

[Mrs. Tarchuk in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone. I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Now, before we start, I'd like to welcome Corinne. Diane Shumyla has moved on to Alberta Corporate Service Centre, and we certainly wish her well. Corinne Dacyshyn is acting committee clerk for our committee for the time being. So, Corinne, welcome.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: If we could move on to the agenda. You all have a copy of the agenda in front of you. Could someone move that we adopt the agenda of September 25, 2001, the meeting of the Standing Committee on Leg. Offices?

MR. DUCHARME: I move that the agenda be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

Okay. The approval of the minutes of June 13, 2001. Again, you all have copies of the minutes in front of you. Would someone move that we approve the minutes as circulated for June 13, 2001, for this committee?

MS GRAHAM: So moved.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Ms Graham. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

For the next two items on the agenda, just by the nature of what they are, I would suggest that someone move that we go in camera. Is someone willing to make that motion?

MR. TANNAS: I would so move, Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is carried.

[The committee met in camera from 11:01 a.m. to 11:51 a.m.]

MR. FRIEDEL: This is going to be a rather lengthy motion. First of all, I would say that I can give it to Corinne afterwards, and I'll do that in a few minutes. I'm going to move that

the Ethics Commissioner be paid a salary of \$95,000 per annum effective September 1, 2001; the allowance for nonparticipation in the management employees pension plan be increased to 10.75 percent of the annual remuneration; the cap of \$86,111 be deleted; his annual paid vacation be 20 working days per year; the statement in the contract where 50 percent of full-time employment is noted be deleted from the contract; this salary be considered as an interim measure to complete the existing contract, which expires on March

31, 2002; and before a new or an extended appointment is considered on April 7, 2002, a portion of the full-time position and placement on an executive pay schedule be considered.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion on that motion?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: There's one item that was left out.

MR. FRIEDEL: In changing the annual vacation, I mentioned 20 working days, but there's also a supplement of five working days per year. I'll give the wording of that to Corinne.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any discussion? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.
Mr. Tannas.

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would move under item 5 that

the Legislative Offices Committee approve an increase of 8 percent to Mr. Frank Work for serving as the Acting Information and Privacy Commissioner effective September 1 until the Information and Privacy Commissioner is appointed.

That's the motion.

I would say that the 8 percent is standard for this kind of position as an acting, to move it from the salary the person is presently receiving. It's also my understanding that this position – although this is not part of the motion – carries with it a car, as is normal.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Can I just add the year 2001, just to be specific about September 1?

MR. TANNAS: Yes. It says effective September 1, 2001.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion on that motion? All those in favour? Motion carried.

I'd like to recess now until 1 o'clock.

[The committee adjourned from 11:56 a.m. to 12:55 p.m.]

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Before we get back to the agenda, Mr. Tannas has a motion.

MR. TANNAS: Madam Chairman, I would move that the committee authorize the Speaker to enter into any necessary agreement with Mr. Work to effect the change from his Assistant Information and Privacy Commissioner position to that of the Acting Information and Privacy Commissioner's position.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Comments? All in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

Okay. We're on to item 6. We'd like to welcome Bob Clark and Karen South. They're here to give us a presentation on a request for supplementary estimates for the office of the Ethics Commissioner. So thank you and go ahead.

MR. CLARK: Well, thank you very much. I would just make four or five quick comments, Madam Chairman, and then it's certainly in the committee's hands. We've sent the budget over, and I would say, too, at the outset that frankly it's much larger than we had originally thought it was going to be as a result of reasons which I will mention.

In this salary area you know we're adding a person to be a receptionist/administrative support person, and we have put in that area approximately \$30,000. Hopefully, that person is going to be starting in the vicinity of the second or third week in October. We have temporary people there now. I don't think any of you have been to the office recently, but everything is about yea far from the walls because they haven't got the baseboards on and all of that kind of material finished yet and haven't got some of the stuff on the walls. They tell us that's going to take place in due course, and I think due course is likely going to be in October. I hope sooner rather than later.

The other portion in the salary area dealt with the salary of a commissioner. Over lunch the chairman advised me of your discussion and decision this morning. You know my views on it. Certainly, that's the committee's job to deal with all those kinds of issues.

The second area is contracts and services. It has come to my attention recently that in all likelihood there is going to be a review committee on the conflict of interest legislation come in to being next year. So I have put some money in for legal counsel under the contracts and services area.

You may recall that the Auditor General, in either his last report or perhaps two reports back, made the proposition that offices should actually pay for the services they're getting. Over the period of the last several years the IPC office has provided reception personnel and financial services to the office of the Ethics Commissioner, so a portion of that additional \$40,000 there is what our office is going to be paying the IPC office for those kinds of services.

The third area, materials and supplies, primarily is made up of a computer system and a stand-alone file server. I think it's fair to say that the \$33,000 is virtually all a onetime expenditure in getting the office set up.

Just three other quick comments. One is as far as furnishings are concerned. Karen has been very successful in going to – I used to call it government surplus; I don't know what they call it now. She's got part of the furnishings for the office from there. I don't think we have any new furnishings; have we?

MISS SOUTH: No, but we have to pay IPC for some of the furniture that they paid for as Information and Privacy Commissioner.

MR. CLARK: And that is in the materials and supplies portion.

Anything else in the materials and supplies area, Karen, other than the new computer system and the file server?

MISS SOUTH: That should cover it.

MR. CLARK: Two other comments. One would be that I've looked at this office, rightly or wrongly, really as an office being somewhat comparable to the deputy minister level. I really based that on nothing more magic than that that's basically what they've done in other jurisdictions and that we deal with people at that kind of level, if that's a fair way of putting it. I've never felt that this was an office that we kind of pay on the basis of how busy you are or how busy you're not, primarily because it seems to me that it's in everyone's interest if you're not very busy, and that's very much part of the work that we try and do.

That's an overview, Madam Chairman, of the reasons for the increases: the salary things, basically the commissioner's salary and the receptionist's, the administrative person; the contract services as a result of the legal services that we plan to get outside for the conflict of interest legislation; plus the payment we're going to be making to IPC for ongoing legal services and for finances and personnel services there; and then materials and supplies for the computer system and file server.

THE CHAIRMAN: Great. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

MR. FRIEDEL: I don't have any questions, but I'm prepared to make a motion, Madam Chairman. But before I do that, I'm going to make an observation. We've had kind of a working relationship with yourself and other Leg. officers where occasionally we approve budgets based on the best available information. There have been a number of times when there was a probability of spending money, but at the end of the year it really wasn't spent and it was just turned back. We've had a fairly comfortable relationship. You know, money that isn't needed isn't spent. So I'm quite willing to forego questioning line by line and suggest that we just go ahead with it as it is, on that understanding.

The motion would be that

we approve this revised budget and request a supplementary estimate adjusted to reflect the commissioner's salary and the related benefits that we approved in the previous motion today.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any discussion on the motion? Ms Blakeman.

MS BLAKEMAN: Well, yes, in that I'd like to ask some questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Go ahead.

MR. FRIEDEL: I'm assuming that when you make a motion, it's up for debate then.

MS BLAKEMAN: Yes, so part of the discussion of the motion. I'm wondering if I can get a bit more information about the anticipated costs of the legal advice for the review of the act. Could you give me a bit more on the breakdown of the anticipated costs there? As well, I'm interested in whether that is expected to be in-house legal advice or whether it's expected that it would be a contract with an outside firm.

MR. CLARK: It came to my attention in the last likely three or four weeks that this was a very real possibility. Quite frankly, I haven't approached the person yet, but we've used David Jones for these kinds of situations in the past, and I would approach him again.

MS BLAKEMAN: I'm sorry; I don't know who David Jones is. Pardon my ignorance.

MR. CLARK: Oh, the firm of De Villars Jones. David I think is regarded as one of the better lawyers in the area of administrative law. He's done work for my office of the Ethics Commissioner on a number of other occasions, and I've found him to be very good, and that's why. We put the amount of \$10,000 in.

If I could speak to Gary's point. I think, Gary, if you go back, we've always turned money back every year on the Ethics Commissioner side and when I had other responsibilities too. It

would be my hope that we could turn back, say, a portion of this. Karen doesn't spend money unless it's really needed, I can assure you.

1:05

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, comments? Mr. Tannas.

MR. TANNAS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. Maybe I'm a slow learner, and that's probably agreed, but we're on the 2001-2002 budget. So I take from that that we did not approve the budget last year, or is this just a straight supplemental?

MR. FRIEDEL: This is an adjustment to reflect the paring off of the Ethics Commissioner's office from the freedom of information commissioner's joint office and reflecting the additional cost of operating the two separate offices, I presume.

MR. TANNAS: Okay. So it is a supplementary budget then?

MR. FRIEDEL: Yes.

MR. TANNAS: That makes some sense then. Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions, comments? Then I'll call the question. All in favour of the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

Thank you very much for joining us this afternoon.

What I would suggest, if the committee is in agreement – we have Mr. Work coming to give a presentation on our next item. While we await him, why don't we move to item 9, which is the update on the process of the appointment of the select special information and privacy commissioner search committee. I just wanted to remind the committee that my take after the last meeting and comments of individuals is that there is a desire among this committee to do a search for that position. I do need to remind the committee that a select special information and privacy commissioner search committee is separate from this standing committee, and as such it is appointed by the Assembly and given its mandate and membership by the Assembly. What we could do and should do, if that's the direction that we want, to see how we want this next appointment to proceed, is have somebody move that

the chair of the Standing Committee on Leg. Offices write a letter to the Minister of Justice and Government House Leader requesting that a government motion be introduced in the fall 2001 sitting of the 25th Legislature to establish a select special information and privacy commissioner search committee.

Is someone willing to make that motion?

MR. DUCHARME: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Ducharme. Any discussion on that motion?

MR. TANNAS: I thought we had the right to authorize that in the first place. We don't?

THE CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. TANNAS: Okay.

MS BLAKEMAN: Is there a custom or a written or an unwritten policy going on here that could be elucidated for the newer members? Is it usual that members of this committee would be appointed or some of us appointed to the special committee? None of us?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Kamuchik, can you comment on that?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: If I may, in the past the search committees for officers of the Legislative Assembly have been made up of members of the Standing Committee on Leg. Offices, seeing as the officers report to the Assembly through this committee. The only thing is it's not as numerous; it's not all of the members that are on the search committee that are, of course, on the Leg. Offices Committee. So you might have a committee of five or six people, but they are derived, generally, have always been, since I've been here, for a hundred years, from the membership . . .

MR. TANNAS: This is your second century here.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right.

. . . of all members of the Standing Committee on Leg. Offices.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. Thank you. That's very helpful.

DR. PANNU: So I suppose the assumption is that that's what will happen this time too.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: It doesn't preclude the government from not going that route, but the history, the precedents, have been Leg. Offices Committee members.

MS BLAKEMAN: Is it the government or the Legislature?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: The Legislative Assembly passes the motion, but the membership comes from proportional party representation in the Chamber.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments?

MR. FRIEDEL: I've been on four or five or six of these committees already, and that's what it's been. It's always been members selected from this committee. I believe that generally there are only about three people on it. I think once or twice there might have been five. I believe the representation kind of mirrors the representation of the parties as they sit on the committee.

DR. PANNU: Gary, how long have you been around?

MR. FRIEDEL: Just about a hundred years too.

MR. TANNAS: I was on the committee from '89 on. We chose the past Ombudsman, and it seemed to me that there was almost a headhunter group, an independent group that we hired or authorized. They took all of the applications, and they did the review. They gave us, if I remember correctly, six people that they thought were good candidates and worthy of consideration, and then we interviewed them, and it was the whole committee.

MRS. KAMUCHIK: I think it's happened two or three times where they have hired a private human resources firm to review the

applications and grade them A, B, C, but for the most part, and what seems to have worked quite well in the past, the personnel administration office, who have experts in that field, has done the screening and pretelephone interviews and then has come to the committee and suggested that these candidates be interviewed, but the final call is up to the committee. The committee decides whether they're going to go ahead and interview. They'll start with phone interviews and narrow it down further, but the committee decides which ones will be interviewed for the position.

DR. PANNU: Just a clarification. It's the select committee that makes those decisions to hire a headhunter and advertise the process? It's the select committee, not this committee; is that right?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right. The mandate that is given to the committee by the Assembly will say: can or may hire outside firms or may have the secondment of government staff, such as the personnel administration office, to help the committee. They may also use the services of committee clerks. In this case it's Corinne or whoever replaces Diane. So the mandate of the committee tells it what they can do, and the committee decides whether they're going to hire an outside firm or go with PAO.

MR. REYNOLDS: Just to clarify, one technical point, the committee doesn't actually hire someone. In the final analysis the search committee makes a recommendation to the Legislative Assembly, if the Assembly is sitting, who would recommend the individual for the position, or there would be a recommendation to the Lieutenant Governor in Council in case it comes at a time when the Assembly isn't sitting, and then that appointment has to be ratified by the Legislative Assembly. In any event, the ultimate decision as to who is appointed is really up to the Legislative Assembly.

1:15

MS BLAKEMAN: I wondered about a budget that goes along with this. Maybe I can get information on that. If it is a matter of hiring an outside firm or flying people in for interviews or even teleconferencing, is there an additional budget that's usually approved by the Legislative Assembly to the select committee, or is it expected that it would come out of the budget of this committee? How does that work?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: The search committee will establish its own budget based on its mandate. If it decides, for instance, to place ads in newspapers across Canada or keep it strictly within the province, that'll play a big role in deciding what the budget figure will be. There is provision made to fly in candidates. Again, if they're going across Canada, of course the cost will be higher. Whether the committee decides to hire an outside consultant plays a big factor; it'll increase the cost. So the committee decides its budget based on what it plans to do. In this case advertising is a big factor. Even in Alberta alone you have to do the daily newspapers, and you'll have to do the weekly newspapers. Of course, if you go across Canada, it would be much more expensive.

MS BLAKEMAN: And where would the money come from? Who is the select committee asking for the money?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: It'll have to come out of supplementary estimates. The Legislative Assembly cannot budget an amount in there until the committee is struck. If a motion establishing the committee is made in the fall and there's time to get it in supplementary estimates, which may be presented in the fall, it'll come in then. If the committee is struck at the end of the fall session, too late to make supplementary estimates, it would go to

supplementary estimates when the Assembly meets again in February. Well, I'm assuming it's February. It's a separate budget, completely different. It's not out of the Legislative Assembly Office.

DR. PANNU: So it's a budget that's not part of the Speaker's office budget then?

MRS. KAMUCHIK: That's right. It isn't. It's got to be supplementary estimates.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any other questions, comments? If not, I'll call the question. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

Welcome, Mr. Frank Work. We'll move back to item 7, and Mr. Work is just briefly going to go through the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner's records retention disposition schedules. So if I could pass over this fascinating topic to you, Mr. Work. Just to remind members, we had tabled this at our last meeting and have put copies of the schedule into this agenda.

MR. WORK: Thank you, Madam Chairman. No doubt this will be the highlight of your afternoon. I should say that I came down a little early, fortunately. I did arrange for the gentleman who prepared our records disposition schedule, who is a consultant we use, Mr. Jim Blower, to be here at 1:30 to answer any technical questions you might have on the schedule, but we'll see how that goes. If you do have technical questions . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sure he'll be here shortly.

MR. WORK: Yeah. I'll chatter for a while and try to give him time to arrive. The briefing note you have in your materials is very good and I think summarizes why this is here, and that is because it's required by the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Normally records disposition schedules are approved by the Alberta Records Management Committee, which is an internal committee of – it used to be Public Works; it might be Government Services now. As I said, that's an internal government committee that vets all the records disposition schedules for all government departments.

In the case of the legislative officers I guess it was thought preferable to have independent oversight of their records management; in other words, not have a government office supervise records disposition schedules but rather bring them to this committee for independent scrutiny and approval.

The significance of a records disposition schedule is that under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act if someone makes an access request to a public body, they have to either come up with the responsive records and then go through the process of saying why they don't have to give access to something under the act. If they want to come up with the response, "Well, we don't have those records," one of the few legitimate ways they cannot have records is to say, "We've destroyed them." Under this legislation the only way you can now legitimately destroy government records or any public body records is if the destruction is according to your approved records retention and destruction schedule. So for all its length and technical complexity I guess it's a fairly significant document in that it's the rules by which government departments or public bodies in general can legitimately

destroy records. Obviously, if there wasn't some valve on that, there would be a premium on warehouse space to store records.

What you have here is the records retention and destruction schedule of our office. As I said, ours was prepared by our consultant. He's a very well-known and I think highly regarded expert in the area of records management, and he assures me that we have not done anything unusual or out of the ordinary in terms of the times. If you'll notice, the records were all described in some detail in the document, and then on the right-hand side there are three columns that indicate how long they are to be retained and how and when they can be destroyed. Ours, I'm told, is consistent with the records management practices of any government of Alberta department. So there is nothing unusual to tell you about or nothing out of the ordinary.

Madam Chairman, I don't have much else to add other than that.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that was a good overview.

Does anybody have any questions? Mr. Friedel.

1:25

MR. FRIEDEL: Well, I just have a comment. I believe this was requested for information. I don't believe it's the intent that this committee would undertake to approve these schedules from time to time.

MR. WORK: Sorry, Madam Chairman. The gentleman walking into the room is Mr. Jim Blower, and as I indicated, he's the brains behind this. I'm sorry, Jim. We started a little early, so I just explained the overview.

I'm sorry, Mr. Friedel.

MR. FRIEDEL: It isn't usual that the Legislative Offices Committee approve or endorse or do anything different with these documents; is it?

THE CHAIRMAN: Maybe I'll ask Mr. Reynolds to offer clarification on this.

MR. REYNOLDS: I believe, Mr. Friedel, the reason that Mr. Work is here today – I could be wrong – is because the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act was amended like the other officers of the Legislature legislation to allow this committee to “make an order respecting the management of records in the custody or under the control of the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner.” So authority was given to this committee to do that under section 61.1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

MR. FRIEDEL: So we are required to do something?

MR. REYNOLDS: On request of the commissioner.

MR. WORK: If I understand the question, this is true, but your responsibility ends there. Once you've approved the overall scheme, there's no further involvement by this committee in the specifics.

MR. FRIEDEL: That's what I was getting at. As enlightening and exciting as this all would be, I'd like to suggest that other than approving the blanket arrangement, I don't think it's something we would want to get into on a technical or regular basis.

MR. WORK: What would happen is that if someone did make an access request to the Information and Privacy Commissioner's

office, again under the legislation that Mr. Reynolds was citing, it would have to go to an adjudicator, who would be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. If we said, “Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Adjudicator; they've asked for these documents; we don't have them anymore; we've destroyed them,” the adjudicator would come back to us and say, “Well, what was your authority for destroying them?” Then we would hoist this in the air and say, “Our duly approved records destruction schedule.” So, as you say, the committee's role ends after approval.

Mr. Blower, I had indicated that there was nothing out of the ordinary with this compared to other government departments' schedules, or we haven't done anything special, I don't think.

MR. BLOWER: No. I believe not.

I think it is important to keep in mind that these schedules do not authorize destruction of material so much as saying: you do not destroy until this time. It's an active document on an annual basis. Even when information comes up for destruction or transfer, that has to be reviewed by the individuals on the Records Management Committee to ensure that it goes the next step. It isn't a blanket “These are now seven years old; we destroy them.” It's “These are now seven years old; if they don't have a need financially, administratively, legally, then we can go ahead with the process of destruction.”

MS BLAKEMAN: Records management is in my background, not that I want to go into it now, but perhaps through the clerk it could be supplied. I need a legend, a translation menu here because I don't follow all of your abbreviations. So if that could be supplied to the committee through the clerk or just to me if I'm the only one that's interested. We certainly don't need to do it now. Just so I have it in my records. If I ever look at this again, I will understand what S/O means.

MR. WORK: We can certainly do that.

MR. DUCHARME: Madam Chairman, looking back at the minutes of our last meeting of June 13, Mr. Hlady had made a motion that the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices approve the office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner's records retention disposition schedules as developed in accordance with the Alberta Government records management guidelines.

At this time on Mr. Hlady's behalf I'd like to move this motion once again.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any comments on the motion? Questions? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

I'd like to thank both Mr. Work and Mr. Blower for joining us this afternoon.

MR. WORK: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: At this time I would like to welcome Monica Norminton. She is here on behalf of the Auditor General to deal with the two issues that we have under agenda item 8. The first item will be Approval for the Audit of the Universities Academic Pension Plan under Section 12(b) of the Auditor General Act. Monica, welcome. If you could just go ahead and explain that one to us.

MS NORMINTON: Thank you. The first thing is that in your package you have information from the Audit Committee of the plan requesting that the Auditor General be appointed the auditor of the universities academic pension plan. The primary reason the Auditor General is requesting this is that it's believed that the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor is practical given the continuing involvement of the Alberta Pensions Administration Corporation, the employers who contribute to the plan, being the university, the investment management division of Alberta Revenue, and Alberta Finance in the universities academic pension plan, all of which are entities still audited by the Auditor General. So the relationship is still continuing through their management. That's the first order.

The second . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, maybe we'll just deal with the first one. Any questions or clarification from Monica? If not, I understand that the motion we need for this particular item is firstly that someone move that

the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices approve the appointment of the Auditor General as auditor of the universities academic pension plan under section 12(b) of the Auditor General Act.

Are you making that motion?

MS BLAKEMAN: I so move.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Blakeman. Any comments, questions? All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Secondly, if someone can move that

the chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices be authorized to sign order AG 2, which approves the appointment of the Auditor General as the auditor of the universities academic pension plan under section 12(b) of the Auditor General Act.

Dr. Pannu. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

Now we'll move on to the amendment of order AG 3.

MS NORMINTON: This comes across kind of confusing, but it actually isn't. The Auditor General is the auditor of the Alberta Mental Health Board under section 1 of the existing order, and under section 2 of the existing order the Auditor is the auditor of the foundation, which is closely associated with the board. In the order as signed there's an error. That's what we're seeking the amendment to. It's a simple request to delete the last phrase under section 2, the phrase where it says "under section 1 of this Order or under section 12(3) of the Regional Health Authorities Act" simply because the Auditor General is the auditor of the board under section 1 and the foundation under section 2. The references are incorrect as they exist, so it's a correction.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions?

I understand that for this one we need a motion that

the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices clarify the Auditor General's authority to audit the Alberta Mental Health Board Foundation by deleting the concluding line of section 2 of order AG 3 that reads "under section 1 of this Order or under section 12(3) of the Regional Health Authorities Act."

Is someone willing to move that motion? Dr. Pannu. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion passed.

Secondly, if someone could move that

the chairman of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices be authorized to sign order AG 3-1, which amends section 2 of order AG 3, dated September 28, 1995.

Mr. Friedel. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

MS NORMINTON: Thank you very much for your time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much for joining us this afternoon.

With the agreement of the committee I would suggest item 11, Date of Next Meeting, be at the chair's call.

Would someone like to move that we adjourn? Dr. Pannu. All those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion carried.

[The committee adjourned at 1:33 p.m.]