at the same time, to sign the book and so on. I thought the House of Commons did it that way, all members. I didn't think it was by political stripe. I thought it was all members in one room, but I guess I'd have to check that out. What Bob has said is that if we continue to do it the way we're doing it and it occupies three days, it makes it very difficult to swear in a Speaker the way we've been talking, because you don't have all members there at the same time.

MRS. HEWES: I like the notion of every member is a member, and why shouldn't we share the event?

MR. GESELL: The purpose here is to represent Albertans. We have the same purpose. We might go about it in a different way, but the purpose is the same.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At Fort Saskatchewan every inmate is an inmate, wears the same stripes.

MR. GESELL: Actually, they don't wear stripes anymore, but all right.

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Chairman, it might be a matter of numbers, too, though. If you had 83 members and you each had at least two guests, you know, that might be a problem - I'm just wondering about that - with the two galleries upstairs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's done in the House, yeah.

MRS. HEWES: You could use the rotunda again.

MRS. B. LAING: Where did your guests stand? On the balconies? What did they do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can't recall. I've got the photographs, but I can't recall.

MRS. B. LAING: When we had the opening when the ministers were sworn in, I was up on the third floor and you couldn't see a thing. If someone has traveled a long way, I think they would be very disappointed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, they'd see more than they'd ever see in Government House, I'll tell you, because you didn't see much in Government House when I was sworn in.

MRS. B. LAING: That just might be one of the handicaps of doing it all at once.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, in fairness, I guess we're masters of our own House. If a caucus says, you know, I think this process should be the following . . . I'm in the ND caucus; therefore we determine our seating plan: our process is going to be that we're going to swear in the Member for Calgary-Mountain View, who I as leader deem to be my finance critic, and that is his seat. And our process is going to be that once the Lieutenant Governor shakes his hand and he signs the book, he will go and sit in the front row in his seat.

I mean, that might be. That's the option of the caucus, isn't it? It would be kind of classy. I don't know how you'd develop a seating plan for a member to be sworn in, walk into the House, and take their seat. Only certain people are allowed to take a seat. I don't want to prejudge, but it's kind of novel how it could be done. I just think we should try and make this thing different and exciting, at the same time bearing in mind the secret ballot process. Who said this ruddy parliamentary system was simple?

MRS. B. LAING: You could also do it sort of by hours: if we had to split, if you wanted to move all together, or whatever. So many go . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The same day, though.

MRS. B. LAING: The same day. Maybe break the day up into three sections and even have some go in there in the evening and do it that way.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: And invite more guests that way.

MRS. B. LAING: Yes. You could invite more guests then, and you'd have everybody sworn in on the same day and be ready to start that next day with the election of the Speaker.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think there's one function here - in the swearing in of a member, from the standpoint of the Legislature, of the Clerk and of the officers, there's a mechanical function type of thing. But from the standpoint of a member and his or her caucus, it's almost a celebration, and thus the importance of having guests and visitors. It comes on the heels of the emotion of the election. Winning an election is one thing, but being sworn in is something else. I think it's a celebration. I would expect that if we took this debate back to our respective caucuses, they would be very strongly in favour of retaining a caucus approach, a celebration approach to the swearing-in exercise. Now, maybe there are ways of putting it all together using the one day for the expediency of making it fit in with the election of our Speaker, using different times of day to accommodate the different caucuses so we could get through it all in one day or maybe using different locations. I don't know, but I think the celebration standpoint, from the caucus point of view, is definitely a part of the process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, Bob, following up on Bonnie, what if 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. were one caucus, 10 to 11 another caucus, and 11 to 12 another caucus. Then all members assemble at 1 o'clock for the election of their Speaker and you use that afternoon. All guests are in town. That's not insurmountable.

DR. ELLIOTT: No, it's not. It's not insurmountable at all, as long as we respect some of those little twists and quirks to the whole thing.



3:45

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. That wouldn't be insurmountable.

MRS. B. LAING: Well, like a good party, I still think you need the one day for celebration.

DR. ELLIOTT: I agree with you.

MRS. B. LAING: Then what do you do with your guests, you know, while you're sitting there maybe eight or nine hours electing your Speaker? Have your day of swearing in and your send-off and your party and get them on the bus or whatever and get back to work.

MRS. HEWES: But we usually have a little event. Don't we have a little tea, a little tah-dah down in the rotunda?

MR. CHAIRMAN: After the opening.

MRS. HEWES: After the opening, and the caucuses usually have a little event after the swearing in.

DR. ELLIOTT: That's where the tah-dah comes in.

MRS. HEWES: Is that the tah-dah? Okay; I got that mixed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, it's interesting. I don't want to detract from our discussion, but let me share with you that each year we would have a function in the rotunda recognizing a particular group. One year was the year of the handicapped, and every member of the House was asked to invite a handicapped person. One was the year of the aboriginals, before it was in vogue, and it was a sit-down banquet in the rotunda.

MRS. HEWES: I can't remember this. Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The NAIT cooking class always catered, and one year - what do they grow in New Brunswick?

MRS. HEWES: Fiddleheads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fiddleheads, which is a native food, by the way.

MR. GESELL: Fiddleheads.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, seriously, Kurt.

MR. GESELL: Yes, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They catered, and at the same time the Speaker gave the Tuxis awards and the scholarships. That was part of the program. We did that each year in the rotunda.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: The first time I ever met Mr. Lougheed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Because he was a Tuxis man.

MRS. HEWES: And you sat around and ate in the rotunda.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We had a sit-down. There were tables, eight or 10 to a table, spread around in the rotunda. It was very noisy,

Bob, you recall. You'd need a good PA system. The pool wasn't running, mind you.

It was one of the greatest adventures I had as a member, not of my own caucus but as a member of the Assembly, because it brought everybody together, and each year - I don't know how many years we did it - you featured a different group. I remember the two groups: the year of the handicapped and the aboriginals, the native people. You were asked to invite a native person. Then it was done away with. I don't know as I should tell you the reason.

MRS. HEWES: Oh, go ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Speaker invited as guests two from each jurisdiction across Canada. They stayed at the Westin and ran up horrendous bills, and it became a budgetary item. Here we had NAIT catering as part of their training and so on. That was the reason it was canceled. I don't know if any of you remember that, but I remember well the reason it was canceled. It was very unfortunate.

MRS. HEWES: It became an embarrassment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yup.

I got a little sidetracked there. What time is it?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Close to 4 o'clock, about 10 more minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So what we have decided, I think, is that we should maintain the tradition of electing the Speaker of the House independent of the Deputy Speaker and Deputy Chairman of Committees. If we're going to do that, then we should elect each at separate elections perhaps, although I know you could make the case for the two.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Before we bring this to a conclusion, I haven't heard anyone express a defence of the existing procedure, existing tradition. I don't intend to defend the existing system, but maybe we should just make the observation that to this point I haven't heard any of our members as strong advocates for the Speaker to continue to be appointed by the Premier and elected in the tradition that we've elected Speakers in the past.

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think what we're doing here is exploring options, and retaining the present tradition is still an option, I suppose. I think we're having an extremely interesting brainstorming session as to what some options might be. Of course we've chosen not to preclude any option because we still want to hear what Albertans say.

MR. GESELL: I agree with what Bob mentioned.

Mr. Hawkesworth mentions appointment of the Speaker. I clearly remember *Hansard* from June 1, 1989. It sure looked like an election to me. Now, the process of how we elect that Speaker might be - you know, we're talking about a different process here. We've discussed that. I think the process we've discussed might be better, an improvement over the old election process. If every member is actively involved in the election of the Speaker rather than just our leader nominating and the Leader of the Opposition seconding, which happened on June 1, I believe strongly that that will empower that Speaker on our behalf. I feel that we then have a covenant with that Speaker for him to have the authority and the impartiality to operate this Legislature, to

chair the debates that we have. I believe there would be a better rapport between the Speaker and all of the members if we all had a vote in the process. We do have a vote in the present process: nominations, seconding, and then we have a voice vote. That's what occurred the last time around. I would feel better if I would be able to put a name on a piece of paper and put it in the ballot box, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the essence of democracy.

MR. GESELL: That's exactly right.

I think that in the process we've been discussing, without saying that that is going to be the final one, there are some improvements to the process of election that we have in place right now, and I stress "election" because it is an election. The opposition leader could have stood up and nominated someone else. The leader of the Liberal opposition could have done the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, based on comments I've heard by leaders of the political parties now in place in this Legislature, there's no question that that would be the way it would happen in the future; i.e., the Premier would not nominate and the Leader of the Opposition or another party automatically doing it. Those days are history, I'm convinced in my mind.

MRS. HEWES: Mr. Chairman, I agree with Bob Elliott. Back to my earlier comment, as far as I can tell, what we're doing is discussing and putting together some of the options, some of the suggestions that we have here. Nothing is carved in stone until we've heard from our various publics.

As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, the present system of election of the Speaker – and I agree; it is an election – is not an acceptable one. I don't think it's acceptable either inside the House or outside the House, and I think it simply has to change. So it is no longer an option as far as I'm concerned, and I think this committee's clear on the fact that this is not the way it's going to be done in the future.

As to whether or not an opposition leader could stand up and nominate someone else, not only is it unheard of, but the understanding and the agreement and the tradition as to how it was done was firmly set in place long before I was here. I gather it served very well for many years, but times have changed. The public and members of the House are demanding something quite different. So as far as I'm concerned, that won't be appearing as an option.

3:55

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was taking that as a given.

Well, I think our time has expired, and after we adjourn the meeting I want to make some comments on this very point. So what we've agreed to in essence is that there will be an election of the Speaker by secret ballot, the method to be determined in due course because we must hear from the public on that, and the Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chairman of Committees in subsequent elections. I think we've agreed on that.

Bob?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: I was just going to ask about the upcoming schedule and issues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's really what I want to come to. We can keep the meeting open to determine that, and I'll make my comments following that. They relate to the item we've been discussing.

The schedule for next week that we've mapped out I have right here: 6, 7, 8.

MRS. HEWES: Meet tomorrow at 2, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tomorrow at 2.

MRS. HEWES: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Corinne, you're a super organizer and secretary. I would just ask that you put a date on all the items that you sign. I'm looking at the notice of meeting and so on. I have a hang-up about dates.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bonnie Laing has raised a point with this. The schedule that you have as proposed was 6, 7, 8 of next week. Now, as you know, the morning of the 7th, Louise, Members' Services budget. Is that accurate?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it makes it awkward for me to be in a morning meeting. This is Bonnie's point saying: hey, we've got all this work to do. Can we not have a four-hour meeting, two in the morning, two in the afternoon? I sense an expectation from several people for us to have something meaningful by the way of an interim report at some point. If you look at the items that we have, we're going to have to, I think, have our preliminary discussions on a variety of issues before we hear from the public. Clearly free votes, access to information, and so on I would think are very, very important items. That was the reason for the proposal next week of 6, 7, and 8. I think we've had confirmations of people for those meeting, haven't we?

MRS. DACYSHYN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. B. LAING: I have a problem with the 7th now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MRS. B. LAING: I have to go with Private Bills, the same Members' Services meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To budget time. But is that in the morning?

MRS. B. LAING: Yes, but then in the afternoon we have quite a significant constituency thing that we have to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. So it's difficult for you.

MRS. B. LAING: So that day would be really bad for me now; sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Bob?

DR. ELLIOTT: Mr. Chairman, as you pointed out yesterday, I am a member of Members' Services. I have the two full days, the 7th and the 8th. I recorded those when the notice of these meetings

came around. I'm just reminding your staff that we did serve our regrets on those two days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should all state our things. I would find it convenient the afternoon of the 6th, that meaning I could travel here probably that morning if I don't come in on the previous evening. On the 7th in the morning I must defend the budget, but I'd planned for the afternoon, and I had planned for Thursday afternoon, which is just preceding Good Friday.

Bonnie, you've got a problem.

MRS. B. LAING: Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The 7th? Bob has a problem with the 7th. Cabinet is Tuesday, so it should be cleared for the two ministers.

MR. HAWKESWORTH: Derek intends to be here on Tuesday and Wednesday, and I intend to be here on Thursday the 8th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bettie?

MRS. HEWES: I'm okay. I'm holding all three days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, great.

So then the afternoon of the 6th, the afternoon of the 7th, and how be the morning and the afternoon of the 8th? Would that be acceptable?

MRS. HEWES: Sorry; I can't do morning of the 8th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can have one in the afternoon?

MRS. HEWES: Yup.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. GESELL: Would you repeat those, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The afternoon of the 6th.

MR. GESELL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The afternoon of the 7th.

MR. GESELL: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And the morning and afternoon of the 8th. Bettie can't make the morning. Or would you rather just the afternoon of the 8th?

MR. GESELL: No. I believe this committee is extremely important. I'll be here for all of those days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I like that thing about this committee. Bettie raised a question in that she had to leave yesterday at 3. I think we've resolved it really by bringing you up to date on that, so I don't think if someone's got to be away for half a day . . .

MRS. HEWES: It's not the end of the world.

MRS. B. LAING: What time would we start in the morning, 10?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think 10 to 12. We're going to provide lunch, Corinne, if that's all right with you, because I think we can achieve certain things if people don't have commitments.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Would you like to go then 1 to 3 and get away earlier in the afternoon? Is that something you can do if I'm bringing lunch in?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We haven't talked about it.

MR. GESELL: I think it's an excellent idea. We should maybe bring lunch in and continue our discussion perhaps informally. Would that be suitable?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that okay with you? Are you committed at noon?

MR. HAWKESWORTH: This is for the 8th?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. People make commitments, you see.

MRS. HEWES: I can't be here till 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, let's do that when we set our next schedule, and we'll just leave next week as is.

MRS. DACYSHYN: So 10 to noon and 2 to 4, then, on the 8th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yup.

Could we have a motion to adjourn?

[The committee adjourned at 4:02 p.m.]

