

[Chairman: Mr. Kowalski]

[2 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon, and welcome to another meeting of the standing committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Welcome to Mrs. Louise Empson, who is filling in for Miss Conroy this afternoon.

When we put out the agenda and the scheduled appearances, we slated a discussion of recommendations today, Tuesday, August 27. Committee members will recall that the manner in which we arrived at how we were going to be dealing with the recommendations is that committee members will have an opportunity to put forward recommendations until the last meeting of this committee. So today is simply an opening opportunity for recommendations to be put forward by committee members, if they have any today.

The suggestion might be that we simply have them read into the record and come back at a later meeting for discussion of the recommendations. That, in essence, would allow committee members to contemplate the meaning of recommendations set forth today. That's one approach we could take with it. If there's another approach or a different suggestion, of course, this committee operates within its own basic rules, so we can determine our own rules as we go along.

Following our discussion on recommendations this afternoon, I'd like to deal with several administrative matters, so I ask you not to simply get up and leave after we've concluded with that.

If that is basically the manner in which you feel most comfortable, we'll throw the meeting open to those individuals who would like to put forth a recommendation today. Today's opportunity is simply to have the recommendation read into the record. If you want to give a brief explanation, so be it. We can come back at a later date for a fuller explanation and an exchange of views among committee members with respect to that.

MR. R. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to read into the record one recommendation for consideration by this committee. It is that there be a section in the Alberta heritage trust fund annual report, separate from the balance sheet, that lists all the assets acquired with fund moneys but shown as assets on other

government agencies' balance sheets; an example is hospitals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have no copy of the recommendation in front of me. Is there any explanation you want to give with respect to it?

MR. R. MOORE: Yes. I'll provide you with a copy of that particular recommendation, Mr. Chairman. The reason for it is that so many funds from the heritage trust fund are spent and end up on the balance sheets of other government agencies. It doesn't show to the credit of the heritage trust fund exactly what was acquired. So the public understands where moneys are going and what has happened with fund money, I think it would be very beneficial to have a sheet in there, other than in the balance sheet, that shows these as being assets acquired from the fund. If it's in the balance sheet of the Alberta heritage trust fund and in the balance sheet of some other government agency, then we have double the amount of assets that are actually out there as far as the government's position is concerned. That's why I say that it should be on a sheet separate from the balance sheet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. In the past there were no questions addressed to the mover of a recommendation at this point in time, but if committee members want to raise questions with Mr. Moore about this proposal at this time, so be it.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Moore talking about deemed assets, or is it separate from the deemed assets that are listed on the financial statement?

MR. R. MOORE: Yes. This is a separate issue from deemed assets.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Chairman, I have two recommendations that I would like to propose to the committee. The first has to do with deemed assets. As I wrote it out, it is that the deemed assets of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund not be included in the financial statement but be listed separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if you have any further information you want to provide at this

time.

MR. THOMPSON: As I recall from when the Auditor General sat before the committee several weeks ago, he has been battling with this in his own mind for years. Secondly, I believe it gives an unrealistic number as far as the fund is concerned. It's an asset. We've spent money on it, and I think we should have that listed in our annual report. To put Kananaskis park in the financial statement as an asset — obviously, there's no way you're going to sell Kananaskis park to anybody. It has value, but it isn't a value that I think should be in the financial statement.

MRS. CRIPPS: If you need a seconder, I'll second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments to be made with respect to recommendation 2? Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: My next recommendation is that the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research be encouraged to investigate the upcoming increase in industrial disease with the object of doing research in that area. I feel very strongly that we are just beginning to see that workers' compensation in industry in the country is going to become an increasing problem in the future. I think there should be some research done in that area.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, if you're still accepting recommendations . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm still dealing with the one Mr. Thompson has on the floor.

MR. COOK: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you on this one? Okay, then, Mr. Cook.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, similar to the recommendation of last year, I'd like to suggest that we fund a research foundation modelled on the medical research foundation to promote pure and applied research in engineering, agriculture, and base sciences.

MR. THOMPSON: Does that mean that we scrap the existing programs in those areas?

MR. COOK: Certainly not, Mr. Chairman, just as we haven't scrapped medical research funded from other sources. This would be modelled on the medical research foundation. If research is being done already, it would simply be an add-on.

MR. NELSON: Mr. Chairman, I thought it might be useful to put forward an item with regard to occupational health and safety. I would like to resolve that the occupational health and safety heritage grant program expand its mandate to encourage funding to postsecondary institutions, such as SAIT and NAIT or other trade institutions, to teach occupational health and safety to students before they are in the work force rather than not have them taught at all. To expand on the reasoning for this, of course, is the fact that it seems to me that rather than having material sent out to the workplace or sending out occupational health and safety officers after somebody has been injured because they didn't know how to handle themselves in a particular area, this may be useful in assisting programs. Rather than doing research, we can put something into development.

Research is a very easy word to expand with, because it really means just that: to look into something. Let's develop something. I think in developing a program, we'll be there to utilize the knowledge of occupational health and safety people in the classrooms of some of these trade schools. It may in fact generate some interest in safety in the programs that are being taught and developed there, and therefore may save some injuries and lives at a future date when people go out into the work force and use this as part of their educational curriculum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be any further . . . Mr. Speaker, on this motion? Would there be additional comments on Mr. Nelson's motion? Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I don't know whether I have this worded well enough, but I'd like to move that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund capital base be maintained by the investment earnings being retained by the fund. In our interview with the Premier the other day we talked about maintaining the integrity and value of the fund. One of the ways I see that being done is to retain in the fund the investment earnings,

say 12 or 13 percent of earnings, which amounts to \$1.5 billion. This would give the fund not only the capability to maintain that integrity but, secondly, some growth capability to look at new investments or new innovations and, as well, meet those four objectives we established back in 1976.

My latter statements are the intent of the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments on Mr. Speaker's motion?

MRS. CRIPPS: Just a question. The Premier was talking about maintaining the integrity of the fund in regard to inflationary rises so that it maintains its present value. You're not really talking about that. You're actually talking about maintaining the integrity and increasing the fund?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Partly. Under the present circumstances, I think we can meet all three objectives: the one you've added that I didn't add; that is, completing the ongoing programs that are in the fund by using the earnings. Secondly, allowing for inflationary costs as to responsibilities of the fund — that could be done. Thirdly, there would be some capability in that \$1.5 billion to initiate new ideas. So those three things could be accomplished, yours included. I'm sorry I missed that when I said it.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I support what Mr. Speaker said. I was going to go a step further. Hopefully the economy of the province is improving. According to forecasts, it's supposed to be one of the best in Canada in the not too distant future in terms of growth. My suggestion is that we start and for the first year, say, put approximately 5 percent of our revenues into the fund. If we increase that each year by 5 percent, it's going to take us 20 years to get back to the original basis. I do feel that there's too much of a cushion there now, that we are getting things into the fund that should be paid for more by the present generation rather than putting it into the future. I think we are defeating the original purpose of the fund if we continue to use the revenues that are generated by it and not be prepared to put more back in for future generations as a savings.

It's all very well to say that we have one of

the lowest cost/debt records in Canada. That could indicate that maybe your financing isn't in good order, when you look at what inflation does and things of this nature. While I'm not suggesting that we become reckless with our money and have a debt load like the federal government . . . I don't think we need to have the 7 percent sales tax to all people on products in Alberta as some are suggesting. What I'm saying is that I think there is opportunity to strengthen the fund and the time to start thinking about it is now and not at some distant time in the future.

MR. COOK: On this issue, Mr. Chairman. At the same time we've had the recommendation by Mr. Speaker on this idea, it's also worth noting that members of the opposition in the House have advocated that we not put money in savings accounts but rather use it to kick-start the economy. I find it difficult to understand the concept that the heritage fund as an organization should be increasing its savings account at a time when I think most Albertans, who are dependent on the construction industry, especially at my end of the city, find it difficult to see how the fund is helping them create employment.

I would like to add a word of caution. Members ought to consider that it may not be the right time. Although I think the concept is sound, I'd like to suggest that right now we ought to be using the money creatively to create employment in the province.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional comments at this point in time?

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of clarification. We're not here to debate the relative merits. It's just for clarification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll have the opportunity at a later time to do that, and then we'll finally have an opportunity to vote on them. There are basically three mechanisms.

MR. MARTIN: I'm aware of that process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for that assistance, Mr. Martin.

Do any committee members want to bring forth another recommendation at this time? Mr. Musgreave.

MR. MUSGREAVE: My debate is in three parts. This should interest the hon. member behind me. First of all, I think it's time that this committee had a debate on the philosophy of the fund. I find that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me, Mr. Musgreave. Are you commenting on Mr. Speaker's?

MR. MUSGREAVE: No. You asked for more recommendations. This is my recommendation.

MRS. CRIPPS: It's just his preamble.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Is that all right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'd like to point out to the hon. Member for Drayton Valley that this is not my preamble. I am recommending that we have a debate on the philosophy of the fund: where it's going; if it's achieving what we originally set out. Secondly, as I mentioned earlier, I think we should be starting to put some of our revenue back into the fund. Third is one of the recommendations made by the president of the Alberta Energy Company to the hearings in Calgary on the white paper. I think we as a government and as a society should be concerned about things that are happening in our communities. I had the misfortune to grow up in the '30s in Calgary, and I know what it was like to be a family that had problems feeding themselves. I think it's shocking that in this rich society in which we live, so many of our citizens still have to depend on food banks in order to survive. I think that's a responsibility that all of us should be concerned about.

Second is something that Mr. Mitchell mentioned. I know it's very difficult, but I think we should be more concerned than we are about the people that are unemployed, as Mr. Cook mentioned. I would like to suggest that somehow we consider some method or scheme or something whereby we could say that we know the inflation rate is down, we know interest costs are down -- that we recognize all these factors -- but the unemployment rate is still much too high. One of our main objectives as a province should be to bring it down, and we should be using the fund to try to do it.

Those are the three areas of debate that I think we as members of this committee should

consider, Mr. Chairman, and I'll have another recommendation later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate what you're saying. The difficulty I have is trying to get what you're saying into a recommendation, but perhaps by the next time we deal with this you'll have it worded in a recommendation that all members of the committee would be able to zero in on.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, this is a new recommendation. Is that on point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll pre-empt you by one. He has another another one he wants to deal with, and then we'll go to you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Having said all those things, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to recommend is that the capital funding of the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research be reimbursed for the capital projects they are undertaking in Calgary and Edmonton, which were not part of their original mandate. Because of their programs they have to build these clinical laboratories, which, I understand, are costing them approximately \$60 million in both cities. I think we should be reimbursing the fund so that it gets back to its original \$300 million.

MRS. CRIPPS: Question. Would there be a caveat on that so that other groups that have received moneys from the fund would not expect to have the same reimbursement if they embarked on projects which were essentially outside their original mandate?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we have any others. The only ones I can think of are Vencap or AOSTRA or some of those. I don't think the same thing would apply.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I have three more suggestions. I don't want to hog the time, so if you want, I can present one and then let other members come in.

I'd like to suggest that we consolidate all medical research activity funded by the heritage fund into the heritage medical research foundation. In particular, there was a discussion on cancer and heart research. Their programming is about to terminate, and it

would make good sense to bring it all under one program so that the administration is not duplicated.

If you like, I can go on to a second recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we'll deal with Mr. Gogo's and then come back to you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman I want to make a comment in the event that, for whatever happens, I can't be at the next meeting in terms of the recommendations. I want to point out a couple of factors. I urge committee members, when making recommendations, to consider the history of the great state of Oklahoma, at one time the oil capital of America, which now has more food stamps per capita than any state in America, notwithstanding South Carolina. Those who refuse to save for tomorrow are regretting it today. I also remind people that we have a budget about \$2 billion higher than British Columbia, our sister to the west, notwithstanding their billion dollar deficit, and if we're not now the greatest spender in Canada, I don't know who is.

I caution members who want to put up bricks and mortar to realize . . . One extreme is a hospital that in operating repeats its total cost every 30 months. Whatever building is put up is going to have to be operated, and to those of us as MLAs who have not learned the lesson of the major facility program under Mr. Trynchy's department, where we're continually having to bail out people because they can't operate: don't look at construction as a panacea to solve all problems.

At the same time, I recognize that in a democracy it's difficult to be saving the money we're saving at the same time we're collecting the taxes we're collecting. That's why the heritage fund is unique. Although I'll be making recommendations later as to what I think we should be doing, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to get those words out so that members may consider that before they make their recommendations.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sensitive to the remarks of my colleague from Lethbridge West, but I think this will go a long way to providing another base industry. Oklahoma is sort of a two-horse town.

I'd like to recommend that we . . .

MR. GOGO: That's probably off the record, is it Rollie?

MR. COOK: Yes, it is.

MR. GOGO: With our free trade talk, I don't think we should be talking.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to recommend that we support the request of the heritage medical research foundation to increase their endowment to generate sufficient funds over the longer term to maintain their program at roughly a \$51 million or \$52 million expenditure on research each year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You said you had another one, Mr. Cook?

MR. COOK: Yes, sir. I'd also like to propose that we consider developing a second major recreation park on the east slope of the Rockies to promote tourism as another base industry in the province of Alberta.

MRS. CRIPPS: That's good; Drayton Valley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any need for questions to be addressed to Mr. Cook for clarification on recommendation 3?

MR. COOK: My colleague from Drayton Valley has indicated her support.

MRS. CRIPPS: Well, on the assumption.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I didn't hear the location.

MR. COOK: Mr. Chairman, I just suggested the east slope of the Rockies. It could be anywhere from the U.S. border to Grande Prairie — up in there.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Chairman, I would like to put forward a recommendation that on a biennial basis an appraisal be made of all the assets of the heritage trust fund on a market value basis, so we know and have a statement put out as to the market value of the fund as of that particular date, say, July 1 or the end of the fiscal year, March 31 — whatever would be convenient. I'm realizing the cost of making an appraisal, so I figure it would be good enough to

have it done once every two years.

MRS. CRIPPS: Question. Unless you were considering the sale of the assets, and given the discussion I had with the Auditor General on the changing value of assets and how that's impossible to correlate, what would be the value of such a . . .

MR. ZIP: People do net worth evaluations all the time in the private sector. I think it's only logical and sensible to do it for the heritage trust fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would there be additional recommendations coming forth from committee members at this time?

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, I had a recommendation. A couple of other members have put one forward, and maybe I just need a little guidance here. Mine was related to the medical research foundation. I was going to take the first part of No. 4 of last year. It would read:

That the Committee recommend the government examine the long term future of the \$300 million endowment fund for the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research.

Leave the rest off for the reason that the recommendation of one of the other members suggested that the approximately \$60 million they're spending on construction be replaced. Because of the exchange I had with the Premier yesterday and the other questions I asked on the thing, my concern is that we have something in place where some talk would go on with them, especially when this six-year medical renewal comes through, so that there's something there recommending that if the findings of that review seem to us to be reasonable, there would be some movement so that we can maintain the fund and do what it was originally supposed to do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're just making a comment now with respect to recommendation 3 that you proposed?

MR. HYLAND: Yes; No. 4 of last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. No. 4 of last year. You're not bringing forth another

recommendation at this point? This is just clarification that you're providing the committee with.

MR. HYLAND: Well, that's the guidance I'm wondering about. I wonder if mine is really a duplication of what some of the others have outlined. Maybe when we read them we can see and just cross that one off. It might be covered, but it might not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would additional recommendations be forthcoming?

MR. GOGO: Mr. Chairman, members may recall that last year, as a result of having the medical foundation appear before us, I recommended that the heritage fund look toward a study in regard to pain control. That was elaborated by the Member for Calgary McKnight, I think, into areas that would concern not a minority group but a group representing fully 50 percent of Albertans; that is, women. Mr. Cook, from Edmonton Glengarry, then rounded out the recommendation which appeared. That was almost a social envelope to include gerontology, women's issues, pain control, social sciences, and some others. As I recall, we received a response from the Provincial Treasurer that this was now being done in many ways, many facets, in the university community.

It is my intention to pursue that again this year in some form of recommendation, and I'd like committee members to be aware of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So you're giving the committee notice at this point in time that you'll be coming back with a recommendation?

MR. GOGO: In fairness, Mr. Chairman, I ask members if, before the next meeting, they would read the response we had. I think we could fine-tune that. I seriously believe that we could narrow it down to a place where it would hopefully be acceptable to the government of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there additional discussion at this time with respect to those recommendations? The Hansard of today's meeting should be out no later than Thursday, I think. I'd very much appreciate it if each committee member who made a suggestion

today would formulate a specific recommendation from today's Hansard. We could read it into the record at the next meeting so that it becomes a manageable item for discussion and debate. It's very difficult to follow the gist of some of the recommendations unless they're worded in such a way that they begin with a capital letter and end with a period and come right to the point.

Might I also note again that in the past as chairman of this committee I did not vote on any of the recommendations presented by committee members unless it was a case of needing to break a tie. As I recall, we've only had one experience in the past where I had to vote to break a tie. I requested that with your concurrence I would not have to give an explanation as to why I voted one way or the other. I simply voted, and we went on to the next one. It would be my intent to follow that same procedure so that I can be as absolutely neutral as possible in all of these discussions and provide my most objective overview in the most magnanimous way.

Having said that, as we go through the agenda, we're going to be meeting with Mr. Trynchy at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. Mr. Trynchy has had the tradition of coming with an audiovisual presentation. We'll be meeting in room 312 to see the update on the beauties of Alberta, and then we'll come back here for the remainder of the discussion with Mr. Trynchy. Tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock we have Mr. Fjordbotten, the Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps tomorrow we'll have no further discussion of recommendations.

On Thursday Mr. Bradley will be in at 10 o'clock in the morning, and if we do not go to 12 o'clock with Mr. Bradley, perhaps that would be an opportunity to read into the record any further recommendations committee members have.

On Wednesday, September 4, we have Mr. Johnston scheduled to appear before us in the morning. While we have two hours allocated to Mr. Johnston, tradition suggests that Mr. Johnston has never really had to remain before the committee for a full two-hour session, so perhaps next Wednesday we might get back to a formal second approach to these recommendations and, of course, also go back to anybody who wants to add a recommendation for the first time.

Next Wednesday, September 4, we have Mr.

Sparrow scheduled in the afternoon. Mr. Sparrow has advised me that he will have difficulty maintaining that. I would like to keep that meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 4. Mr. Sparrow has asked that we consider meeting with him on Thursday afternoon, September 12, at 2 o'clock. So the schedule will not change. We will add one meeting on Thursday, September 12, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Would that cause a difficulty for committee members? Then we will arrange such. Thank you. We'll have a revised piece of paper provided to you tomorrow with respect to that.

One other matter that one committee member brought to my attention is the desire of committee members in the past to visit Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund irrigation projects in the southern part of the province. Mr. Hyland has outlined a proposal of such a visit. I'll ask Mr. Hyland to convey to all members what this visit might be, and then we'll have a discussion as to whether or not committee members want to do it.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Chairman, normally when either the Department of Agriculture or the irrigation association have an irrigation tour, they have two parts to it: partly headworks and partly rehabilitation. That's the outline that I suggest. It would start roughly — and all these times are very rough — at 9:30 in the morning at the Lethbridge airport, because I think that's the time the Time Air flight gets in from the north. That allows for only one overnight. I suggest we tour part of the St. Mary irrigation district, the main canal going south from the airport toward the headworks, possibly look at the St. Mary reservoir, Waterton dam, and on the way go through the changes and upgrading that the Raymond and Magrath irrigation districts have done through their districts, because it's on the way out; then back from Cardston, or from whichever reservoir we are at last, to look at the LID weir and the flume across the Oldman River, which is new upgrading and part of the rehabilitation of the Lethbridge Northern main canal, to have a look at Keho Lake, and then possibly the evening in Lethbridge with a reception with the Irrigation Projects Association, if we so desire.

The second day would see us heading in the other direction: along St. Mary main canal works and their upgrading, through Chin and

Stafford reservoirs, through Taber Irrigation District, on to see the Forty Mile siphon that was constructed last year and the site of the recently announced Forty Mile reservoir, have a look at the lateral south of Bow Island -- it's a totally pressurized lateral from one central point; about 6,000 acres are irrigated out of that -- maybe a reception of some sort in Bow Island, and return to Lethbridge for the night or to catch a plane or whatever.

Mr. Chairman, that's without talking to anybody. That's something Mr. Thompson and I drew up roughly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are no proposed dates at this time? But it seems to me, Mr. Hyland, you had indicated that there was a caveat in terms of water flow?

MR. HYLAND: Yes. I'm not sure when Lethbridge Northern shuts off, but St. Mary usually shuts off about October 10. I think Mr. Speaker would agree that it would be better before that date, so you could see most of the canals in operation. You could really see the upgrading and the changes in them if they're only about half full, which they will probably be from now till fall. If we get later than that, you'll still see the upgrading, but you won't see any water in them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps we could have questions for clarification before we determine whether or not this is something committee members want to do. Mr. Zip, do you have a question you want to raise? [interjections] Perhaps, Mr. Nelson, we might go to Mr. Zip first and he could speak into the mike so everybody could hear.

MR. ZIP: I think it's an excellent idea. I have never had an opportunity to view the irrigation works, and this certainly would be a great help to me to have a greater appreciation of what has been done. I recommend that we go ahead with this and set a date sometime before the end of September.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Nelson, did you have a comment?

MR. NELSON: Good idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there general agreement

that the committee should do this?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That being the case, perhaps by tomorrow all committee members might take a look at their schedules to see what two days might be most appropriate between now and October 10. Is that it?

MR. HYLAND: Some of them are talking about shutting off sooner this year, because they're starting construction earlier.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The Bow River is shutting down. We can't fall-irrigate or anything, so it's very low at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hyland, I would imagine, as well, that this overview could be scheduled in such a way that if a committee member said, "Well, I can only go for one day, not two days", they could come in and out.

MR. HYLAND: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Could I ask you and whichever colleagues you have in the committee to work with you to come back to us with a more formal kind of approach for a visit; in other words, times and places?

MR. HYLAND: Do you want that by tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

Would there be additional business the committee would like to raise at this point in time?

MR. R. MOORE: I move we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If there's no further business, we'll accept your motion for adjournment. Thank you very much. We'll see you tomorrow morning in room 312 at 10 o'clock.

[The committee adjourned at 2:41 p.m.]