

[Chairman: Mr. Anderson]

[10:05 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Welcome to the meeting. First of all, I'd like to make sure everybody knows everybody else here. We have a number of officials who have been assisting the committee in getting started. At the very beginning I might add my heartfelt thanks for the excellent work that has already been done through the Clerk's office. Doug Blain, the Clerk of Committees, you all know; Louise Empson, who is going to be our secretary throughout the committee's involvement; and we have Mike Clegg, Law Clerk of the Assembly, Parliamentary Counsel, who has also already been providing us with some assistance and material. As an observer at this meeting so far, from the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department, Garry Pocock, who is sitting at the end here.

To begin with, we have an agenda before us, that I've put together with the assistance of your memos and discussions I have had. Are there any additions or deletions from the agenda or changes you would like to see made? Hearing none, I'll assume the agenda is accepted as distributed. I think you have all had a chance to go through that.

The first topic is the chairman's opening remarks, which I'll try to keep short. I know most members here have another meeting at 11:30 or going onto twelve o'clock, so by 11:30 I think we should try to end this first official session.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, that was to be my question — if you had any suggested length of time for the meeting. You have already resolved that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest that 11:30 is what we should aim for in getting out this morning.

The remarks I have to begin with really relate to the purpose of the committee and how it would operate. Frankly, I think that few legislators in the country have had the opportunity that we've now been given by the Assembly to influence the direction of the province and indeed the country. There's no question that any decisions with respect to Canada's Upper House or a system that we may wish to suggest will affect all of our country and all of its institutions.

I think Alberta in particular is aware of both the strengths and weaknesses of our current system, having gone through the energy debates and the constitutional debates in recent years. I believe that, at least as much as any other people, we recognize the need for decisions at the federal level to be made not only on the basis of population but also on the basis of region or province so the country is recognized in total and aspirations and hopes are dealt with properly.

I think the motion establishing this committee pretty clearly defined our parameters. The debate that ensued in the Legislature also gave us some direction in that regard. Now we have the responsibility of going through the specifics, to determine how we'll carry out these responsibilities.

Personally, I think we have three main objectives. The first is to reflect the views of Albertans with respect to Upper House reform. The second is to be realistic in terms of the report we'll present, recognizing that for any change to take place in Canada's Upper House we're going to require the approval of the House of Commons, the Senate, and seven out of 10 provinces representing 50 per cent of the population. I think that will require some discussion with people in other parts of the country.

As well, I think our report in the end must be well thought out enough that it contains the benefits of other systems and not the liabilities. That will require us, as the motion indicates, investigating other forms of government, in whatever manner we decide to do that.

In terms of running these committee meetings, it would be my suggestion that we

operate fairly informally, with just the normal rules of courtesy and operating a meeting in place, in terms of going through the Chair when any discussion takes place and motions to verify decisions we make. Other than that, for these meetings — we may wish to change it for the public hearings — I suggest we operate on fairly loose rules, not referring to Beauchesne or other legal material that is available to us unless we have to. Is that generally agreed? Would you prefer me to operate on that basis as chairman?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Very good. The only other thing I'd like to say is that I think we have to balance our responsibility to do a thorough and complete job with the obvious perceptions that are there now that we have to be seen to be frugal as well being frugal in how we do things.

The last point I'd make before opening it to the next issue of committee goals is only that I'm proud to be working with you all. I think we have an excellent group of a variety of talents and experiences, and I believe that as a committee we stand a good chance of influencing the decisions to be made in the country, certainly in this province at least, in years to come.

Moving to the next agenda item, committee goals, my suggestion for the committee is that this is an issue that could wrap us up for the entire morning. What I'd like to suggest is that we go through 15 or 20 minutes of discussion on this issue and leave those as individuals' opening remarks with respect to committee goals until the January meeting, when we spend some great length of time going through that.

Just in keeping with the initial remarks made, I've personally have scribbled down the three goals I think we have. One is to communicate with other Albertans regarding Upper House reform; second, to communicate with other legislators on possible acceptable alternatives; third, to investigate Upper House forms in other countries in order to identify positive and negative aspects that may be in keeping with the Canadian system; and then, in general, to produce a practical, in-depth set of recommendations that suggest a way in which the rights and aspirations of Albertans can be recognized in Canada.

Members may now wish to make some opening statement. Again, I suggest we keep them as brief as possible so we can get through the lengthy agenda with the short amount of time we have this morning.

MRS. EMBURY: Dennis, would you just repeat — I'm sorry. I know it's on tape, but I just want to get the feeling again. You kind of rushed through those.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry.

MRS. EMBURY: Would you just give them again, please, so I can think about them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure. I have them in order of personal preference. The points are: one, to communicate with other Albertans regarding Upper House reform; the second is to communicate with other legislators on possible acceptable alternatives; the third, to investigate other Upper House forms in order to identify positive and negative aspects that may be applicable to the Canadian system of government; then, as a general goal, to produce a practical, in-depth set of recommendations that suggest a way in which the rights and aspirations of Albertans might be realized in our federal system.

MRS. EMBURY: Thank you.

MR. R. MOORE: Just to make a comment on the goals you outlined, Mr. Chairman, I agree whole-heartedly with what you said. They are as brief as we can put them for

today's meeting. I'm glad to see you put them in the light that we would come back in depth and examine this at a later meeting.

In my mind, one thing we must keep in mind on the whole situation of goals and where we're going to end up is that we must remember the underlining fact that it's what the citizens of Alberta see as the form we should go. Their ideas should be projected. We must always keep paramount, even in the other jurisdictions, that Alberta concerns are addressed and eventually addressed in the recommendations we make at the end.

Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I can only add to that, Dennis, that your set of goals and priorities are certainly acceptable. The final goal is goal number four, that we produce something that's practical and applicable to Alberta's scene. In a news release to my own constituents, I suggested that my goal is to suggest changes that will facilitate Alberta's expanding role in Confederation. If we think in terms of the pulse of the people of Alberta at the present time, I think that's one of their greatest concerns — where do they fit into Canada? Is the present federal system really meeting their needs? In the next year or year and a half, if the economy continues as it is and there are economic pressures, I think that question is going to become even more paramount.

So in terms of political harmony in Canada, particularly from the west in Canada, we can answer the question for Albertans about their economic future in terms of economic answers, in terms of sale of gas or production of oil or increasing the construction industry or building business in Alberta. That's going to be one answer. But the other answer they'll want in that discussion in Alberta will be how do we fit in the federal system? Is Ottawa really listening to us? Have we a voice from the west that is strong enough to do something in Ottawa? Because of that, I think our responsibilities as a committee are going to become even more important in the coming year.

So how we handle our goal to arrive at, as you have said here, recommendations that will meet the aspirations of Albertans in the federal system is going to be very important and very, very significant. As I think more about this committee's responsibility, I see the importance of the committee growing. I think we should keep that in mind as committee members.

As an inset to those remarks, I know that some people were concerned about an article in Calgary, and I haven't seen it yet. Those remarks were made prior to our Thursday meeting, right after I came back last Tuesday. Certainly I want to say that I've reassessed those remarks. I'm going to work in harmony with this committee, and we're going to make it work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's just an inset of remarks to clear some concern in some of the minds of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure all members appreciate that.

Are there other comments with respect to the goals of the committee? As I said, if we accept the plan for the committee, or some variation thereof, I think we'll have several days to discuss the initial comments in January.

MR. ALGER: Mr. Chairman, I'd simply like to say that my whole reason for being here is the fact that I agreed with my constituents that more communication was highly required between eastern and western Canada. I for one am delighted to be on this committee to help subjugate that very thing, so that somewhere along the line we'll have a more effective country, both east and west, and get along a lot better. I think this committee will have a lot to do with accomplishing that very thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Not hearing any further comments on committee goals, are you agreed that we'll put that off to our next meeting in terms of a more in-depth discussion on goals and how we in fact look toward achieving those goals?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We go on, then, to the committee travel schedule, which I put together with the assistance of your memos and personal discussions as to the direction we wanted to go. The schedule you have is in most ways reflective of the comments given me, but it has a few assumptions in it that require major decisions on the part of the committee. The first one is that we need to travel throughout the country. That's indicated in the schedule. The second is that we want to approach Albertans through public hearings. That's evident in the July/August portion you have on the committee schedule. I suppose there are a couple of others. One is that any decision on travel elsewhere is not inherent in this proposal and would have to be made either at this meeting or a future meeting, as well as that we would not be sending the entire committee to all places in Canada but only to Ottawa, with approximately half of the committee visiting other places. The one exception to my comments regarding international travel is Washington, which seemed logical to slot into a trip to central Canada in terms of making expenses as minimal as possible and at the same time visiting the system that is closest to us geographically. So those are the assumptions that are on the schedule.

Again, I tried to develop it — any of it is most changeable — in accordance with the personal schedules that you gave me in the memos and with other responsibilities that I know all of us have in terms of the sittings of the Legislature and approximate dates on which we might go into and come out of session. It assumes, as well, a time frame that has us reporting back to the Legislature in the spring of '85.

With those assumptions and the travel schedule before you, are there any general comments before we make some specific decisions?

DR. CARTER: Just a general question, Mr. Chairman. Have you had the opportunity to have any contact with our missing member at the moment, Nigel Pengelly? I understand he is coming along fine with his health rehabilitation program, but any feedback with respect to his availability?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dr. Carter, no, I haven't. I did try to get hold of him twice, and both times I would have disturbed him resting. I now have a phone call from him that I received a few minutes ago, and once this meeting is over I plan to have a further conversation with him. My understand, though, is that the medical advice to him has been that he not be too active in January and February. It is for that reason that I haven't scheduled him in any functions during that time period, but rather have waited till the June period to put Mr. Pengelly on the list. If that changes from his point of view, I don't think there would be any difficulty slotting him into any of these spots where he might feel he could participate.

DR. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. PAPROSKI: Just a general comment, Mr. Chairman. First of all, if we are going to be talking about a report pertaining to the Upper Chamber that impacts on all Canadians, I think it's imperative that we visit all provinces and all territories. I think that has to be an underlying philosophy, and I'm pleased that you have arranged a schedule for us indeed to visit all provinces and territories.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

MR. ALGER: I rather like the way you have done this as well, Mr. Chairman, although I would indicate to you that if you're going to the Northwest Territories, February 15 to 18 wouldn't be my choice of time for some reason or another. I think I'd rather live with the mosquitoes in June.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just on that comment, I realize many of these places are not necessarily being visited at the most desirable time. Saskatchewan and Manitoba in particular, the Northwest Territories and Yukon, or for that matter Ottawa in February isn't that pleasant. But given all our schedules, I think we only have a limited time frame in which to accomplish the task, and we have to do it as time permits. When that coincides with weather conditions, that's great; when it doesn't, I don't think we have too many choices on it. On this, I think we're going to require first of all a decision that we travel to the provinces. Mr. Paproski has indicated that that's acceptable to him, and I think it's in keeping with the general discussion we had at dinner the other night, when we had an informal meeting of the committee.

The other decision, though, possibly more controversial, is whether or not we split it up in this way, that in fact we don't all go to all provinces. Just for the record, the obvious reason for doing that, which we've all discussed, is the need to be frugal on the committee and to try to look at the expense problem and the perception there is, yet at the same time have enough of the committee travelling that we have an understanding of the viewpoints of the other legislators we're going to be dealing with on this issue.

MR. R. MOORE: I agree. I think there's absolutely no need for all of us to go to every province. From the economic standpoint it makes sense, too. But I'm very glad to note in your travel schedule — there had been some indication that there might be travel outside of Canada, and I'm glad that this isn't being considered at this time. As we go across Canada, that will dictate if there is a need to go any further at that time. If that need is there to serve Albertans in coming up with a better picture, we'll have that at that time.

So I'm pleased to know that we're going to go to Albertans and Canadians and take a look at the whole situation prior to any decision further down the road. At that time, the people we will have met with will indicate where we should be going.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I move that we visit all provinces, if you'd like that motion.

DR. CARTER: And territories?

MR. R. SPEAKER: And territories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I have a motion from Mr. Speaker that we visit all provinces and territories. Is there discussion?

MR. PAPROSKI: I second the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is moved and seconded. Are you ready for the question? Those in favor of the motion by Mr. Speaker? I see unanimous agreement.

MR. ALGER: That's as outlined here, Mr. Chairman?

DR. CARTER: That's another issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just in principle that we're going to visit them all.

MR. ALGER: Okay.

MR. R. MOORE: Are you still arguing that . . .

MR. ALGER: No, no

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Ray, did you say you had . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, the second motion now, if you'd like me to move it, is that the visitations be done — I don't know how to word that — I guess I could say in terms of the schedule as outlined by the chairman. The only reason I hesitate a little is that maybe some of the members would like to switch dates or do something, and if we pass that motion it confirms the persons. Maybe the general motion I would like is that all members of the committee do not visit all provinces but a necessary portion of the committee go to each one of the provinces, as determined by discussion of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. And generally in accordance with the travel schedule.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of course that leaves us flexible both for dates and people travelling. Thank you.

MR. ALGER: I'd second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion on that motion?

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I think it's very important, in that we have a chairman and vice-chairman on this committee, that these two people attend as many of the visitations as possible. Looking at the schedule, I know it's not possible to have both the chairman and the vice-chairman visit each of these provinces and areas, but I think we should take that into consideration and do that as much as possible when the opportunity arises.

MR. ALGER: We have one or the other on . . .

MR. PAPROSKI: Yes, I know. What I'm saying is that I think that both the chairman and vice-chairman should together attend as many of these locations as possible.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That would be a separate motion, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think that would be a separate point from the current schedule. You'll notice that because that comment was made to me by several members, at least in terms of the chairman, I am scheduled on most of the visits. In terms of Mrs. Embury, there are several for which she is not, so we can deal with that one.

Further, though, on the motion that not all the committee travel all places and that we generally approve the travel schedule, leaving dates and individuals flexible — that's generally the motion.

DR. CARTER: On that point, we're still dealing with the issue of travel within Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

DR. CARTER: The other is another issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, the motion specifically deals with travel in Canada.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Canadian travel and Northwest Territory travel.

MR. PAPROSKI: Just on clarification, Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Speaker mentioned that we should try to break up according to the schedule. I think it is important to underscore that on February 12 to 15, all of us will be in Ottawa. I think that is the one area we would go to as a group. You would agree with that?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Oh, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there are no further comments, those in favor of the motion? Unanimous.

MRS. EMBURY: Dennis, I just want to pick up on something Ron said, if I may. I think he brought out a good point. We may not want to discuss international travel today, but I think we have to be aware of it within the near future. We have to look at it in terms of next year, because it would have to be a budget item. So we can't just wait until the middle of next summer or something to make that decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we get to budget, Sheila, perhaps we can go through that discussion.

MRS. EMBURY: As a matter of fact, it has just been brought to my attention that probably — I'm not sure if February 7 is too late to consider that, but we would at least have done a bit of travelling by that time. Or is January 9 too late to make that decision?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wouldn't think that would be too late, especially if we're talking about travel in December or January next year. Maybe we could get Mr. Blain's advice on that, having experience in that regard from the Clerk's office.

MR. BLAIN: Money for travel until March 31, 1984, of course will have to be obtained by special warrant because the estimates are already in position for that period. Travel subsequent to April 1, 1984, will have to be fed into the upcoming budget for the fiscal year '84-85. I recommend that, if possible, the committee decide on the question of estimates as soon as possible because of the requirements to make our submissions to Treasury and for the books to be printed. Perhaps I could deal with this further when we come to considering the estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, perhaps we could deal with it then. I think the material Mr. Blain has put together, somewhat in discussion with myself, reflects flexibility in terms of possible travel but doesn't necessarily tie us to it. But we can discuss that in budget estimates.

The next item on the agenda is with respect to staffing.

MR. PAPROSKI: Excuse me. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. While we are still dealing with the proposed schedule, and I'm not sure whether this is appropo, but on January 9 to 11 you have that in Edmonton we will have an orientation discussion of issues. Is it appropriate for me to bring up whether we should be meeting for three days at this time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Why don't we leave that discussion, Mr. Paproski, to the January

meeting, number 9 on the agenda.

MR. PAPROSKI: All right. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would fit in there. I think the motion we passed wouldn't preclude us changing from two days to one.

With respect to staffing, of course we have the usual assistance, the excellent help from the Clerk's office and from the Parliamentary Counsel's office; they have already been introduced. In addition, in discussions with Mr. Blain, given the amount of work which the committee is likely to undertake and which it has already made decision on regarding the schedule, we felt that the committee may wish to consider hiring a co-ordinator to co-ordinate research activities, information development with the Alberta public, and indeed with other provinces, and to generally co-ordinate scheduling.

Mr. Blain, you had suggestions to me regarding how we might deal with that person — what category in terms of financial considerations we might want to consider there. Could you outline those for us?

MR. BLAIN: Yes. Before I do that, Mr. Chairman, could I perhaps have your permission to refresh the committee's memory on the permanent staff situation for committees of the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BLAIN: I'm sure the committee is aware of what I'm about to say to them. I just thought it might be an appropriate time to refresh your memories.

As you know, by my appointment as Clerk Assistant I am also the Clerk of Committees. So I am to the committees as the Clerk is to the House, the principal procedural adviser and also your financial officer. We have two permanent secretaries of committees. The executive secretary is Mrs. Empson, whom I have assigned to this committee for its duration. In addition to myself and Mrs. Empson, who are the principal permanent officers of the committee, we have available the services of Mr. Clegg, who as Counsel to the Assembly is also Counsel to Committees. In a memorandum to the chairman outlining the responsibilities of my office for committee services, I have said that Mr. Clegg is available at all times to the committee for counsel and advice regarding his specialist area — which, in some instances, overlaps with my own in the procedural area — either by direct approach from the chairman or any other member of the committee, or a request to Mr. Clegg can be co-ordinated through me as Clerk of Committees. I have said this to Mr. Clegg, who agrees with my statement, unless he has changed his mind. So that deals briefly with the permanent staff of the committee.

The chairman raised with me the question of employing a co-ordinator for various aspects of committee activities, principally for public relations.

THE CHAIRMAN: And co-ordination.

MR. BLAIN: And co-ordination, and any other resource services that that individual may be able to provide. I think that's an excellent idea in a committee of this nature. As long as the committee approves the money in the budget to do this, it can be arranged. It would be necessary to employ such a person on what is referred to as a fee for service basis. If we use any other type of contract, then there must be a government position available against which that person may be employed, and we don't have such positions. Also, the fee for service basis gives a considerable amount of flexibility in employing the person. We are not tied to a set period of time. The time of coming into the service of the committee and the time of leaving the service of the committee is at the decision of the committee.

In this particular instance, no advertising campaign is necessary; no competition is necessary. This decision can be made by the committee. An annual rate of salary is established, but payment to the individual is on a prorated monthly basis. The individual will invoice each month for the salary due, which is very, very similar to the system which you use for your constituency office secretaries. No benefits and no deductions are involved in employment of this nature. What it comes down to, in effect, is that the individual accepting the position is, for all practical purposes, self-employed.

MR. ALGER: A style of consultant fee, if I may interject. Is that the idea? It's like having one anyway.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, you could look at it in that light. The expenditures are charged against our expenditure Code 460, which is professional, technical, and labor services. But the salary established is gauged against a public service level. In this particular instance, I have recommended to Mr. Anderson that Information Officer II, by qualification and salary level, would seem to fit the bill. Unless the committee decides otherwise, I think we were in agreement on that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Blain. I think the first decision of course is whether or not we proceed with hiring a co-ordinator. The second would be how we proceed to hire that person. Comments on the first point, or both together?

MR. ALGER: If it's entirely necessary, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we hire him on the basis that most ministers ask for recommendations for people for their staff of various and sundry types — it's an idea — and send in a resume of what their capabilities are. I suppose this is the board to decide who should be hired.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you could just take a minute to explain what you believe some of the responsibilities of this co-ordinator would be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, thank you. In the kind of position we're speaking of, the co-ordinator would be responsible for overall activities of the committee; therefore co-ordinating the resources that we might have — and we'll deal with that next — from the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department, if we choose to accept those resources, from the Law Clerk's office, from the Clerk's office, and other research that we might have, as well as for co-ordinating scheduling. Probably one of the prime functions, at least initially, would be in terms of trying to assist us to communicate with Albertans regarding the responsibilities we have and their views on Upper House reform. So the individual would assist us if we choose to make that communication through talk shows, speeches, and so on, and indeed in the development of the public hearings, with the advice and expertise of the Clerk's office, and generally in co-ordinating the functions of the committee.

They would act as the focal point, I suppose, for the staff and not as an executive director, which many similar committees in the country have had — but more as a co-ordinator, because the expertise is here. I would see the public communication function as being a major one. That's assuming, of course, that we want to carry out extensive public communication with the Alberta public, which we have agreed to in the schedule to some extent, but we haven't really had a chance to discuss other details of that.

MR. PAPROSKI: Just as a quick supplementary to that. Would you foresee this individual travelling at all, or would this individual remain in Alberta?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Personally, I think it would be likely that the person would put together with us more than independently — I doubt that there would be independent

travel. But if the person is sort of generally dealing with our directions, we might wish to have them with us at various points in the committee travels.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I think one of the most important aspects of our whole process here is communication. If we are going to be successful, we have to be successful in communication. I think that pretty well dictates that we have to have somebody in that capacity who is knowledgeable and can do the job for us. Individually we can do our part, but we need a co-ordinator. We are all committed in other areas besides Senate reform, and this co-ordinator is just as essential as anything I can see.

As to the choice, I don't think we need any complicated process. We have a chairman and a vice-chairman. If anyone wants to make recommendations to them as to individuals, they can do so. But I don't think we need to go to the expense of advertising or anything else. It is up to the chairman and vice-chairman to select that individual, based on the qualifications of the people who are available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moore has suggested a process. In the discussion about whether or not we should hire somebody, I should mention that the salary range we were talking about for that category of person was roughly \$26,000 to \$31,500, if I recall correctly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I am not clear what we are communicating at different points in time. I think what you are saying to me is that at this point in time, someone should be making arrangements or setting up schedules to communicate the purpose of this committee and that his function changes towards the end of our . . . Let's say we issue a report at some point in time, then that person again sets up a schedule to communicate what we found. I suppose you're saying that in the interim, the progress of the committee should be communicated to the general public. We are talking about Albertans, I guess. Or are we talking about Canadians in other provinces as well? That's one thing I want clarified.

Secondly, in terms of writing the report, are the chairman and vice-chairman going to write the draft of our report, or would this co-ordinator write that draft? Or do you have someone else in mind for that kind of function?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dealing with the first part, in terms of communication, of course these are issues that we really haven't had a chance to go over as a committee. It is my personal point of view that we need to communicate to Albertans not just the purpose of the committee but the issues involved in Senate reform, particularly those who might wish to make presentations to us, so that the presentations are as informed and as complete as possible and that we have helped to raise that awareness in Albertans, an awareness that I think is already there but the specifics of which they may not know. So, yes, I would see that person helping us to do that in whatever way we choose to do it.

I think we have a responsibility to Albertans to communicate the issues involved, why there is a need to look at the issues, and the different dimensions they might wish to look at. In keeping with what you are saying, Mr. Speaker, I see that as the first part of the responsibilities to a large extent, in addition to the co-ordination. I really think there is a fair co-ordination function needed there. We already have some duplicated research in terms of material that comes from the Parliamentary Counsel's office and other materials available from FIGA. Some of it is available through government members' research, and you may well have some that's available from the opposition end. So I think there is that, and we want that put together concisely. While we may have the resources to do that, we don't have somebody to co-ordinate that happening as well.

As we move into the public hearing process, I think there will be a real need to communicate specifically with groups who might wish to make presentations, on how they might want to do that, and then through the process, making sure it operates as smoothly as possible.

In terms of the report writing, we haven't really reached a point of discussing who would write that. In terms of an initial draft, I would certainly see myself and likely the vice-chairman being quite involved with it. But somebody to technically pull it all together, I would see being the co-ordinator, in terms of the person pulling the material together and maybe suggesting various draft possibilities to us so we could be more efficient in making those decisions.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I am just thinking that we need a very highly qualified person. It isn't just someone who organizes schedules; it's someone who has capability and some insight into this whole question of Senate reform and has a keen interest in it. I think that's a very specialized kind of person. They are available now. I am sure if we put out an ad — I know Mr. Blain said we don't have to really advertise for it, but we should also consider that route, because there are many, many people out there with great professional training and experience who are eagerly looking for this kind of assignment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have had two approach me to date.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We shouldn't just select the first ones — I'd certainly think of this advertising approach being of great benefit to us.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, just following exactly on what Mr. Speaker said, that was my concern here, trying to anticipate what type of person this would have to be. It's obviously going to have to be a hardworking individual. Qualifications do come to mind. I am assuming that at least one qualification would probably be a basic degree. I am not sure if we are looking at an administrator, a manager, a journalist, or a law student. It seems to me that there is a quite a variety in background that we want, plus a very amiable person. Is this what you have seen? Have you had any ideas about the qualifications, age, or anything of this person?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In terms of the qualifications of age and academic background, personally I wouldn't think there would be specifics that we require. We really require a generalist to a large extent, someone with public communications capabilities and good writing skills, as well as being well organized. To me, those would seem like the primary criteria. I wouldn't want to limit it by a degree, because I think there are a number of disciplines that might apply. In fact, there may well be individuals who don't have a certified academic background but have equivalent experience in a number of areas. But I think those are the qualities that I would see first. Certainly if we talk about an amiable person, those public communication and interpersonal skills would be very key. Being personally organized would be key in being able to work with others in a co-operative way rather than in any sort of directing way; and, again, the writing skills

We are going to have to do a great deal of communication, which of course the Clerk's office is very experienced at. Still, in terms of the other provinces we are going to meet with, as well as the public, and just the communication of how we go about doing that — to me, it's a generalist to some extent but certainly someone with a lot of qualifications. Two people have approached me so far. I think both are fairly well qualified. As Mr. Speaker was saying, there are undoubtedly a great number out there who at this point are looking for jobs.

AN. HON. MEMBER: And we can't even ask them their age.

MRS. EMBURY: That's your problem, not mine.

MR. PAPROSKI: In terms of a recommendation to you, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if it's possible that you could draft something for us, listing some of those points that you

just mentioned, some characteristics that you see would be very beneficial to the committee, and circulate that to us in the not too distant future. Perhaps we could provide some further input as to what we feel would be positive as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure, I can certainly undertake to do that. Do you want to make a decision regarding hiring or not hiring such a person today, though? It is my personal feeling that we have a very short time frame in terms of when we start being very active. Personally, if we go the route of hiring an individual, I would like to see it happen within the next couple of weeks.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with your comments, especially in light of the fact that if we want to have some information assembled so that we can have a meaningful orientation session — whether it's one, two, or three days in January — we should get on with it. I think we are all aware of the fact that we have good resources here in terms of staff, but we don't want to put any undue pressure on them as well. They have enough other committees and other commitments.

I would move that this committee proceed to hire a co-ordinator and that the chairman and vice-chairman be the ones who do the hiring.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. On the motion by Dr. Carter . . .

MR. BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, could I make one brief comment before you vote on that. It is in relation to the status of this co-ordinator. What I am about to say is that this co-ordinator will have specific responsibilities for the committee, but overall the responsibility for effective administrative and financial support for the committee is mine. We can't have two people going in different directions. I should not be riding herd on the individual, but it should be clearly understood that it's part of the committee staff structure when the individual is acquired. I hope that no member has any objection to that, because we have had some experience in the past where specialists have gone off on a track that diverged from the overall support to the committee. It caused no serious problems, but it caused little problems along the line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is precisely for that reason that I was defining the position as a co-ordinator rather than an executive director.

MR. BLAIN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They would be responsible for co-ordinating, not giving direction, at least in an absolute sense.

However, we do have a motion on the floor by Dr. Carter. Could we have a seconder before we proceed with discussion on that?

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, you don't need seconders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wondered about that at the beginning, but we have been proceeding that way. I thought that the rules of the House would apply here. Okay, we don't require one.

Is there any further discussion on the motion by Dr. Carter in that case?

MRS. EMBURY: I am just wondering if it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, since it isn't part of the motion — but I don't really think it has to be — if it might be understood, if it was agreed upon, that you and I definitely would consult with Mr. Blain regarding this appointment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think that would be appropriate.

MRS. EMBURY: All the motion basically reads is that the final decision is made by us. I don't want to change the intent of your motion, Dr. Carter.

DR. CARTER: It doesn't cause me any problems. I think the technical aspect of the motion is there, that the chairman and the vice-chairman make the appointment. I am only too happy to have the two of you. The rest of us agree with the chairman's definition that it's a co-ordinator, not an executive person. Hopefully the consultation process is going to take place with respect to Mr. Blain. We have it there on the record. I am quite happy with that, and I hope the rest of the committee would be.

MR. R. SPEAKER: On this motion, would there be any problem, after you get it down to two or three people, coming back to the committee and discussing the possible prospects that you have, in terms of before the final decision is made?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could certainly do that. I guess the only difficulty I see is in terms of the time frame. I would like to see it happen very quickly or I think the person would be much less effective than they could be. It would require another meeting of the committee to do that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In terms of advertising, I think in terms of the student manpower services that are available right now. We have had an experience in the last month where we needed someone to do a job, and with just one telephone call there, our phone was ringing off the wall. We ended up with excellent people, excellent qualifications, at a very small sum of money, which in a sense is just about unfair to them. They are working way beyond expectation. So we tapped a resource that is sitting out there, just waiting for opportunity. This person happened to be a graduate of the U of A, with lots of energy and capability.

I would like to see at least some kind of advertising or contact with those agencies, by telephone call would even be sufficient, to say: look, we have a position open; would you place it on your job opportunity board? The people who are really keen and are down there will respond. I hate to see us just circulate this by word of mouth around the building. Sometimes you circulate in your own stew, and you don't get the best tasting food in the end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have quite a specific . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: My request would be to broaden the communication in securing the person.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, that might be an appropriate second motion in terms of how you want that done. In your first remarks — I don't know if you want to pursue that — in terms of the the vice-chairman and myself presenting only a short list to the committee as a whole, I think that would constitute an amendment to the motion. Do you want to pursue that further?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Our next meeting is in January.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to the current schedule. I suppose we could schedule one before.

MR. R. SPEAKER: No, I will leave things as is, because I think the person must be on staff, assisting here, in December.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I can undertake that . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: If you could informally consult some of us, that would be appreciated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, we can do that.

Other comments on the motion now before you which suggests that we hire a coordinator and that it be the vice-chairman and chairman who do that hiring? Those in favor of the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, do you want to make a further motion regarding how we go about this hiring?

MR. R. SPEAKER: I would like to move that the chairman advertise to some of the employment agencies now in place, such as student manpower services in Edmonton, Calgary, and other cities, so we can broaden the call for people to fill this position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for clarification on the motion. When you say advertise, are you saying specifically an ad in the newspaper or just a call to these employment agencies in particular?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right. To clarify the motion, in speaking to the motion, I am not asking for a massive advertising program at the present time — radio, television, newspaper, placing ads across the province. I am asking the chairman or his appointee to make telephone contact with the various employment agencies that are already in place in the province, which, in turn, do advertising, such as student employment services in Edmonton, Calgary, and other cities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You have the motion before you that we contact employment agencies in the process of hiring. Any comments on that? Those in favor?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see none opposed. The motion is carried. Thank you. We will proceed with that.

The next item under staff is with respect to the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department. I have had discussions with both the minister and the deputy minister, and there has been an offer of assistance in terms of research and background material, which would be co-ordinated, I understand, by you, Garry, from the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department. I guess the decision we require is whether or not we will accept the offer of assistance from the department.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Their expenses are paid through FIGA. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In terms of salary expenses, yes. If we require them to do any travelling, I assume that would be in our budget, but I haven't clarified that. No?

MR. BLAIN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blain says no.

AN HON. MEMBER: We get great talent cost-free.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion that we accept the invitation to utilize the services of a staff person from FIGA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Discussion on the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's agreed? Good.

Now we will move on to budget, which, Mr. Blain, perhaps you could take us through. Obviously we have made a decision by accepting the schedule of activity in general, regarding where individuals would travel in the country, but no decision as yet out of the country.

MR. BLAIN: Louise has provided everyone with a copy of the draft estimate that I have drawn up for the committee. This draft estimate covers the total operations of the committee as I know them at the present time. The first item on the estimate is wages, and I have estimated \$4,500 for wages. This represents a quarter of a man-year in the classification of Clerk Typist III. I feel that, having decided to employ the co-ordinator, that person, by the nature of the duties which will come to him or her, as the case may be, will require a certain amount of clerical assistance which is beyond the capability, in time only, of the permanent staff of the committee. Therefore, I have recommended that the committee employ a Clerk Typist III on that basis and at that cost, which is the lower level of the public service salary scale for a Clerk Typist III. The quarter of a man-year doesn't necessarily imply that the individual will be working five days a week. The work load could be on an "as required" basis. It might be one or two days; it might very well be five days a week initially. But as the load decreases, then the individual could be on call. We are fortunate in having available to us at least two experienced Clerk Typists who have come to our assistance in circumstances like this at various times, and are readily available to us. So that is my reasoning for expenditure Code 120 in the amount of \$4,500.

I see no other requirement in the manpower control group, so the manpower control group total would be \$4,500. Would you like to comment item by item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you generally ran through, identifying any aspects you think that haven't been clear to members, then I'll leave it to questions of specific estimates.

MR. BLAIN: In Code 200, travel expenses for public servants and non-public servants, I've estimated the cost of travel, as you'll see, in two categories. Initially I was provided with information for the entire committee to travel everywhere, and with two staff members, the Clerk of Committees and the secretary of committees, to accompany the committee. So the first figure, \$220,842, represents the cost of that travel. The second figure, \$146,198, represents the cost of committee travel as shown not in the schedule that you've just adopted but in the committee schedules, which show the destinations and the prices for the entire travel operation.

Advertising: for the purpose of the public hearings, it will obviously be necessary to engage in a program of newspaper advertising. I think it unlikely that radio advertising would be involved. Based on the costs for two previous committee advertising programs, I've estimated \$30,000 to meet the expenditures required for advertising for proposed public hearings in six locations.

Freight and postage: I've allotted the sum of \$100, and I think the reasoning for that is self-explanatory.

Rental of property, equipment, and goods: I've estimated the sum of \$1,000. This is

to cover estimated rental of meeting space for the public hearings. It may be that meeting space in provincial buildings might be suitable, in which case of course there would be no rental expenditure. But we can't count on that, because I don't yet know the locations or what the response to the committee is likely to be. Therefore I feel that we should be prepared to rent commercial meeting space if necessary. Also under that, in two recent committee operations we have found that in many instances it's more economical to rent a vehicle for a day rather than to become involved in multiple taxi trips. So I've provided for the rental of vehicles where we're engaged in the public hearing operations. I don't really foresee any other needed equipment, but it's possible that we might need to pay for coffee service and things like that. So I've covered that in the rental of equipment, but as I say, I don't really foresee that.

Telephone and telecommunications: that is to cover the cost of any long distance calls, or it may be that on a rare occasion the necessity to send a telegram or telex will arise.

Professional, technical, and labor services: you've already discussed the matter of hiring a co-ordinator. As I said to you earlier, I have recommended the category of Information Officer II, the salary level of which is \$26,000 to \$31,000. So I've allotted \$30,000 for that purpose, based on a year's employment. Over and above that, I've allotted \$5,000 for the cost of transcripts, should you decide to have transcripts for the public hearings, because we are charged back for the Hansard services in that instance.

Code 510, hospitality: I've allotted the sum of \$5,000 to be required for hospitality. Experience tells me that when the committee is travelling under such circumstances as this committee will be travelling, it will undoubtedly be offered hospitality by legislative bodies or individuals whom it is visiting. I'm reasonably certain that the committee will on frequent occasions wish to reciprocate that hospitality. Therefore I've allotted \$5,000 for that purpose.

Materials and supplies: I've allotted \$2,000 for that purpose, which is to cover the purchase of committee letterhead, gift items, and any other incidentals that may arise, such as perhaps the purchase of periodicals or maps or anything of that nature.

Again, you'll see that the supplies and services control group is two separate totals, depending principally on the travel arrangements. In the first instance it would be \$295,142; in the second instance, of the travel being split, \$220,498.

Payments to MLAs, which covers the per diem indemnity of \$100 a day for attending committee meetings, for being engaged in work relating to the committee although not necessarily taking place at a committee — the chairman may very well be required to engage in work between committee meetings, or the committee may ask any member of the committee to perform a task on the committee's behalf, for which of course the entitlement to the daily indemnity of \$100 exists for a day or any number of days. I've also considered the possibility of the \$75 a day expense allowance being required. But I think that would not be frequently, because when the committee is engaged in its travel program, of course all hotel accommodation, meals, and incidentals are provided for. As you'll see, there again that is divided on the basis of the whole committee travelling or part of the committee travelling. The total for the whole committee is \$63,200; under the second circumstance it is \$46,000, which brings the estimated total expenditures for the committee operation to the end of the fiscal year 1984-85 in the first instance to \$362,842, and in the second instance, \$270,998.

I want to say to you that this paper is a working paper, that the committee may very well — and in one or two areas, it may be necessary to raise the sums that I have estimated. But bearing in mind the chairman's comments regarding frugality and the present financial climate, I've been very careful in calculating these figures, in fact perhaps a little overcareful. So I present this paper for your consideration. Approval of this budget or an amended budget will of course require committee resolution.

The other thing I must say to you is that we'll have to split this figure. Part of it for first part of the operations in the present fiscal year will have to be obtained by special

warrant; the balance for the '84-85 fiscal year will have to be pumped into the upcoming estimates.

If there are any questions, I'd be pleased to answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Blain. I guess we should clarify that in both travel figures, there is included of course, in the case of the A items, international travel, which would include London, Germany, and Australia, and in the case of B, that's the whole committee travelling versus half. So while we haven't made a decision regarding that, I suppose this budget, if accepted in that way, would still give us the flexibility of accepting some travel, be it to those specific places or other places that would still fit in that general budget guideline.

MR. R. MOORE: Basically that's what I was going to say on the budget. In looking at responsible budgeting from this standpoint, we shouldn't be looking at the bottom figure. We should be realistic in realizing that there may be changes as we go along, so we should allow for that in the budget. It doesn't necessarily say that because we come in with it in a budget figure, we're going to spend it, because we're going to be responsible in our actions. I think everyone around this table realizes that. We aren't going out to just spend it because it's in the budget. I think the worst thing to me is to take a very, very low figure and find out that somewhere down the road, we have to go to special warrant to finish off. I think that would be very detrimental to the image of the whole committee here, if we weren't responsible in the first place in budgeting things that we see that should be in there. Even though it may be a little high at this point in time and viewed it that way, we should communicate to the public and the Legislature that this is an outside figure, that we're going to work within that, and hopefully well below it; that we'll approach it responsibly. But we should build it in now, instead of coming back — it's a total disaster to come back with special warrants; I'll tell you that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Moore. Might I suggest to the committee that now we've had the general review from Mr. Blain, we go through it item by item and see if there are any additions, deletions, or modifications of one sort or another that members would want to make to them. Then we'll go back with the overall budget, once that's been determined.

We start with wages. Any questions, additions, deletions on that first category? If not, we'll proceed to travel expenses. Again, Mr. Blain, we've just talked about those as the item B being the one that fits with the current decisions made by the committee, assuming that follows through on international travel.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The A would reverse our decision on local travel. I suppose if the committee made a separate decision that the whole committee travelled internationally, there's not a budget item that would fit that precisely here. It would be somewhere in between those two figures. Comments or questions regarding that?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, while I realize we need the breakdown for our budget estimates as such in the Legislature, is it possible for us to say that — if you just take the total amounts, and instead of looking at A and B, we approve a global budget item? Then could we work from within that for the amount that's needed for this year and then for next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that would be the way we should do it. However, to get to that global budget item, I think we should just have an understanding of whether or not people think specific categories are generally in keeping with what they want to do. My

understanding is that regardless, we can transfer money within these items; we're not tied to the cost of one. If we underspend in travel expenses and overspend in professional and technical services, that doesn't require a change of the budget vote.

MRS. EMBURY: I guess for this item, travel expenses, I'd like to just leave it that we have an A and a B there. I'm not prepared to make a final decision on which it should be at this time. If we are in agreement with the travel schedule that you outlined to us, until March anyway, for this budget year, that certainly is indicative of the A figure. But I'm not prepared at this time to make a decision on the international.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the B figure?

MRS. EMBURY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Blain, how does that fit in with our time frame, though? Can we withhold a decision on total budget for some length of time, pending a decision on international travel? Or should we be making one on assumptions that we . . .

MR. BLAIN: Relating to the 1984-85 estimates, it's certainly very desirable that we be able to present an estimate quite soon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By "quite soon", Mr. Blain, what would be our deadline?

MR. BLAIN: In two weeks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see.

MRS. EMBURY: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I don't know whether I'm putting the cart before the horse or the horse before the cart. I guess the reason that I raise the other is that I'm prepared to make a motion for the total expenses to be somewhere around \$300,000. So I suppose if you wanted me to really zero in on this item, this is where it's going to be affected — the compromise between those two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right.

MRS. EMBURY: And so . . .

MR. BLAIN: Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. I was about to say — but please finish.

MRS. EMBURY: That's okay, because I was just trying to — I just came to the rough estimate on total expenses, but I hadn't quite worked out the travel expenses between the A and the B.

MR. BLAIN: I understand; it can be a little confusing. But again, this document is prepared for your information and based on the two factors we've been considering about travel. If I may be so bold as to make a recommendation to the committee — may I be so bold?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be bold, Mr. Blain.

MR. BLAIN: I would recommend that the committee consider the larger figure for its operations, for two reasons. One, it gives more flexibility, as the chairman has already pointed out. For example, if we have a surplus in travel and we find that the \$30,000 for

advertising isn't enough, then it's an internal transfer; we can apply money from one expenditure code against another to meet the requirements.

The other point I want to make is that if the \$362,842 proves to be more than the committee needs, the surplus will in any event go back into the pot. It won't be spent. This is perhaps cosmetic, but it always looks better if the committee comes in under, as long as it doesn't come in too far under — and I doubt very much if it will. There's a principle in accounting and budgeting that — you know, people tend to say: my estimates were \$500,000 and at the end of the year, I had over \$100,000 left. That doesn't prove good financial management; all it proves is poor estimating. And it would certainly go a long, long way to obviating the necessity of a special warrant. Committees is one area where there is normally no problem about special warrants, because the House has struck the committees and realizes they must be paid for. But as Mr. Moore correctly points out, special warrants are a naughty word.

DR. CARTER: On both sides of the House.

One question, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Blain. If, as you say, there are surplus moneys left to go into the pot — which pot?

MR. BLAIN: Into general revenue.

DR. CARTER: You then can't soak them up in terms of operation of legislative committees, I assume?

MR. BLAIN: No, it couldn't be applied against the operation of another committee.

DR. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We have made one decision, and that's in terms of splitting the committee for the travel across Canada, which cuts the expenses down a significant amount. Let's say the one decision that may cost more is the decision to go international and everybody goes. That's an extra \$75,000 more if that were the change of decision, say, in February. So if we went for a round number, say \$350,000, that still leaves that flexibility. Is there any value in rounding it off like that, Mr. Blain? Or is it best just to leave it at \$362,000 as an estimate?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Taking into account what Mr. Speaker is saying, that we have made a decision on the national travel and Washington.

MR. R. SPEAKER: If we could quickly determine what the difference is in making the first decision — let's see; it's \$60,000 versus \$35,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So that's \$25,000 plus the staff. Oh, the staff wouldn't change. So that's \$25,000.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Right, so \$350,000 is somewhere near that figure.

MR. BLAIN: Yes, it could be revised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's a reasonable suggestion.

MR. R. MOORE: I agree with Mr. Speaker: \$362,000 or \$350,000 — either one. We do it with the full understanding that it goes back into the general fund. It's there, and it certainly makes this committee flexible in how we approach our responsibilities. If it's so dictated that it's necessary to spend up to that, then I guess that's what we're

obligated to do. We're charged by the Legislature to carry out a certain responsibility. But I don't say that we go out and spend it, and I know we're aren't going to go out and spend it irresponsibly. It's going to be reasonably spent. This committee will decide that, and we go along with that. It should be built in there. I agree with Mr. Speaker — leave \$362,000 as it is, or bring it to \$350,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think he said \$350,000. I'm cognizant of the time, which by our deadline gives us another two or three minutes.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Paproski wanted to say something, I believe, before I put my hand up.

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I must be candid with you. I don't know if I'm prepared to make a decision on this figure at this meeting. If it's absolutely necessary, fine; but I wonder if we could consider this a little bit more than the 10 or 15 minutes that we've been giving to it. It's a major amount, and it's a major decision with respect to the total committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we could leave the specifics. If we don't make a general decision, that would necessitate another meeting within a week or so.

MR. CLEGG: Mr. Chairman, there two points I'd like to raise. One is with respect to the international travel by the committee. Something the committee should bear in mind is this: if they travel overseas, they will be meeting groups of people who have been brought together specifically to meet with them. If the committee only travels in part, and if it's later found out that some concerns or questions of members who did not travel were not fully explored, or if there was some lack of complete understanding about what was said at that meeting, it's very difficult to go back. It's easy to phone through to B.C. and say: we were talking about this; can we just run through this again? It's very difficult to do this, to find the people in Canberra or in Bonn and to rehash that.

What I'm saying is that if four members of the committee go to Bonn or to London or to Canberra, and it's suddenly found that, I wish we'd asked that because he wasn't there or she wasn't there and that wasn't brought forward, there's no way you can go back. That might be considered by members when they're deciding whether the whole committee should travel internationally. It is a one-shot affair. It's not necessarily the entire case with Canadian travel; matters can't be followed up afterwards.

If I may take a moment very quickly, Mr. Chairman. This committee has an extremely important task, as members will acknowledge. The content of the work that the committee is doing is more complex and specific than many other committees. It has a lot of legal connotations to it; it impacts on constitutional law, on election law, on parliamentary law. The budget as constructed presently is apparently constructed on the basis that you would not have legal counsel with you at any of your most important meetings. I wonder whether the committee feels that this is a worth-while economy. This particular area that the committee is into contains a great deal of very complex factors. There are many ambiguous terms and expressions which are used, which some people mean one thing by and some people mean another. I had thought that the main and most important role as counsel to this committee that I could fulfil would be to make certain that people talking to this committee knew precisely the terms of this committee's questions and that this committee understood precisely the terms of those people's answers. I feel that both in working with the committee and in assisting the chairman in writing his report — if he wishes me to do that — I should be very limited if I'm not able to attend any of the meetings of the committee except organizational ones. I just wanted to raise that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Clegg. Mr. Clegg raises a question which is a difficult

one in terms of how many people travel with the committee where. In fact Mr. Blain alluded to it when he indicated that there were two people — we have of course Mr. Blain and Mrs. Empson — who would be thought to travel with us in a lot of cases, and also a co-ordinator that we've agreed to hire, who in many cases may be dealing with the public relations aspect. Mr. Clegg has made a case regarding legal counsel travelling with us as well. I think the committee has to deal with the question on the basis of expenses and how far we wish to go with travel costs. That certainly has a ramification on this budget.

MR. CLEGG: It would have a difference of between 1 and 4 per cent, depending on how extensive this was. I think it's a question of priority, whether a group in an area like this feels it more important to have legal counsel with them or whether they want to have a co-ordinator with them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think at this stage, looking at the time — if I can make a suggestion to committee members, we have two options right now. One is to approve a general upper limit budget figure that would be used for estimate purposes; the other would be to call another meeting within a week or 10 days. Can I have your suggestions or some motion in that regard, either to recommend an upper figure limit within which we can decide who will travel in the future and who will travel where, or that we have another meeting?

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move that we consider an overall budget of \$350,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's moved by Mrs. Embury. Discussion on the motion? Those in favor of the motion by Mrs. Embury? Unanimously approved. Thank you. So we have an overall budget decision. A decision on who will travel and where, we can make as we proceed.

Very quickly before we adjourn, I don't think we have time to go into the January meeting in depth, but Mr. Paproski raised the question of whether it should be one, two, or three days. Does somebody want to make a motion on that? From our discussion the other night at dinner, I was under the assumption that we wanted to accomplish three things. One was to generally, ourselves, determine the questions that need to be asked with respect to Senate reform and where we were going. Second was to interview or meet with some people with expertise in the area, to give us a better handle. Third would be to have an orientation on our first travels at least, which by the schedule we now have would be Victoria, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan. We can do that in terms of packing it all into a short time frame or spreading it over three days.

MR. R. MOORE: Quickly, because we're running out of time, I make a motion we make it two days. I think we can accomplish it in two days if we get at it. We all have tight schedules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A motion for two days. Discussion on the motion? All in favor? Unanimously approved.

MR. CLEGG: Just to assist members in planning, can you specify which two days? It might assist members if they knew which two days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are three days mentioned there. Any preferences?

DR. CARTER: One question in that regard, though, is: was your thinking that the 11th then becomes a travel day to get to Victoria?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It might, in part at least, if we need it.

MR. R. MOORE: Maybe we'd better make it the 9th and 10th, because there is a group going to Victoria on the 11th.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed that it's the 9th and 10th.

I'd like someone to make a motion, if they would, with respect to expenses for the informal meeting of November 23, whether we pay those expenses or don't.

DR. CARTER: I'd love to second Mr. Speaker's motion that the meal be paid for the other night, since I gave him the needle. I make the motion that the bill be paid for the meeting of November 23.

MR. R. MOORE: I support Mr. Speaker's suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion. Any discussion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed to unanimously.

Any other business before we adjourn? We've got through a great deal this morning. Obviously we'll have to do more work on the budget, and I guess we can throw an hour or two into the January meeting on that as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: In terms of that meeting on the 9th, will the meeting start in the morning? Someone suggested at an earlier meeting that we have a little time when we arrive in terms of reading the documents that are prepared.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My first inclination would be to start in the afternoon of the first day and maybe 10 the next morning, something of that sort — a session in the morning and a session in the afternoon. Does that sound generally agreeable?

I would very much appreciate suggestions as to who we should have to meet with the committee. We did talk informally about former Senator Manning. I understand he's going to be away. The Premier will be away as well. We can have the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who will be around, and the deputy minister if that would be helpful. Are those people two that we'd want to meet with, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Deputy Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

MR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that these two days be left to us. I think there is enough information, and I think we have ample opportunity to meet with others. But I would rather suggest that on these two days we get together early Monday if possible to have perhaps an hour overview, get together for some reading, and after that hour overview, meet again after lunch.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a little contrary to the discussion the other night.

MRS. EMBURY: Could we do like you had us do for this meeting? Could we send you our ideas?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please.

MRS. EMBURY: Then you can file them. I think you did an excellent job, by the way, in outlining the schedule for travelling and everything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. PAPROSKI: I'm sorry; I didn't realize I was contrary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you happy to leave it to the chairman with consultation from you on your ideas? Please send them to me.

Maybe as a general guideline, though, if we have somebody else in — just an hour or two. The rest would be for us. Thank you very much.

MR. PAPROSKI: I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Everybody agrees? Thank you.

[The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.]