

8:32 a.m.

[Mr. White in the chair]

THE CHAIRMAN: I'll call the meeting to order. The top of the morning to you.

MRS. O'NEILL: And the rest of the day to you.

THE CHAIRMAN: We got the proper response. We're starting off to a mighty fine day; we are.

Today we have the pleasure of the Ministry of Environmental Protection, and we have with us the Auditor General's office. Unfortunately or fortunately for him, the Auditor General, being of Irish descent and coming from a little way out of Dublin, we understand, is taking a personal development day and is climbing somewhere in the mountains on this glorious day and leaving the business to us. So we'll send along regards to him upon his return.

We do have the minutes that were distributed. You'll recognize that *Hansard* has some difficulty and some staff have some difficulty getting the minutes out any earlier, but the minutes have been circulated this morning. You have a minute to review those.

We have an agenda before you. Might we have a motion to accept the agenda as presented? A wee motion?

MS BLAKEMAN: Certainly. I'm happy to.

THE CHAIRMAN: A wee motion has been made. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Good heavens, was it a late night last night? Actually, I was here.

It is agreed. It is carried.

A motion on the minutes as presented, if we might have another wee motion to that effect. Dr. Pannu. Is it agreed?

MR. HLADY: What's that?

THE CHAIRMAN: A motion on the minutes as presented.

MR. HLADY: I'm just going over them right now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could hold that in abeyance until later in the meeting so you can have a chance to read them. How's that? Is that reasonable? We'll stay the vote on that for the moment.

Mr. Minister, if you would be so kind as to introduce your staff, and then we'll have an introduction of the Auditor General's staff and continue with the introduction of your department. Thank you, sir.

MR. LUND: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, committee. Of course we're always very pleased to have the opportunity to appear before the committee and have a look at what happened back a couple of years ago. Before I start, I will introduce our staff with me. On my right is our director of finance, Bruce Perry. On my left, starting on my immediate left, Deputy Minister Jim Nichols; assistant deputy minister in charge of environmental services, Doug Tupper; assistant deputy minister in charge of natural resources services, Morley Barrett; and Alberta forest and land services assistant deputy minister, Cliff Henderson.

This morning I would like to speak about the ministry's revenues, expenditures, and key achievements. At the end of my comments of

course we'll invite questions and comments on the 1997-98 public accounts.

On the revenue side, the largest source of revenue for the ministry came from timber royalties and fees, which totaled about \$103.2 million. Land and grazing and other fees provided another \$41 million. Revenues increased by some \$73.2 million because of the following factors. The contribution from timber royalties and fees was up \$49.4 million due to higher lumber prices and the strength in U.S. lumber consumption. Revenue from transfers from the government of Canada was up \$12.1 million mainly due to the Canada/U.S. softwood lumber agreement. Investment income was up, \$2.4 million higher than budgeted, due to the larger fund balances on hand. Other revenue was \$3.8 million higher primarily due to the sale of land. Land and grazing fees were up \$5.5 million as a result of increased oil and gas activity.

On the expenditure side the majority of the total ministry expenditures are represented by the voted expenditure of \$266.2 million, statutory expenditures of \$31.7 million, while the remaining expenditures totaled \$2.8 million.

Let's look at the voted expenditures. Voted expenditures were \$4.7 million more than budgeted primarily due to employee salary settlements and the achievement bonus award program. Additional expenses from contract agreements and other supplies and services were also up.

Statutory expenditures. In our environmental protection revolving fund \$17 million was spent on various functions such as vehicle rentals, reforestation services, and the Environmental Training Centre. Environmental protection revolving fund expenses were \$8.1 million less than budgeted due to a change in the accounting for the forest resource advancement program, known as FRAP. These expenses and revenues are now being charged directly to the environmental protection enhancement fund instead of the revolving fund. The environmental protection enhancement fund spent \$12.5 million on forest fires, emergency spills and cleanup, drought and flood emergency, and the forest resource advancement program. Environmental protection enhancement fund expenses were \$10.1 million lower than budgeted primarily due to lower than anticipated forest fire costs.

The net contribution from general revenues. Since revenues generated by my ministry are less than our expenses, additional funding is provided from general revenues. The ministry reported a \$106.8 million net contribution from general revenues, \$109.8 million less than budgeted. This reduction in the contribution from general revenues was the result of a transfer of excess equity from the environmental protection and enhancement fund. A new policy was implemented regarding the treatment of the department's incremental revenues transferred to the enhancement fund by establishing a \$150 million equity limit, or cap, on the fund. Equity in excess of the cap is now transferred to the general revenue fund, which potentially reduces our net contribution from the general revenue requirements.

Now I would like to shift focus and outline some of my ministry's accomplishments in 1997-98. The Ministry of Environmental Protection includes the Department of Environmental Protection, two reporting boards, and the Special Waste Management Corporation. The two reporting boards are the Environmental Appeal Board and the Natural Resources Conservation Board. The department is composed of three services: environmental services, land and forest services, and natural resources services. These services provide major programs in key areas such as forest management and protection, public land administration, the management of fisheries, wildlife, water, parks, and the environment, including activities of compliance enforcement and monitoring.

It is worth noting that the department formerly had four services. We amalgamated two of these services to improve the efficiency and performance of the department's operations. The services we amalgamated were our environmental regulatory services and our corporate management services. They are now the environmental services. The new service reflects our commitment to more integrated operations. Supporting the three services are the communications division, financial services, and human resources services.

In 1997-98 my ministry continued to be an effective performance-driven organization. We set ambitious goals and high standards for performance and met their challenge. Our accomplishments, which I will highlight today, demonstrate that Environmental Protection delivered what it promised in the 1997-98 business plan. In accomplishing these goals and objectives, my ministry again demonstrated that success can be achieved through teamwork, innovation, and continuous improvement. By streamlining, revising our processes, and contracting out some parts of our operations, we saved some \$6.8 million in costs. This includes the privatization of the Pine Ridge nursery and a variety of maintenance activities. To meet our budget reduction targets we also permitted private operators of campgrounds in the province's recreation and protected areas to use market-based pricing for the services they provide.

8:42

Teamwork was also a guiding principle for my ministry in 1997-98. For instance, we developed partnerships to deliver environment-related activities through delegated administrative organizations. Five new such organizations were formed: the Alberta Conservation Association, the Alberta Used Oil Management Association, the Alberta Professional Outfitters Society, the Beverage Container Recycling Corporation, and the Forest Resource Improvement Association. This brought the number of existing DAOs to six. None of them require government funds for their operations.

Before I continue I'd like to draw your attention to the commitment, dedication, and innovation that Environmental Protection staff brought to their work. This ongoing commitment of excellence was recognized and is evident in the number of awards Environmental Protection staff earned for their activities in the '97-98 business year. Environmental Protection employees took four of the 19 Premier's awards of excellence. The awards were for the following.

A gold award to the Fort McMurray oil sands review team. This team earned their award for a new approach to reviewing regulatory applications for the Suncor Steepbank mine and Syncrude Aurora mine, that was both thorough and efficient. The team participated in the design and development of operating conditions, performance criteria, and reporting programs that will be in place for the life of these projects.

A silver award to staff who worked on the Canadian Shield's special places project. Staff worked with communities and stakeholders involved in six sites nominated under the Alberta special places program for the Canadian Shield. As a result, a full complement of sites representing the unique and natural features of the Canadian Shield were designated as protected areas.

Another silver award was given to a project team that developed a comprehensive set of municipal standards and guidelines for the regulation of municipal water, wastewater and storm drainage systems. As a result, new standards and guidelines will help Alberta continue its state-of-the-art municipal water regulations.

A bronze award to the forest protection group for their work in creating wildland fire-fighting units. In response to a challenge in the 1995 fire-fighting season, the group designed and implemented a new training program geared toward the creation of the eight-man

wildland fire-fighting units. The new units are better trained and better prepared for fighting devastating forest fires.

I'm proud of these groups. They and the rest of the Environmental Protection staff are a key reason why my ministry continues to successfully meet the challenges and achieve the goals of our business plan.

Goal 1 of our 1997-98 business plan was "to protect and maintain Alberta's high quality air, land, and water for the health and enjoyment of Albertans." My ministry was active in the past year in protecting the quality of Alberta's environment. We implemented 17 new standards and guidelines that industries, municipalities, and government will use to protect human health, air, land, soil, and water within this province. We carefully monitored Alberta's ambient environmental conditions to assess the effects of human activities on the quality of the environment and took actions when this quality was compromised. We continued to carry out compliance assurance and enforcement activities to ensure compliance with provincial legislation protecting our natural resources and the quality of our environment. Some specific examples are as follows: we issued some 100 administrative penalties for a total assessment of about \$780,000; we laid approximately 6,000 charges under a variety of legislation administered by the department.

In fulfilling this goal, my ministry again displayed the value of partnership. We contributed to the public's knowledge of Alberta's environment and encouraged environmentally responsible behaviour through environmental awareness activities. We worked with Albertans, industry, and other departments to reduce waste and divert waste from landfills. We gave Albertans information on important environmental decisions and opportunities to have their voices heard on environmental issues. This had the added benefit of improving the decisions we make.

We continue to work with Albertans as joint stewards of the environment. The Environmental Appeal Board continued to deal effectively with appeals filed with the board during 1997. Of the 65 appeals filed, more than 55 were eventually denied.

In keeping with my ministry's operating principles of providing service excellence in all regions of the province, we regionalized the responsibility of environmental approvals for a number of community level activities. In total, approximately 150 industrial facilities are able to obtain approvals and deal with related issues in the communities where they operate.

Goal 2 of our 1997-98 business plan was "to manage Alberta's renewable resources for the continued prosperity and benefit of Albertans." In '97-98 my ministry continued to guide the use, management, and development of our renewable natural resources in a concerted effort to support the Alberta advantage. By carefully managing the ministry's water infrastructure, valued at more than \$3.7 billion, we reduced the consequences of droughts, floods, and erosion. Our commitment to involvement led to the development of new technology to improve our operations. We installed a state-of-the-art control system for water facilities in southern Alberta. The benefits of this system are tighter control over water operations through more reliable information and our new ability to operate these structures by remote control. We also introduced a new high-speed fax broadcast system as part of our improvements in flood risk assessment and information distribution. The new system permits hundreds of clients to be notified of emergency conditions within minutes as opposed to the hours it used to take.

To better manage our renewable resources, we've continued to expand our partnerships in collaboration with other departments, levels of government, and external organizations, all of whom contributed to our achievements. One such effort was the endorsement of Alberta's commitment to the sustainable resource

and environmental management document by the Sustainable Development Co-ordinating Council. This council is co-chaired by the Deputy Minister of Environmental Protection and the Deputy Minister of Economic Development. This initiative was part of our continuing progress in integrating resource management. The initiative integrates broad provincial natural resource policies. It also provides effective decision-making and an up-to-date legislative framework for sustainable resource and environmental management.

On the national level our co-operative efforts continued with our signing of the Canada-wide accord on environmental harmonization and its related subagreements. All CCME ministers, with the exception of Quebec, signed this agreement in January of 1998. The accord increases co-operation among federal, provincial, and territorial governments, clarifies roles and responsibilities, eliminates duplication and overlap, and makes more efficient use of resources.

We also signed the Mackenzie River basin transboundary water master agreement. The agreement is between Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia, the Northwest Territories, Yukon, and Canada. It establishes common principles in the co-operative management of the Mackenzie River basin aquatic ecosystem. We developed and implemented 15 codes of practice for regulated activities such as asphalt paving plants and tanker truck washing facilities. These activities have the potential, individually and collectively, to damage the environment. Through these codes of practice we are able to track industries' activities, changes in growth to ensure environmental protection.

Goal 3 of our 1997-98 business plan was "to protect and manage Alberta's natural heritage for present and future generations." In '97-98 Environmental Protection continued its efforts to ensure that future Albertans would have access to the natural heritage we enjoy today. We did this while supporting the government's goal of prosperity. We made significant progress in the special places program. A total of 46 new sites have been added to Alberta's network of protected areas since the program first was announced in 1995. This number represents a contribution of 1.3 million acres to the network.

8:52

My ministry announced a new management strategy for Alberta's recreation and protected areas program. The strategy balances a variety of activities and interests and outlines how the government will allocate resources to both protect sensitive wild spaces and build a park system for the future. Following the strategic direction contained in the Alberta Forest Conservation Strategy, my ministry developed the Alberta forest legacy, a new made-in-Alberta approach to sustainable management of the province's forest resources. In addition, increased economic activity during '97-98 resulted in the largest number of new major project proposals in recent years. With capital costs totaling some \$11 billion, we responded to this increased responsibility with an innovative approach to how we review major development projects that are subject to Alberta's environmental assessment and regulatory process.

Now, these were just some of the many activities of my ministry during the 1997-98 fiscal year. At this time, Mr. Chairman, we'd be only too happy to open it up for questions and discussions on our 1997-98 activities.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We might have Mr. Saher introduce the staff of the Auditor General's office first, and then we'll get on with questions, starting with Mr. Sapers.

MR. SAHER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On my left is Michael Stratford. He's an audit principal in the office of the Auditor General. His responsibilities include taking a lead in the audit of the Ministry of Environmental Protection. On Michael's left is Ken Hoffman. Ken is an Assistant Auditor General. He's responsible for the Ministry of Environmental Protection amongst other ministries and has a particular interest in performance measurement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

We'll commence. Mr. Sapers, please, with the first question.

MR. SAPERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Minister and staff and friends from the Auditor General's department. Thanks for that overview.

Mr. Minister, we don't dwell a lot on good news and positive things, and I want to just comment on the awards presented to your staff over this last year. There are some significant differences of opinion on some policy issues that you're well aware of, but we do recognize and congratulate the excellence of a number of the initiatives as well.

MR. LUND: Thank you very much.

MR. SAPERS: The first set of questions I have flows from comments on page 109 of the Auditor General's report. On pages 108, 109 the report speaks of delegated administrative organizations, and reading from the report, the Auditor General has said, referring to your department, Mr. Minister:

The Department still needs to define quantifiable goals and measures against which the success of these DAOs can be measured. As well, the Department has yet to formalize the systems and processes to monitor the performance of DAOs. Until such controls are put in place, the Ministry will not know whether the DAOs are achieving the goals set out for them by the Ministry.

My first question is: what performance measures or targets have been established by your department in '97-98 to monitor the performance of the Alberta Conservation Association, the Alberta Used Oil Management Association, the Beverage Container Recycling Corporation, the Professional Outfitters Society, and the forest resources improvement program?

MR. LUND: Thanks for that question. It is a very important issue. We've taken very seriously these comments of the Auditor General and agree it is very important that in fact we do make the DAOs accountable to the public. What we've done is brought forward a process that will make the DAOs accountable for the functions they perform that our government mandated. Of course, that in many cases means dollars that they collect for programs we mandate to that DAO. They will be subject to the freedom of information act, they will be subject to records management regulations, and of course the whole accounting will be an audited process.

MR. SAPERS: I appreciate that it's still a work in progress, and I'm glad to hear you're not challenging the Auditor General's recommendations. But maybe there's a more fundamental question, and that is: given that those controls weren't in place and to some extent still aren't in place, on what basis was your department able to determine that these delegated administrative organizations were the most cost-effective or efficient delivery mechanism, if these procedures and systems and processes weren't in place and continue to not be in place to monitor their activities?

MR. LUND: We are going to require them to develop three-year business plans. Within those there will be the goals we expect them to meet. In this particular fiscal year we're talking about, there were

some targets like the CCME target that by the year 2000 the amount of waste going to landfills is going to be reduced by 50 percent. The bottle recycling DAO has an obligation under that government target to increase their recycling so the amount is reduced. The tire recycling board, once again, had some targets even back at this point. Their first target was to recycle as many tires as come into the system in a year. Now they've accomplished that, so they're setting new targets as we move forward.

I don't know, Jim, if you'd care to make any further comments.

MR. NICHOLS: I guess I'd make the comment that, remembering this is '97-98, this is the year that five of the six were in fact established. So now they're up and running.

Some of the other things they have to do -- they have to file an annual report with the minister which outlines their objectives. The minister talked about business plans which will include performance measures, and also on each of these boards we have department representatives.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mrs. O'Neill, then Ms Blakeman, please.

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Minister and staff and Auditor General's staff. My question is in reference to schedule 7 of the department schedule to the financial statements, particularly on page 101, 4.1.2 of the annual report. In referencing that, I would ask the minister if he could please explain the benefits Alberta has received from the recently signed harmonization agreements.

MR. LUND: Thanks for the question. As I said, we signed the harmonization accord in this fiscal year. What it does is bring the province in as a full partner with the federal government and other provinces in setting standards for environmental operations and quality. It will hopefully help level the playing field. As you can probably appreciate, Alberta has the most stringent standards in Canada. Other provinces have much lower standards, so if we can move their standards up to ours, that levels the playing field for industry. That's an objective. Now, I've been very clear that in this harmonization Alberta is not going to lower their standards. We're going to try to get others to come up to our standards.

9:02

If we start talking about various subagreements, I just touched on the standards one. We have in there also the environmental assessment subagreement. It allows the federal government, the provincial government, and if there are other provincial governments involved an assessment of a project where there's cross-boundary. It allows us to sign agreements where we could end up with one process, and hopefully going through one process, you won't have to go through several others.

The way it basically works with us and the federal government: when we're setting out the terms of reference for an EIA, we would have both governments sign off on the terms of reference. That then moves it forward so that you have one EIA as opposed to two. We then have the ability to use a joint panel. A good example of where this worked was in the Cheviot mine. There was one panel which was joint, so the federal people had a person on, and out of that, then, flows a result that's proved or disproved by the federal and provincial governments.

There were the three subagreements: the standards, the environmental assessment, and inspections. In the case of inspections, what was happening before was you'd have a provincial inspector come to a site, a federal inspector come to a site, each taking a sample, each testing for sometimes the same thing but sometimes something just a little different. This makes no sense.

It's a real waste of manpower and time. So under these inspections we can have one inspector come and do the work for both. A prime example was the question I had in the Leg. just yesterday or the day before dealing with the CITES permit. It makes absolutely no sense where you have two permits, one federal and one provincial, dealing with the same issue. Why not harmonize it and have one? It works best for both government and the individual requiring the permit. While the one I just cited isn't covered by this harmonization, that's a good example, though, of what we're trying to do with the harmonization accord.

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you. I do have a supplementary question, and that is that since the House of Commons Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development recommended that the harmonization agreement not be signed until its concerns were satisfied, my question is: how will its concerns and, I would say, the concerns of the other stakeholders be addressed in responding?

THE CHAIRMAN: You'll recall that we go through this every once in a while. This committee is designed and specifically charged with the responsibility of reviewing the documents that are prepared by the department and reviewed by the Auditor General for that calendar year. When we start getting into what is the policy of government, then we overstep our bounds. So perhaps the member could rephrase her question to deal with that which was contained in the report, not something that might come out of it in a subsequent year; therefore, speaking of history and not future policy.

MRS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then in reference to the financial statements that obviously would have included some consideration with respect to the House of Commons standing committee, how did you look at the harmonization agreement vis-à-vis the federal when you were putting the allocation of moneys?

THE CHAIRMAN: That's very close, but if you can briefly cover the ground now.

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, maybe I can help alleviate your discomfort by making my answer short. We -- when I say "we," I mean the ministers of CCME -- amended the agreement in one area. There was to be a five-year review. We reduced that to two years so that the House standing policy committee could assess how it worked and maybe wouldn't have the discomfort they had. You've got to remember the committee is chaired by an individual who believes that unless the decision is made in Ottawa, it's a wrong decision.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good accounting of the last year's circumstances.

Ms Blakeman, followed by Mr. Yankowsky and Dr. Pannu.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I welcome again the stalwart and vigilant members of the Auditor General's department, the members who have come in support of the Minister of Environmental Protection, and additional staff in the galleries, I notice.

Okay. Integrated resource management. This is a grand idea in that it's meant to be a comprehensive approach to sustainable development, recognizing that the use of one resource for one purpose may well affect the use and management of other resources. So the idea is: everybody work together for the best in all things. Now, I have spoken many times in the House on the concerns of the constituents of Edmonton-Centre on environmental protection. I note in the Auditor General's report for the year under scrutiny,

pages 106 to 108, that the Auditor General points out the department did not address the recommendations from the previous year's report that

the Deputy Minister-level Sustainable Development Coordinating Council incorporate accountability principles, including performance measurement into [the integrated resource management] strategies and plans.

So my question is: what steps were taken by the Department of Environmental Protection in this fiscal year, '97-98, to develop an implementation plan to guide the integrated resource management initiative?

MR. LUND: Are you talking about recommendation 23?

MS BLAKEMAN: Yes.

MR. LUND: Well, staff from the core departments dealing with sustainable resource management have prepared an interim implementation plan entitled the Alberta commitment to sustainable resource and environmental management. It's made up of a committee of ADMs, or at the ADM level, and they are looking at implementing this across all departments. As you rightly point out, what happens in one department can affect the environment, and we want to see a seamless system where we have some input into decisions made in other departments so that if there is an environmental concern, we can raise it and it can be addressed.

I don't know if our deputy cares to add something more to that.

MR. NICHOLS: Thank you, Mr. Minister. The original intent of this exercise was in fact to find a quicker and more efficient process to do integrated resource planning. We were finding that integrated resource plans were taking up to 11 years to complete, and they weren't keeping pace with development activity. We then started the exercise with working groups from across the many departments, and in '97 the intent was to look at a range of policies, from natural resources policies to land use policies, that would be complementary and would support each other. At that time the Auditor General made the report saying there should be a performance measure for that process.

As we got into the exercise, we changed the focus. It became apparent to the group that in fact it should be a concentration and recommitment to integrated resource management, and we moved down that route. We then made the deputy's committee, the sustainable development co-ordinating committee, responsible and accountable for delivering integrated resource management across the government, and in fact we set up the committees the minister spoke about today. We still have a commitment to develop a performance measure, and that will be in place by September of this year. But the reason it wasn't, quite frankly, is that we changed horses.

9:12

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. A supplementary then. Can you expand on the types of measures and performance targets that were established by the Department of Environmental Protection in '97-98 that assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the resource management decisions and operations and which serve as a baseline to assess the impact of the IRM, integrated resource management, on routine activities?

MR. NICHOLS: We don't have a specific goal. The way we would measure those types of things, if you're talking specifically within Environmental Protection, would be, for example, in the oil and gas industry: the number of appeals we had. We set conditions and operating guidelines to ensure that any operation we take in the

forest or the land base is compatible with our wildlife and protected area goals. Of course, if we're not doing it successfully, it will result in appeals. I don't have the specifics of the appeals, but maybe Cliff has them for this year.

MR. HENDERSON: We had three appeals last year on some areas, and actually the appeals were denied. So we are protecting the objectives of integrating and balancing industrial activity with our wildlife resources.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Yankowsky, followed by Dr. Pannu.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone. I have some questions regarding the Environmental Appeal Board, and I want to refer you to schedule 7 of the department's schedule to the financial statements. I refer you to 6.1.1 on page 101 of the annual report. I have a question here, and that is: why did the board ever extend their budget of \$471,000 to \$594,000? It was an overexpenditure.

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, we have to recognize that the Environmental Appeal Board has no control over the number of appeals it handles, so their costs are needs driven. Also, it's not only the number of appeals, but you can get into some really complex appeals. Of course, when that happens, you've got longer hearings, if it goes to an actual hearing, which of course adds to the cost and makes it really difficult for us to assess. They, I think, are doing a very admirable job with the number of appeals they get and are handling them in an expeditious manner.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have a supplementary question, and that is: are there any other measures the board could or will undertake to maintain a balanced budget in the fiscal year 1998-1999 with water legislation and landfill issues coming under its jurisdiction?

MR. LUND: Well, one of the things we did back in the particular fiscal year we're talking about is we changed the act so that in fact mediation became a tool they could use to settle these appeals. The way that works: you have one member of the board go and meet the appellant and the proponent, try to work out the issue without an actual formal hearing. That process is working very well. The board usually goes to the community where the appeal originated. A lot of the appeals are on land reclamation, so they prefer to even go right to the farmer's kitchen. That way there's a level of comfort, it's not real formal, and they're able to deal with it.

In some cases, of course, people are not satisfied and want to go to a full hearing. In this particular fiscal year, for example, one project had some 209 appeals. On the one project. The board was able to keep that from going to a formal hearing and actually ended up, through mediation, satisfying all those 209. I think they're trying to do as much of that as possible. We're looking at in this fiscal year if there are some other ways, because as you rightly point out, with the water act coming in, we could have more appeals under that. But they're doing it in the most efficient yet satisfying manner to the public.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Pannu, followed by Mr. Ducharme.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Minister, for providing a detailed opening statement. I would like to draw your attention to the departmental annual report; pages 11 and 32 I believe would be appropriate. The report clearly, I think, notes the problem of declining levels of water quality in the Smoky, Peace,

Athabasca, North Saskatchewan, Red Deer, Bow, and Oldman rivers. In at least half the cases, upstream water quality is reported as poor, but certainly water quality downstream from urban centres is often rated poor to unacceptable. Declines in water quality in the North Saskatchewan, Red Deer, and Athabasca rivers from good to fair reveal the failure, obviously, of policy implementation, if there is a policy, to improve water quality. I wonder: how does one explain this declining water quality in the context of the statements that were made with respect to the department being committed to the highest levels of environmental protection, and what measures have you taken since to deliver them?

MR. LUND: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. This is one area we are having some difficulty with. We're looking at how we might measure quality. As you noticed, there are the four levels. There are "not acceptable," "poor," "fair," and "good." We're measuring a number of parameters. Some of those can be affected by nature. For example, if you have a lot of runoff, if you have a lot of rain and a lot of runoff, if it's running through an agricultural area, you may pick up, for example, some nitrogen. The nitrogen in turn allows algae growth. The algae growth reduces the oxygen in the water. So all of a sudden you have lower water quality on one parameter, just one out of the six or so. It could be that it's only slightly below what we would say -- if you're looking at "good" and "fair," it doesn't meet quite the compliance, say, because it's 100 to 96 percent. Say it's at 95 percent of top quality. All of a sudden the whole rating goes from good to fair because one parameter dropped one little bit.

So we're having some difficulty whether this is a really accurate measure of what is going on within the system. You rightly point out that it moves. Sometimes it's fair, poor; it can go in either direction. But it can be, as I described, just one of that number of parameters that has only changed slightly, and it may have nothing to do with the industry, with the conditions man has created. It might be straight natural. You can have cases, for example, where you have higher readings of other elements that are naturally occurring and have nothing to do with what man is doing. So that's a level we're trying to work with.

I don't know, Morley or Doug, if you'd care to add anything to this water quality.

9:22

MR. TUPPER: Yeah, I could, if I might. There are a number of factors that affect water quality, as the minister has said. Some of them are natural, and others are even: where do you take the measurement? So how do you know how well it really is? A good example of that is a long-term monitoring station that was established just upstream from Lethbridge. It started to show increasing fecal coliform levels, and that's not something we want to see. But an assessment analysis of it showed that what happened was the city grew around it, so now it's receiving the storm runoff from the city much more directly. Of course, overland flow tends to allow for some treatment of storm water, but piping it into a river does little to change it. In cases like that it influences the index, and in fact in that particular case a new site needed to be found and has been found upstream. So you get a better long-term picture.

The other aspect of the water quality index, too, is the corrective action matter. There's a lag between detecting the problem or seeing the problem and actually being able to correct it. For example, within the city of Edmonton we have reasonable water quality upstream, but downstream is unacceptable for most uses. The correction, of course, is to install better treatment, and that's happening. The city will have tertiary treatment in place by about 2005, so already the corrective action has been taken, but the impact and the observation of it will be much later. So that's another factor to look at in these water quality indexes.

The other thing, as the minister has stated, is that CCME, the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, is actually looking at these indexes, trying to craft perhaps something that better tells the people of the nation how the water quality really is. That's a work under way. It may be two or three years before we get there. In CCME there's a strong commitment as part of harmonization, for example, for a lot of stakeholder involvement, so we set up the technical committees, work on it, get the stakeholder involvement, and then eventually agree on what the index or what the approach might be.

MR. LUND: But I can assure you that this is really valuable information for us. It clearly shows us the impact that municipal waste has on water quality, and as the assistant deputy pointed out, storm sewer water is a big concern of ours. We are seeing more and more how where it's not treated or held or some kind of treatment is not done to it, it does have a very negative impact on the water quality. I guess the example of areas where we're working with the city of Calgary -- you maybe have heard of the Shepard slough project. I'm really excited about those kinds of projects. I think they're projects that can do an awful lot for water quality but also assist us in other environmental issues like providing more wetland and habitat for wildlife. You're doing the two at once. Those are exciting kinds of projects.

DR. PANNU: Thank you, Mr. Minister. That helps understanding, I think, particularly what the deputy minister had to add to your answer. There are clearly two issues here. One is measurement, refining it. It's a technical issue. The other is whether or not there's a problem. I'm guided by your report which says there is a problem independently of how we measure the problem. I think that's being recognized.

I want to draw your attention to the table, figure 3, on page 32. The problem of declining water quality has to do with more than just storm sewer problems in the urban areas. If you look at the Issues/Concerns columns, they draw attention to pulp mill activity in the case of the Smoky River and Peace River areas and the case of the Athabasca River area. Were any corrective actions taken with respect to that source of declining water quality?

MR. LUND: You're referring to the pulp mill part of that or the minister's . . .

DR. PANNU: Yes, yes. It's your department's own table that I'm referring to and sources that I draw attention to.

MR. LUND: On the Smoky -- who do we have on the Smoky? I'm not sure when we talk about the pulp mill.

MR. TUPPER: On the Smoky it would be Weyerhaeuser.

MR. LUND: Weyerhaeuser, exactly. They have spent several millions of dollars in the last two years upgrading their effluent. They've put in another treatment so that their quality will be better. We trust that will have some long-lasting effects on it. At Grande Prairie the city is doing a lot as well to improve their storm water and the sewage treatment, to improve that quality.

As the deputy pointed out, these actions take a little while before you really see the results. Mind you, the one with the upgrading of the pulp mill by Weyerhaeuser -- I suspect we will see that result in the upcoming year, this year.

My deputy just points out that on page 37 you can see how the effluent concern is dropping, the discharge. Do you want to expand on that?

MR. NICHOLS: It's just one measure, but if you turn to one of our

performance measures on page 37, you'll see the pulp production versus the amount of substance discharged. It's dropped from 0.99 in '97 down to 0.83.

DR. PANNU: You're referring to the annual report?

MR. NICHOLS: Yes. That's just one measurement.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ducharme, followed by Mr. Sapers, please.

MR. DUCHARME: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone. My questions relate to the Natural Resources Conservation Board. Mr. Minister, could you please identify what applications the board processed in the '97-98 year?

MR. LUND: What number were you . . .

MR. DUCHARME: Page 133 of the annual report.

MR. LUND: I lost your question. What was the question? I'm sorry.

MR. DUCHARME: I was asking: what applications did the board process in the '97-98 year?

9:32

MR. LUND: Their activity during that year was a lot around the Little Bow/Highwood project, that diversion project. So they held a prehearing conference in June in High River. In the fall, in November, and again in January they actually held a hearing in Vulcan. Then in December, from the 2nd to the 5th, then again on the 15th and 16th, they were again in High River continuing that hearing. So as you can see, that was a fairly large undertaking.

The staff also were involved in a couple of other issues. They were into detailed discussion with the federal government dealing with this harmonization that we talked about earlier, because the Natural Resources Conservation Board of course will be involved, particularly as we look at if Grande Alberta Paper should go ahead or if Daishowa should go ahead with the paper machine. Then the NRCB would be involved and also the federal environmental assessment. So they were working out how that process would work under the harmonization.

Another area where they were doing a fair bit of work was trying to get an understanding, the board itself, of the First Nations culture, some of their needs, because certainly if these projects go ahead, there will be First Nations involvement. For that matter, down at the Little Bow project there was some First Nations involvement. So that, I think, is a very important exercise, that they have to have some understanding of First Nations needs.

MR. DUCHARME: My supplementary has also been answered. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Sapers, followed by Mr. Klapstein.

MR. SAPERS: Thanks. I want to go back to the DAOs, but I also have some questions about the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation. So maybe I'll get those on the record first, and if we get the time for another round of questions . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: I'm sorry. The chair didn't catch the . . .

MR. SAPERS: Oh, I'm just muttering, Mr. Chairman.

My questions have to do with the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation. It's mentioned a couple of times in your

annual report, Mr. Minister. Did the department or did the corporation itself conduct any reassessment during '97-98 of the cost of site remediation that may be required after the Swan Hills facility closes its doors? And if you did those assessments, can you share the results with us?

MR. LUND: I'll have my assistant deputy minister responsible answer that question, please.

MR. TUPPER: Yes. There were a couple of assessments done. There was a third one done, but I can't recall if it was completed and filed with us before or after the end of the fiscal year that we're talking about. Certainly we had another report done assessing the options to decommission that site. I think it arrived in the spring, but as I say, I'm not sure whether it was in that fiscal year or this current one.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are you willing to share it?

MR. TUPPER: I beg your pardon?

THE CHAIRMAN: The second part was whether you're willing to share the report. I think that was it.

MR. TUPPER: The report was certainly released under the freedom of information act, so that's not a problem. I believe the opposition might already have it actually.

THE CHAIRMAN: Supplementary question, Mr. Sapers.

MR. SAPERS: Okay. Well, I'll check. Thanks.

The supplementary question has to do with projections that may have been prepared by the department or the Alberta Special Waste Management Corporation during '97-98 that have to do with the income that will be received by the corporation and the department under the revenue-sharing formula to do with the net income of the Swan Hills joint venture.

MR. LUND: Are you familiar with it?

MR. PERRY: Enough, yeah. Mr. Chairman, the revenue-sharing agreement essentially returns -- it's a very complicated agreement, as I think most people understand. In these statements there is no revenue from that sharing agreement in '97-98. There was none reported by Bovar that would be returned to the province under that agreement.

MR. SAPERS: The question was about the projections that have been done based on the experience of '97-98.

MR. PERRY: Oh, projections? I'm not familiar with the projections or with the corporation during that era, '97-98.

MR. SAPERS: So that means that none have been done, or you're not sure?

MR. PERRY: Well, I'm not sure if they in fact have been done; no. That's my answer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, if you have subsequent answers to some of the questions, if you'd forward them in writing to the secretary of the committee, they will be circulated. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Klapstein, followed by Ms Blakeman.

MR. KLAPSTEIN: I'd direct you to page 101 of the annual report for '97-98. I'm referring to schedule 7 of the department's schedule to the financial statements, reference 5.2. I notice that the regional operations subprogram has overspent its operating budget by \$1,578,000. Could the minister explain what contributed to this overexpenditure?

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, this particular subprogram provides funding for the majority of activities carried out in the forest regions, including forest protection-related projects such as prevention, detection, weather, presuppression, staff salaries and benefits, facility maintenance and utilities, as well as vehicle rental, fuel, and maintenance.

One of the main contributing factors to the overexpenditure was the payout under the severance compensation as we were reducing the number of staff. It's known as the severance payment for restructuring program. That accounted for a lot of dollars.

Another area. In finalizing the budget, we didn't have enough money in this subprogram to cover the additional regional manpower that we ended up needing because of people retiring or right-out resignations. We did have a number of people leave the department, particularly as the industry was flourishing. They could get quite a bit more money working in the private sector than we were able to afford. So we did have resignations as well as retirements, and we hadn't budgeted enough money to replace those folks.

Another problem that we run into. The forest management reviews which are held between the region and the head office to determine how funds are spent: that actually happens during the winter, so we don't have all the information that we need in a timely manner to get it into the budget, into this subprogram. Additionally, funds for things like the Junior Forest Wardens program and the insect and disease program in the regions, they too are difficult to forecast in time to get into the subprogram, so we have those coming along at a later date. They all contributed to this overexpenditure.

If I could just take a moment to talk a bit about the junior forest ranger and warden program. It's an excellent program. We have some 1,400 people aged 16 to 18 involved in the program, 445 volunteers, some 63 clubs. It's a program that we support. We believe very strongly in it. It has a real take-up in the communities. We just simply can't accommodate everyone, though, but we did contribute a fair amount of money to that program and have contributed to this. So a \$1.578 million overexpenditure.

9:42

MR. KLAPSTEIN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ms Blakeman, followed by Mr. Lougheed.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you very much. I am compelled by the Member for Spruce Grove-Sturgeon-St. Albert and also by a constituent in Edmonton-Riverview to ask the minister -- this is on automated recreational fishing and licence system. The reference is on pages 23, 24 in the department report. My question is: what cost-benefit analysis was conducted by Environmental Protection in '97-98 to determine that the automated recreational fishing and hunting licence system and the privatized management of the licensing business has created greater efficiencies and improved service delivery?

MR. LUND: I'll have to refer to one of our natural resources . . . Okay; Dr. Morley Barrett can. I've forgotten the number exactly, but I want to put it on the record.

DR. BARRETT: I may not be able to give you the exact number either, but I can tell you that we had committed to doing this as part

of the series of three-year business plans the government brought in. This was identified as part of the third-year plans, where we were trying and dedicated to moving those functions that could be just as easily or better delivered in the private sector out of the department to just that source, to the private industry.

In that case the number of staff that we had on for the busy seasons -- it was costing us in the order of several hundreds of thousands of dollars to do that and hire special staff for a very narrow period of time, for the hunting seasons. For the fishing licences, the same. It was not particularly efficient. When we sold most of them through our office -- of course, a high proportion of the hunting licences particularly were sold in our offices. They were only open during office hours and not available to folks in non office hour periods, not available on weekends.

From a fishing licence perspective it's important to know that the vast majority of them were already out and being sold in the private sector. More than 80 percent of them were already sold by private vendors throughout the province. So it made it more efficient to privatize the whole operation, combine them, because we had hunting licence vendors separate from fishing licence vendors. It was costing us a lot of money to get information to over 1,100 vendors, some of whom only sold part of the information and part of the licences available. We wanted to consolidate it and make all of them full-service folks, make them available seven days a week, make them available in some cases 24 hours a day. So that was some of the incentive. We'd already earmarked the dollars and the staffing costs of doing those things in-house to disappear from the department budget in the third year of the first set of business plans, and that happened. Those folks were downsized. They were let go, and we did privatize.

I would be pleased, if you wish, to respond on those beyond this budget period to what we think is the success of the program, but that goes beyond the period we're dealing with.

MR. LUND: Just to add to those comments. Also, by getting into this system, we now have right up-to-date information for the management within the department. For example, we know exactly on a day-to-day basis how many licences are sold, something we didn't have before. We were always way behind, particularly when it got to fishing licences, because the vendor didn't turn them in for maybe two months. We were way behind in that information.

Also, as far as enforcement is concerned, under the old system, where things were written out by hand, there were lots of mistakes. In fact, a person that could maybe have had his licence suspended sometimes turned around and got another licence because there would be a mistake in the address or the computers wouldn't pick it up. Now with the new system, with the swipe card, that's not going to happen. That number is there. Their WIN number is there. It's identified to an individual, so if there's an enforcement against that WIN number, they won't get a licence. That's another side benefit. It's not just the dollars that we save but all these other benefits that were attached to going to this automated system.

MS BLAKEMAN: Okay. I would certainly like to take the minister up on the offer to provide the cost-benefit analysis through the chairman.

My supplementary is also on fish and analysis, the wildlife tracking, in particular the chips that are put into some of the fish to track them. I'm wondering if these are Y2K compliant, or have we embedded these chips in fish -- oh, dear; I am so sorry. Well, it will give us a bit of amusement this morning. The point is that these fish now have these electronic chips embedded in them, and they're part of longitudinal studies and tracking. So we could have years of information, supposedly, in these fish, hit Y2K, and the information



is gone. How do these work? Has this been addressed? Was it addressed in this fiscal year?

MR. LUND: Well, once again I'll have our assistant deputy minister answer, but I'll tell you we're not going to go out and catch the fish and change the chip.

DR. BARRETT: Perhaps I'll just comment on that. Typically, when fish are marked, it's done in more than one form. For example, a little tag called a floy tag often is put in along the fin near the back which has a number that can be read. Some of them have a bar code type of arrangement, which you're referring to, which can be electronically read. Those aren't the majority of markings, because those only work particularly when you have the fish moving past some automated reader system such as a spawning migration or when you're catching them to do a spawning study such as bull trout going up a water course to spawn.

If you have a lake situation, you don't have them swimming by your reader, like a bar code reader, so you can't use those. The majority of them are in situations, if we wanted to, where we know the spawners, like bull trout, where these major studies go on. We do handle them, and we do measure growth rates, maturity rates, size, changes from year to year. So we could if we needed to. When we go back, the ones put in this fiscal year, I'm sure, are probably not even functioning anymore because some of these tags only have a certain life span. We don't consider it a problem in terms of being able to continue the data, gathering it all.

MS BLAKEMAN: Thank you. I'm taking you absolutely seriously. It's just the idea of swiping fish with bar codes on them. It was a worthwhile question. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRMAN: Presumably you swipe before you put the batter on; right?

MR. LOUGHEED: Looking at page 97 of your annual report, at 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 there's a great deal of capital budgeted. What would that capital go towards?

MR. LUND: That was primarily a new fire information resource environment system. What this system will do is allow forest protection personnel both in the regions and in the head office to obtain accurate and current fire and weather detection and aircraft/manpower information and links all of this information into the operation's use. In forest management the budget was allocated to further the work done on the environment management system so that funds were also budgeted to continue the development and implementation of the timber production revenue system, and that calculates and tracks all moneys received by the department from the sale of the province's timber resource. So those are the two areas that we were upgrading and needing some capital dollars on.

9:52

MR. LOUGHEED: You need to be commended for your acronym.

Is that the extent of your expenditure in that one area, or are there other capital expenditures besides that?

MR. LUND: Well, no. We're doing some other systems as well. The forest insect and disease operation, the FIDO system -- we get more acronyms in this department. That's another one. What that one does is it's specialized information with regard to insect and disease control and spraying operations and sampling statistics, contract, and aircraft information. Additionally, business area analysis was done to determine if the current inventory management system should or could be redesigned to fit into Imagis.

We're also into the implementation of FIRES, which is incidentally the fire information resource environment system, and FIDO so that actually down the way these will reduce our costs on a provincewide basis for the information we need. Also, it'll be compatible with the Imagis system, which is another computer system that we use within the department -- well, not only in the department; that one's used right across government -- so we can have these systems talking to one another and be able to provide the information in a more accurate and timely manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Dr. Pannu, to finish up.

DR. PANNU: Mr. Minister, your ministry completed its review of the northern river basins study report and committed Alberta to action in such areas as pollution prevention, science-based ecological management, the resolution of contaminant and nutrient issues, continued environmental research, and I want to underline this next part, and open and full public participation in basin management decisions.

I am especially interested in your view of this "open and full public participation" model. Could you specify the initiatives and measures you have adopted to create such open and full participatory models and their success? I'm quoting you almost verbatim from page 18 of your department's annual report. It's the column on the left-hand side, the second paragraph, and then going up to the top of the next column on the same page.

MR. LUND: Page 18?

DR. PANNU: Page 18.

MR. LUND: Okay. The reason I was questioning is because 18 is the Bow River quality, and on this one you're talking about the northern river basin study.

Maybe to get a complete answer, I'll have the assistant deputy minister in charge of this area respond.

DR. BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. Minister. There are actually three things, sir, that I think are relevant to this issue. In a direct follow-up from the northern river basins study, there is now a second in a series of ecological studies going on, in which we are partnering with the federal government to continue some of the research identified as the priorities in that. The funds are committed, and it is under way. So that has been good news. There are some new federal dollars matching and on the table with us, so we're pleased with that.

Another thing I would add. The Mackenzie River Basin Committee has been structured, and of course Alberta is a major player with that, looking at the issues and water quality issues as well within the jurisdictions involved in that: the two territories, Alberta, British Columbia, and Saskatchewan.

Perhaps the most significant thing, I think, is something that came through with the passage of the new water act, that came into force on January 1 of this year. There's a requirement that the river basin plan and a framework for river basin planning be established and developed within three years. We actually have a draft of that planning framework now, and it'll be going out for a very broad public review. It'll allow for public participation and consultation in all the development of all the basin plans throughout the province. So that will be becoming public.

It's well in advance of the three years. We hope to have all the consultation done and actually arrive at an agreed framework in half that time, hopefully within a year from now or thereabouts, which

would be certainly within 18 months instead of the three-year period, so that we can begin using this framework in the detailed river basin plans, which will allow for steady and broad public involvement.

DR. PANNU: A supplementary. Who was consulted? You mentioned that you're almost near the completion of the consultation process in the preparation of this.

DR. BARRETT: Oh, no. I'm sorry. The consultation process on the framework will be broadly distributed. It's just about to be. We have just put together as a department, in working with some colleagues in the department that are going to be involved, a position paper which is going out for consultation. So over the next year we'll be interacting with folks to arrive at what all parties can agree to as an appropriate planning framework. That will just be coming out in the near future to folks. There will be lots of opportunity for that, and that will be a template for going forward in Alberta for the river basin planning system throughout the province. But that is not fixed. That's just a starting point.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to thank the minister and his staff from the committee. I gather the minister will continue championing the areas of responsibility -- junior foresters, FIDO, and chips and fish -- in the department.

Committee, we have a couple of items to deal with first before we retire for the day. Might we have a motion on the minutes as presented?

MS BLAKEMAN: There's a correction.

THE CHAIRMAN: A question on the minutes? A correction? Okay.

MS BLAKEMAN: My mike is on. If it's okay, I'll just go. I note that the spelling of one of the members of the committee is slightly incorrect, and I'm wondering if that could be corrected. For the hon. Member for Edmonton-Glenora, the spelling of the name is S-a-p-e-r-s. That is the correct spelling of the name. Therefore when it's in the possessive, the apostrophe follows. It's a small detail but . . .

THE CHAIRMAN: Could you point out page 17 under item 3, "The Chairman invited . . . Mr. Sapers"? Is that the location?

MS BLAKEMAN: It's consistent throughout the document, so if I could ask that there be a general note there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. SAPERS: There's one other.

THE CHAIRMAN: And another one, sir?

MR. SAPERS: Sorry. I just note that the minutes don't fully reflect the *Hansard* in terms of discussion on the motion, particularly, Mr. Chairman, after you vacated the chair and joined the discussion. The minutes reflect you added to the motion but then don't reflect additional comments by myself and Mr. Hlady and Dr. Pannu, I believe. I think the minutes should reflect the fullness of the debate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Would "and further discussion took place" satisfy your concerns? You have an amendment, then, to the minutes. We have one amendment to the minutes as it is now.

10:02

MR. SAPERS: Only just to note that the minutes should reflect the

contributions made in debate by Calgary-Mountain View and Edmonton-Glenora. Actually I think Edmonton-Strathcona's comments came also after the deputy chairman. So if the minutes could just reflect that. They're complete up until that point. If they could reflect that as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So I take it that the amendment would be the inclusion of a line or two describing the number of speakers that spoke after the motion was put. That's right?

Yes, Mrs. O'Neill.

MRS. O'NEILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it would be very difficult -- and I'm sure it was -- to record the minutes from this, and while we do have *Hansard*, as I understand, I'm wondering if with respect to this it might be more appropriate just to reference *Hansard*. It was a sensitive meeting, a sensitive topic. Mr. Sapers has asked for the inclusion of I don't know how much with respect to -- I don't know whether they're his comments or someone else's comments. If so, there are other comments that are absent from the rest of it, and I don't want to get into the question of saying: well, if we include this, we should include that. So I don't know how to handle it, but I do make that observation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, the text of what has been said is in *Hansard*, but what the mover of the amending motion wanted was just to note that various speakers spoke on the subject, not the essence of their contribution but that they did contribute. That's merely it. Is that acceptable?

MRS. O'NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I'm saying there are other speakers who spoke on the topic prior to that point that are not recorded in here too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Perhaps what we could do is lay this matter over then, and those of us that have some input, if you could make a note and leave it with the secretary as to what you wish included. We'll discuss it, and we'll bring back another copy a week hence. Sound reasonable?

Dr. Pannu, your contribution.

DR. PANNU: Rather than every one of us calling the office, I think the point has been made that from a certain point on in that meeting certain members of this committee made statements. Those names have been noted, I trust. So it's only those names that are missing now that need to be added.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not the subject matter but just that they were noted. Between the secretary and myself, we'll do the best we can to note all those contributions then. Is that reasonable?

Mrs. O'Neill.

MRS. O'NEILL: Yes. I would rather us not have to contact and do that. I'd be happy to leave it to her discretion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we'll do the best we can and prepare it for your review next week. Reasonable?

A motion to adjourn. Mr. Hlady? Is it agreed? It's carried.

[The committee adjourned at 10:05 a.m.]