

8:31 a.m.

Wednesday, April 29, 1992

[Chairman: Mr. Pashak]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I'll call the first meeting of the public accounts for the Fourth Session of the 22nd Legislature of the province of Alberta to order.

MR. TAYLOR: In the year of our Lord 1992.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, 1992.

I'd like to welcome all members back, especially our new members, Mr. Barry McFarland; Christie Mjolsness, who's been on the committee before but returns this year; Nick Taylor, and I understand that it's his first time on the committee. We also have another member from the New Democrats on the committee for the first time, Mr. Jerry Doyle. I welcome him. Stand up, Jerry, please.

Also with us this morning we have our Auditor General, Mr. Donald Salmon. With him are his senior assistant Auditor General, Mr. Andrew Wingate, and his senior director, Merwan Saher. We welcome all of you gentlemen, and for the benefit of new members to the committee, the Auditor General and one or two of his associates always attends our Public Accounts Committee meetings. He'll bring with him an associate who's responsible for the auditor of the minister whose department is under review at a given point in time.

I've had circulated an agenda. Would any member of the committee care to move the adoption of the agenda as distributed?

MRS. OSTERMAN: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mrs. Osterman. Those in favour of adopting the agenda, then, as distributed? Approved? I understand that one of the members might want to add to the agenda.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, under Other Business I intend to give notice of a motion that I'd like to have considered at our next meeting. Would you like me to read the motion now or at that time?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think at that time will be fine, if that's okay with the members.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if it wouldn't be proper for the Auditor General to be allowed to move a little to the side because that's not a very pleasant place to be sitting with the sun shining in your eyes like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I've already raised that issue with the Auditor General, and he's quite comfortable to remain where he is. I think he's anticipating that by the time we get to the Auditor General on the agenda, the sun will have moved behind the pillar and he will be out of the spotlight, so to speak.

The first item on the agenda is to provide new members – essentially, this is for the purpose of the new members – with a brief description of how the committee operates and the authority of the committee. Basically the authority for this committee is contained in the Standing Orders. The Standing Orders provide only a very limited reference to the Public Accounts Committee. It says only that we shall examine the public accounts. Until last year we have not been able to report back to the Assembly, but last year's budget contained authorization to have a written report

of our activities prepared. A proposed written report is contained in the notice of this meeting that was circulated, and we'll get to that somewhat later on the agenda.

Our budget for this year has already been approved by the Members' Services Committee. For the benefit again of new members, the budget does not permit us to meet outside of session. All of our meetings will take place during the session itself.

With respect to the conduct of the meetings, I'm the Chair. I don't know whether you know this or not, but chairs of committees have virtually all the powers of the Speaker of the Assembly other than the fact that I can't name members, technical things. So I can't eject you out of the committee, but I can suspend the meeting of the committee should it prove to be unruly, but that has never occurred. I can restore order by taking any concerns that I have back to the full Legislature itself.

With respect to questions, that really is my major function on this committee. I try to recognize members that want to put questions to our guests, and I try to arrange it so that all members from all parties have an opportunity. Then I try to rotate that list in that way. If members should not find themselves with an opportunity to ask questions on a given day, I try to recognize those members at the first opportunity in subsequent meetings of the committee. Basically the committee itself will determine the order in which ministers come before the committee, and they will determine the questioning strategies and that sort of thing.

Are there any questions that anyone would like to raise, any of the new members in particular, about the operation of the committee? Basically, then, it's the cabinet ministers themselves who come before the committee, and we ask questions usually directly of cabinet ministers. They may bring with them members of their departments, and cabinet ministers quite often will ask their guests from their department to respond to particular questions. Usually I invite the cabinet ministers to make, hopefully, a brief opening statement. Some cabinet ministers would like to occupy the whole period with a statement. I try in a gentle way to discourage them from doing that so that members will be able to get their questions in.

MR. TAYLOR: What's the difference between this and the examination of the budget? Does it just go back farther or what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a very good point that Mr. Taylor just raised. It's up to the members themselves to determine just what it is that we examine here in the Public Accounts Committee. Generally speaking, the government members will bring a motion forward restricting our questions to the public accounts for a given year. In this case, it'll be public accounts for the year ended March 31, 1991, and to facilitate the business of the committee, over the years we've found it very helpful if members in putting a question will either refer to a page in the Auditor General's report, a specific recommendation that he's made and ask questions around that specific recommendation, or, if they are asking questions that relate to the public accounts themselves, to mention the page or a line reference or something and focus it in that way.

The reason for that is that if we don't focus on the accounts and actual expenditures or recommendations and we ask broad general questions, often we get into the kinds of debate that go on in the Legislature. Members, I think, would prefer to be more task oriented and get at actual explanations for specific expenditures rather than get into the kind of philosophical debates that occur in the Legislature on occasion. Is that a reasonable explanation in terms of what we try to do in the committee? Would anyone like to add to that? Any other points? Okay.

Sorry; Mr. Lund.

MR. LUND: Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. I certainly don't mean to question your method of handling the meeting, because certainly I think you've done a very good job, but I was a little bit concerned when you mentioned how the speaking order is arrived at. It disturbs me when I see members coming in late and then getting bumped up on the speaking list. I think that certainly if a member is not here, they should not get priority just because they come in late, if they happen to have missed the last meeting. I hope you will consider that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate that correction. I do try to give those members that are here exactly at 8:30 when the meeting begins priority in terms of questioning, and if members are even a minute late, I recognize them after the other. At least I do that within my ability to notice who's here at the time, kind of thing, if I can do that.

All right. Perhaps as part of my report I should mention claiming for these meetings. There is an entitlement in the Members' Services order for members of committees to claim, I believe it is, a hundred dollars a day, even for attending committee meetings while we're in session. I'd just say that in the past year members of the committee from all parties have not made that claim because I guess there's just been a general feeling that one should not make that claim while we're in session. However, that does not prevent any member that does wish to make that claim from making it. I just thought it would be fair to everyone to point out what the past practice has been regarding that issue, though.

#### 8:41

The next item on the agenda is the approval of the report. Maybe just a word of explanation about the report that was prepared on the activities of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts for 1991. You all have a copy of the draft. Now, authorization to prepare and print this report has already been provided. As the Chair of the committee, I could authorize the presentation of this report to all Members of the Legislative Assembly, but I thought I would at least bring it back to this committee to get your reaction, your response to this document, and if you have any concrete suggestions, I'd try to take them into account before I actually release this document.

Before I recognize Mr. Paszkowski, I'd just like to make a further comment, if I may, which is that I shared a copy of this report with the co-chairman of the committee. He expressed some reservations about the fact that not all of the answers to questions that were put to ministers were included in the document. Personally I felt that if we did that, we'd have a very bulky document, and all of that information is contained in the *Hansards* that are made of these meetings. I tried to take into account the co-chairman's concern by rewording the introduction to this document to make it very, very clear that those answers are available. You'll note that on page 1 in the introduction of this report in the last paragraph it says:

All meetings were recorded by *Alberta Hansard*. Complete responses of Ministers and the Auditor General may be found in the transcripts, which are available in the Legislature Library. Any person wishing more detail should refer to the transcripts, which number 97 pages in length and are organized according to subject heading. The minutes are organized in similar fashion.

I think it does provide ample recognition that we did get answers to the questions from ministers, and really all this contains is a list of the questions that were put to cabinet ministers.

We had a budget appropriation of some \$250; I think it cost us less than \$100 to prepare this document. Most of it is just kind of photocopying charges.

Mr. Paszkowski.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly I think the initiative is a good one, and I would encourage it. However, I do have some problems in identifying only questions and not the answers. It seems to me that the questions are also in *Hansard*, and if we want to really be objective and achieve the total goal, I think we have to include the questions and the answers. I like the initiative. I like the effort that's coming forward. With that in mind, I'd like to make a motion

that the public accounts report for '91 be revised to indicate the replies to the questions posed and be brought back to the committee for further review.

I think it's important that *Hansard* does indeed already identify the questions. It has the answers as well, and if this is going to be truly objective, it should include both. Therefore, I make this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion on the floor. As the Chair of the committee, may I comment on that just briefly, or is that reasonable? It's just that I'd like to ask our secretary: how many pages do you think that would include if we covered all the answers? I mean, we'd have the full *Hansards*, then, so it would be about a 200-page document.

MRS. DACYSHYN: I would say at least another 10 or 12 pages, just judging by the number of pages there were in the questions themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is not the practice, by the way. As I understand it, this document is modeled on exactly what the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee does.

In any event, Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, as I recall, I was one of those people who, when this came up at the end of last year's deliberations, spoke in support of you preparing a report, and I continue to do that. But I think that the purpose of a report is usually a summary of what has occurred in *Hansard* and was recorded in *Hansard*. That's to some degree true of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund report and others that come from our committees of the Legislature. In the Heritage Savings Trust Fund report, if I recall correctly, the answers are recorded for at least the Treasurer's response to the recommendations and so forth. There's a kind of a pulling together of the essence or a summary of the debate on both sides. So I support the motion that the Member for Smoky River has made insofar as I think we need a balanced portrayal of questions and answers, highlights, and so on. That's the real purpose of a report, to bring things down into kind of a summary form. Otherwise, for all the committees we could just say go and read *Hansard*.

MR. PAYNE: First, I guess, a response to your comments, Mr. Chairman, and then perhaps a question to the mover of the motion. I infer from your comments that your main concern with the motion would be the bulk of the resulting document, and I'm wondering if I could ask the mover of the motion about when he used the word "indicate." It's kind of a peculiar word: to "indicate" the responses. Did he visualize verbatim, in toto excerpts from *Hansard*, or by "indicate" was he implying a response summary? I think if it were the latter case - let's acknowledge that in a lot of ministerial responses, I mean, there's a lot of wheat in the answer, but there's a lot of chaff also. I don't think it would take very much effort to edit out the chaff and get the substance of the reply. That would make a very readable document and not a very bulky document.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: Certainly I would be prepared to accept a summary. I feel that if we're going to have a report, we have to have a balance, as the hon. Member for Ponoka-Rimbey has indicated. I don't think it would be a proper report with just the questions, because eventually the questions can become quite pointed, and without the answers they may convey the wrong meaning. I really feel very strongly right now. I might have some concern that we may eventually bog down into dialogue if we have someone summarizing, and we may have critiques of the summary, and that may present some additional problems, whereas if it is verbatim, well then of course we avoid that particular issue. But this is something that we might be susceptible to if we do have someone summarizing it. If we can agree to that, I don't have any problems with it, but I think the balance is essential, and that's the point I'm trying to make with the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should point out that the questions themselves are not verbatim questions. They're summarized as well, so maybe we'll try to take that into account. It might also satisfy the member's concerns to some extent if we include in the report the Treasurer's response to the Auditor General's recommendations as well, although you get that as a separate document. We'll take a look at that.

Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I have difficulty supporting the motion. I think your report is excellent. I think you've referred directly to anybody who has the interest that the entire transcripts are available and are easily accessible to anyone who cares to see them. In these times we really have to try to minimize our cost of government overhead generally, and extra reports and so on that are just a duplication of *Hansard* in essence would be really a waste. I think this report is fine, and I cannot support the motion.

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to congratulate you on your report. I have a question though. What would be the distribution of this report? Secondly, the comment that all the *Hansards* are in the library: they are not very convenient for people who don't live right here in Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This report is intended for Members of the Legislative Assembly and anybody who would ask for it. Many of the Public Accounts Committees across Canada do provide reports of their activities to the Assembly, much in the same way that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee does.

8:51

MRS. B. LAING: Given that it could be available to other people, then I would really have a problem with not having a balance and having some type of a summary or whatever of the answers given.  
Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ready for the motion then? Those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? The motion carried.

I will make an effort to redraft the report and include a summary statement from the cabinet ministers, and I'll bring that back to the committee for their further review.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, while you're on the questions, as a newcomer on the thing, in reading your report, there's no recommendations anywhere. Is it part of your mandate just to ask questions and not say anything? I thought, particularly since the Auditor General's activities are germane to what you do, that you would have recommendations as to whether the Auditor General's

powers are expanded or focused or whatever it is. All we do is ask questions, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee members themselves determine just what it is we do in the committee. You certainly have the liberty at any point to bring motions forward with respect to the matters that you have just raised.

MR. TAYLOR: Can you move a recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You could move a recommendation if you choose to do that. Whether the committee members will support you or not, we would have to wait and see, and that would be tested.

MR. TAYLOR: At least in the heritage trust fund it's recorded that you asked something and it was turned down, if it was turned down. It's in the minutes anyhow. But do people never recommend anything? Is it too early in the morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Generally speaking, the past practice of the committee has been just to ask questions about the public accounts for the year that's under review.

MR. TAYLOR: But you can make a recommendation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can make a recommendation. I would just suggest that if you're going to make a recommendation, in fairness to the members of the committee, you should do it by giving a notice of motion and submit those recommendations so that committee members would at least have some time to review them.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next item of business is Delegate Selection for 1992 Conferences. These have all been approved by the Members' Services Committee, and it's contained in this year's budget. That is, there's an appropriation for two members of the committee, their spouses, and a staff member to attend the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees annual conference, which will be held in Fredericton, New Brunswick, from July 5 to 7. Also, approval was granted by the Members' Services Committee for two members and their spouses to attend the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference in November 1992, in Toronto, Ontario. Again, for the benefit of new members, the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees is an organization that is composed of representatives from public accounts committees across Canada. They sometimes invite delegates from other jurisdictions. I think it's an important conference because we learn how other public accounts committees function in other jurisdictions. Some of these ideas are very useful, and some of them have been brought back into this Assembly. The Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation is more of a technical conference. It is an organization that exists to promote more effective accounting in the public sector, and it's also a very worthwhile conference.

Having said that, we need a recommendation, I guess, from the members in terms of attendance at these conferences. Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I understand that is required. With respect to (a)(ii), the annual conference of the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, I would like to move

that the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn, Mr. Barry Pashak, and the Member for Lacombe, Mr. Ron Moore, be approved to attend the 1992 Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees conference and that the usual provisions with respect to being accompanied by their spouses be included.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And a staff member as well? Would you include that in there?

MR. JONSON: Yes, certainly. I'm sorry; that's customary too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion on the floor, Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, speaking to that motion, there's no particular urgency for us to deal with this motion today. These are conferences in July and November. I certainly want to say that having attended the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees conference last year, it was most useful. One gets a very good sense of what other public accounts committees around the province are doing and some other ideas on dealing with these questions. I certainly would be pleased to see yourself as chairman or an alternate from this committee representing Alberta at that conference, and we'll deal with the other one, I take it, in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, in the current financial circumstances of the province we really have to take a look at how we can perhaps get as effective value for tax dollars as possible, and I'd have to question the idea of the necessity of spouses being added in this motion here at taxpayers' expense. I would like to suggest that this is a question that needs a little more thought, and perhaps members would like to consult with their respective caucuses about this. So I would move that we table this motion until next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Tabling a motion is really technically not debatable unless you want to alter the instruction, but a motion to table takes precedence. The motion is to table this item for one week, until next week's meeting. Those in favour of tabling? Those opposed? The motion to table is lost.

Mr. Lund.

MR. LUND: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. It was just a question. Maybe I've misunderstood the hon. member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, but I thought he said that this conference was not until November, and I thought we were talking about the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, which is in July. We are talking about the first one? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion on the motion by Mr. Jonson? Mrs. Osterman.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think the motion in part is a good motion, and I would like to see it dealt with now because most travel arrangements made early do involve considerable savings, as I recall. Maybe our secretary is nodding in the affirmative there, so I think it is important to deal with it.

I understand that it has been customary in the past that some amount of the cost of spouses has been included. Keeping in mind the public discussion about political expenditures in particular and government expenditures in general, I would say that if this motion is accepted, those who are traveling bear this in mind and use their own conscience with respect to the travel. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I would support the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further debate or discussion? The question's been called? Those in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion carried.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, have you noted my request to have a recorded vote on my motion to table?

[For the motion: Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Gibeault, Ms Mjolsness, Mr. Taylor]

[Against the motion: Ms Calahasen, Mr. Cardinal, Mr. Clegg, Mr. Drobot, Mr. Jonson, Mrs. B. Laing, Mr. Lund, Mr. McFarland, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Osterman, Mr. Paszkowski, Mr. Payne, Mr. Severtson, Mr. Thurber]

MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect, then, to the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference, which will be held in November 1992, is there a motion with respect to that, Mr. Lund?

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure this is a very valuable conference. You mentioned that it was technical. I do have some concern inasmuch as in this time of restraint – and certainly the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods indicated he was concerned about some printing costs when we're sending information out to the public, so I'm sure he would agree with me that perhaps right now there would be some question as to the total value of sending people to this conference. With that in mind, I would like to move

that this year we do not send representatives to the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation.

I know it's in the budget; however, I think that in this time of restraint it's incumbent upon us to make sure how those dollars are spent even though they have been approved in the budget. We owe it to the taxpayers to take a very careful look at where we're spending.

9:01

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you making a motion, then, that we send no one?

MR. LUND: Yes, that's right. The motion is that we do not send anyone to the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference in November in Toronto.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms Mjolsness.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not too familiar with what goes on at that particular conference, and I was wondering if whoever went last year could just give us a brief overview of what goes on or how useful it is for members to be there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee never sent anyone last year, actually. I've attended the conference in previous years on behalf of the committee. Is there anyone else here who has attended a Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference on behalf of the Public Accounts Committee?

In any event, it's basically a meeting of auditors from both the public sector and private sector as well as auditors general from across Canada. I might ask the Auditor General to comment on the conference as well. Basically, it looks at how auditing practice can be improved in the public sector. Primarily, the approach is to emphasize what are called value-for-money audits. Many examples are presented at these conferences where value-for-

money audits and improved accountability in the public sector actually leads to, I would suggest, significant savings for taxpayers. There are procedures that can be used, I think, to improve efficiency in terms of government operations. In fact, I've become rather convinced from attending these conferences that we should make much greater use of value-for-money audits. I found it very, very useful, and hopefully I've been able to bring some of those ideas forward and make them available in various debates in the Legislature to all members of the Assembly.

Would the Auditor General care to make a comment on the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation conference?

**MR. SALMON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify, I would like to fill in a couple of things there. What you've said is correct; however, the foundation has expanded to the point where about two-thirds of those attending are not auditors, so there's only about a third that have an auditing situation because the foundation is doing extensive research in management accountability, particularly with respect to effectiveness. When effectiveness comes into being, all managers are interested in whether or not they're getting value for what they're trying to achieve. Although a lot of work has been done on the value-for-money side for the auditor, it's now gone the other way as well, where management is trying to determine ways and means to measure how well they're doing with respect to their positions in conducting affairs of the organizations they are involved in.

Last year's conference had a presentation by a hospital group talking about efficiency within the health sector. They had some very interesting discussions as well from one of the senior presidents of one of the banks in Canada, who talked about trying to tie in the effects of management operations with what the Auditor can do to assist in measuring those kinds of things. It is fairly broad. It's technical but not as technical that anyone can't be interested in it. They have encouraged members of Legislatures to attend, because they feel also that the government side of things is important to be looked at in that regard.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you very much, Auditor General.

I would just like to make one other comment, if I may, if the committee will indulge me with this. I anticipated that I might be named to attend the conference in Fredericton, and I propose to travel to that conference using my bonus points, actually. I fly back and forth from Calgary to Edmonton so frequently that I'll be able to travel to that conference without air travel expense. My wife will not be accompanying me. I don't know whether the member in some way could change his motion to permit travel to that conference by reducing the expense to the public. In any event, I'll leave that to the members.

Mr. Severtson, did you have a point that you wanted to make?

**MR. SEVERTSON:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Auditor General answered part of it. I was going to ask if he sent staff from his department to that, and by the answer I could tell that he has.

When you say many of the Legislatures are attending, is it ministers that want to find out ways to manage their departments, or is it committees such as Public Accounts that send members?

**MR. SALMON:** There have been both at the conference. It's a fairly broad group of people. It's not just the auditor side and it's not just the manager. There have been deputy ministers there, and some ministers have come and spoken at the conference as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you.  
Mr. Clegg.

**MR. CLEGG:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't speak up because I never went to that conference as a member of Public Accounts, but I did go when I was in Members' Services. The Auditor General has certainly made the remarks that I was going to make. Being a very hard up farmer in northern Alberta, that conference was far beyond my ability to get a lot out of it. I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that you, being the professor you are, would get more out of it than I did, and you did get into the business when I was there and how much money and again when we were getting into the private sector to some degree.

I just have a question: at the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees in New Brunswick, does this Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation in fact give a report to this Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees at their meeting, or have they done that before?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I think we're confusing two things here. The Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees meets in New Brunswick, and they don't issue a report. The Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, which is a different conference that's held in November, does put together a summary of the presentations that are made at the conference, and they're available.

**MR. SALMON:** Mr. Chairman, the executive director of the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation has spoken to the public accounts committees conference, but there's no tie-in. He was just invited to make a presentation.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Subsequent.

**MR. CLEGG:** Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know what happens, but when you attend the Canadian council, do you get a lot of knowledge from the report that's made from the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation? Is it a good report? I'm just trying to justify, you know, if we sent somebody to the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, then maybe that information can be got from this other group.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Did you want to comment?

**MR. SALMON:** There is an annual report of the foundation that could be made available that gives a summarization. I've got a number of those still in my office if they would be of interest to some.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Also I think the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation performs quite a useful service. They do issue reports from time to time on various issues, and as they come out, I've circulated copies of these reports to members of the committee in the past.

As you're aware, there's a great deal of networking that goes on in conferences that is important. The executive director of the Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, as the Auditor General has pointed out, attends virtually all of our Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees. You begin to find out who the resources are within the accounting profession that can help you as a member of a Legislature, as a member of a government, or whatever, whether you're in opposition or a member of a government.

Mrs. Osterman.

9:11

**MRS. OSTERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, to some degree I had a partial answer to a question I had with respect to information that

flows from this conference that's now under discussion via the member's motion. I guess I'm wondering at least in the first instance if this year it's not possible to get the actual papers that are presented at this conference with a view to circulating them to members and then hold a discussion about the merits of the kind of information that's presented. I feel as if I'm operating to some degree in the dark, and I'm hoping not too many people will nod their heads when I say that, but I do. I realize that the chairman is being very diligent in trying to minimize his own expenses, and therefore I'm somewhat hesitant to say flat out that he shouldn't attend, but on the other hand, I really can't speak to the merits of this conference. If we could get the papers, I think it would be very useful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I'm going to interpret that as a motion to table in a moment. I'll come back to Mrs. Osterman, but Mr. Lund wanted to get into the discussion.

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, I'm searching for some answers. If I could, through you to the Auditor General: I know you don't have to know this, but if you could give me some idea of how many people from Alberta are attending these conferences without us sending representatives from this committee.

MR. SALMON: I would say, Mr. Chairman, probably in the neighbourhood of 20, 25, maybe 30. There are about 600 people who attend this conference every year. It rotates between Toronto, Ottawa, and Montreal on a three-year rotation. I would say there are at least that many from Alberta. They're coming from the private sector as well as from businesses, also connected to government, internal audit side. I've had some from my office as well. I've been involved since the beginning. Since I've been the Auditor General, I've been on the board, so I'm very familiar with what's going on.

There is a summarization that I maybe could bring to the committee if they're going to table the motion so that they don't make the decision today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I'll permit the discussion to go on. Mrs. Laing wants to be recognized. Mr. Lund might have a follow-up question. Then I'll recognize Mrs. Osterman again to move a motion to table with the instruction that we get this report.

Before I do that, did you have a follow-up, Mr. Lund?

MR. LUND: Yes, Mr. Chairman. How many people from the Auditor General's department go from Alberta?

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, that has varied. It goes from three to five depending on the year and what we're trying to cover.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I should also mention that two members from Legislative Offices have already been approved to attend this conference as well.

Mrs. Laing.

MRS. B. LAING: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to speak in support of Mr. Lund's motion. His motion was that as a cost saving to the public, we would only attend one of these conferences this year. You know, having heard a little bit about the format of the Canadian Comprehensive Auditing Foundation, it seems very comprehensive. It may be an absolutely excellent conference, but I think the Canadian council would be a little bit more relevant to the actual work of this committee. If there are people going from

Members' Services, surely somehow this information could be shared between the two committees as a cost saving to the taxpayers of Alberta. I really think we should consider very seriously Mr. Lund's motion.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I recognize Mrs. Osterman now? Is that reasonable? You didn't really move a motion to table at that time, but I gathered from your remarks . . .

MRS. OSTERMAN: No. Mr. Chairman, having listened to the discussion and with the fact in mind that we now know that staff from both the Legislative Assembly and the Auditor General's own department are attending this conference, I think that in this first year of a major discussion about the value of it, it could be very useful after we look at some documentation for there to be a meeting with an overview and recommendations coming from staff to this committee. That obviously would be a great cost saving, and it would involve all the committee. Until that information is available to us, Mr. Chairman, I would move that we table this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion to table is before the committee. Those in favour of tabling this until we get the information as indicated in the motion? Maybe I should count. Those opposed? The motion to table is lost, so we're back to Mr. Lund's motion. Any further discussion on the main motion?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, you had indicated that you are using your bonus points. Before making a decision, we should all have a good idea exactly what the cost of attending this convention is. It's pretty hard to judge if you might save \$500 or \$1,000 then lose the benefit of the information or your ability to perform better your duties in the Legislature. I think we should be more concerned about the thousands and hundred thousands and millions of dollars rather than the penny-ante stuff when perhaps it might help us perform better as members of this committee or any other committee in the Legislature. It gives us a much better understanding, as the Auditor General pointed out. There is a network that goes in place, and people learn from these conventions. I'd like to know exactly what the cost would be. It appears it would not be very much: a hotel and whether there's a fee for the convention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, the total cost for two delegates and their two spouses – that is, four people – to attend this conference has been budgeted and approved in the amount of \$5,200. The registration fee for this conference is \$550 per person, and spousal registrations are \$50, so that's \$600 for a delegate and a spouse. Then multiply that by two is \$1,200, and then there's \$4,000 provided in travel expenses, for a total of \$5,200 that's budgeted and approved.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, it's nice to pretend we're looking after nickels and dimes and the dollars look after themselves, but the actual cost of this convention doesn't seem that extreme to me, and I repeat again that we should be looking after the thousands and the ten and hundreds of thousands and the millions.

MR. McFARLAND: Mr. Chairman, nickels and dimes may not seem all that important, but it would appear, anyway, that none of the members from this party are charging their \$100 per day. That's an indication that nickels and dimes are important. I think, unless as a newcomer here I'm totally off the wall, that the

Auditor General who balances our books is attending along with three to five staff members, that surely if the gentleman that's being paid to balance the books can't bring back information, I don't know why we should have to send one or two members down to bring it back.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay. Any further discussion on Mr. Lund's motion? Those in favour of Mr. Lund's motion? Those opposed? The motion's carried.

Next item on the agenda would have to do with Organization of Future Meetings, Meetings of the Committee, time and place.

**MR. CARDINAL:** I'd like to address this issue, Mr. Chairman, the 1992 public accounts motion. I move

that the Public Accounts Committee meet only when the House is in session on Wednesdays from 8:30 a.m. to 10 a.m.

There are a number of reasons why I am making this motion. One, I believe the big item, of course, is cost. The cost may not be so visible for urban members that live in Edmonton, but a lot of the members in Public Accounts are rural members that live quite a distance from this urban centre. As it is, we spend 25 percent of our time each year sitting in this House, and I feel that's enough time to be dealing with these issues.

9:21

In addition to that, I know our government is open, and there was no time in the past three years serving my constituents that I could not go to any minister, get any answer I wanted, or go to the Auditor General's office or any department and get absolutely any answer I wanted. I feel that is available; it's open; it's a matter of walking into an office and getting the information you want or phoning. It's all available. If we are looking at cutting costs, then I think we should definitely try and stick to holding meetings while the House is in session. You know, as a rural member serving a constituency that is 28,000 square kilometres, I have a tough time spending as much time as I want to make myself available to my constituents. On the other hand, for an example, an urban member in Edmonton would be in a completely different situation. You can have meetings year round because your constituents are next door to you here. In fact, I notice that some members have two offices within walking distance of the Legislature. I feel that if we're looking at cutting costs, these are some of the considerations we need to look at.

Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you, hon. member. Okay. We have a motion to meet on Wednesday mornings at 8:30 to 10 o'clock while we're in session. Those in favour of the motion? Agreed? Those opposed? Motion carried.

Questions by Members. How would you like to see the questions put? Mrs. Osterman.

**MRS. OSTERMAN:** I've got something framed here, Mr. Chairman, by way of a motion.

Moved that the committee continue the past practice that upon recognition of the Chair a member be allowed one question and two supplementaries and will then drop to the bottom of the speaking list for any additional questions.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Thank you. There's a motion before the committee. Any discussion? Those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? Motion carried.

As to the type of questions, I already made a comment about that. Mr. Thurber.

**MR. THURBER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I realize you did deal with it in your opening comments, and I totally agree with what you said at that time, but just for the record I would like to put a motion forward

that all questions do relate to the annual report of the Auditor General and the public accounts report for the fiscal year 1990-91. Each question should relate to the section involved on that particular day.

There have been times when we've kind of strayed from that and tried to get into other areas, and it became, as you mentioned before, something akin to question period. I think the decorum of this committee requires something a little better than that. So I move that as a motion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Any discussion on the motion? Those in favour? Anyone opposed? Motion carried.

Now, Scheduling of Auditor General's Report and Scheduling of Cabinet Ministers. I anticipated that the business might have been transacted a little more swiftly today and that we may have only needed the Auditor General to come back on one further occasion. I just checked with the Auditor General. He's available, of course, to come back for the next two meetings if that's the wish of the committee. Is there a motion with respect to that, Mr. Moore?

**MR. MOORE:** Well, I was on Scheduling of Cabinet Ministers. That was what I wanted to get in on, if you want to have it now.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Well, if you could just provide the information to the committee, but we'll have to get back to the scheduling of the Auditor General before we deal with . . .

**MR. MOORE:** I was on the scheduling of ministers.

**MR. JONSON:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the scheduling of the Auditor General, I think his report is the essence or the base from which we work here in this committee. It's been my observation that he or his assistants have been here for every Public Accounts meeting. I hope the availability is not a problem, with due respect to the Auditor General, that he will be here for our meetings. So I would suggest and I could put it in a motion, Mr. Chairman, if necessary,

that we should be planning for our next meeting and if necessary the meeting following to deal with the Auditor General's report.

Certainly, if all the questions directed to the Auditor General are exhausted at our next meeting, that would be sufficient, but I think there should be a plan for having two meetings, as has been the case, I think, in the past.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I'm interpreting that as a motion that we invite the Auditor General to attend our next two meetings. It's important that we have that so we can begin scheduling cabinet ministers in advance, because of their schedules. That's the motion, then, that the Auditor General would come before the committee on at least two more occasions. Is there any discussion on that motion? Those in favour of the motion then? Those opposed? Motion carried.

Okay, now with respect, then, to the scheduling of cabinet ministers. Mr. Moore.

**MR. MOORE:** Well, this area here always raises a lot of discussion. I feel that every minister should on occasion come before Public Accounts. I did a little research on who had appeared and when, and we found that we had eight departments that haven't been here since 1986. Now that we've established a rotation, we

find that they are way down in the rotation. To correct this, I think they should be brought forward. There has been too long a period since they have appeared before Public Accounts, and they're handling public money, and we should be able to look at how they are conducting our affairs.

The other area – and this concerned all members – is that in a rotation, if you go past the Provincial Treasurer this year, he goes to the bottom of the list and he doesn't come up for a long, long time, and that's not good. The Provincial Treasurer is a very key person in the whole process. With that in mind, I'll make the following motion, and just to tell you what I did, I brought the eight departments up to the top, I took the Provincial Treasurer out of the rotation way down the list and put him in at number nine, the first one up on top of the rotation, and we'd go with that rotation. So I'll make the following motion that will reflect those various points.

Moved that the departments and ministers responsible appear before the Public Accounts Committee in the following rotation. If a minister is not available on the date for his department's appearance, that department will exchange places with the department next in the rotation list.

He doesn't go to the bottom. I want that clearly understood. He just switches with the next guy that's available under him.

1) Culture and Multiculturalism, 2) Attorney General, 3) Education, 4) Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, 5) Health, 6) Tourism, Parks and Recreation, 7) Municipal Affairs, 8) Family and Social Services, 9) Provincial Treasurer, 10) Transportation and Utilities, 11) Agriculture, 12) Career Development and Employment, 13) Economic Development and Trade, 14) Energy, 15) Labour, 16) Advanced Education, 17) Public Works, Supply and Services, 18) Consumer and Corporate Affairs, 19) Forestry, Lands and Wildlife, 20) minister responsible for Occupational Health and Safety, 21) Solicitor General, 22) Technology, Research and Telecommunications, 23) Environment, and 24) Seniors.

Seniors is just a new department, and we haven't anything on the Public Accounts report on that department yet, so he drops into the 24 slot. I therefore move that this be the rotation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to adopt the motion as distributed to members of the committee?

Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: No; I'm just ready to vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussion, first of all? Those in favour of the motion as distributed? Those opposed? Motion carried.

I just had a request by ITV to come in and film this committee in action this morning. Apparently it's up to the Chair of the committee to say yea or nay, but as always I'll defer to the committee members themselves. Does anyone on the committee have an objection to ITV? Mr. Lund?

9:31

MR. LUND: Well, just a question. How long are you planning on having them in, and is this going to be something that happens on a regular basis?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, no, I don't think so. So I assume that's fine with members of the committee?

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, just with respect to the television coverage. I don't have any objection to it in a general sense, but I think that – I'm looking for maybe a different word. I sort of wonder about the courtesy and the notice that the committee or that you as chairman have been given with respect to this matter. Certainly if it was arranged and they wanted to come in and film

part of the meeting as properly arranged with yourself, that's no problem, but I do object to just like this, saying, "We'd like to pop in," you know. I think the committee should have a bit of notice, and that should be arranged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate your point, and I just wish I'd caught your hand before I indicated to the Sergeant-at Arms that it would be all right. I think your point is valid and well taken.

Mrs. Osterman. Is it on this?

MRS. OSTERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and basically because it's a matter that I think some thought should be given to. I can't provide you with a detailed explanation as to why I feel this way, but I do believe it's appropriate for a committee to have notice and that we should discuss this. If they would like to cover the next meeting, then let us discuss that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. CLEGG: Yes. I'm having some problem. Is there a specific reason that they've come today, or is it just that all of a sudden we seem to have . . . Did you have this request before, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just two minutes ago, before we started this discussion actually.

MR. CLEGG: A supplementary question. Did somebody request them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. ITV made a request of the Sergeant-at-Arms. The Sergeant-at-Arms came to me and asked if it was all right. He informed me that I had the authority to say yes or no to this, but I thought I would survey the committee members, which I did.

So Mr. Gibeault first, and then Mr. Doyle.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, we're the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, not private accounts, and the media people here should be welcome to cover the business. This is the public business; this is not private members' business or anything else. So I want to support your view and our committee decision that the media should be allowed to cover these proceedings as they wish. I don't think they should need to have special dispensation every time they want to come to cover the affairs.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, these minutes are over the speakers around the Legislature. The gallery is open, to my knowledge, to the public. So what if somebody's in here with a camera? It's in here every day. There's no cost to the committee. The cost is, in fact, to the company that wants to inform the public as to what we actually do. Has somebody not got their hair combed, or what's the problem here? I can't understand. It is a public meeting.

MS MJOLSNESS: I share the same sentiment with my colleagues. I have no problem with the media coming in. I don't believe they would probably stay very long. I'm not sure about that.

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, I don't want any misunderstanding. I'm certainly not opposed to them coming in. I just think that we should have had some notice. Just the way we are now assembled, for people that have got no idea of what the Assembly



looks like and how we operate, it may leave the wrong impression. I would have liked to have had things arranged a little bit. I think it's an excellent idea, and if they wanted to come in for the whole hearings, I'd welcome that. It's great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Laing.

MRS. B. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Mr. Lund. I have no objections to them coming in, but I really feel that since this was an organizational meeting, this could have been brought up and discussed and a committee decision made on it. This way everybody's kind of on the spot at the last minute. Because it is an organizational meeting, I think it should have been brought up and discussed. I've really no objection otherwise, though.

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Chairman, I too have some reservations. In the last notice it is my understanding there was no closure to the media. The media has access to their gallery up here. They're not there, so I don't know why we have to accept it without notice.

Mr. Doyle mentioned the cameras in the House. The cameras are only allowed in the House at question period. It's my understanding that's the only time they're allowed in the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I just got a sense from the discussion that if it were put to a motion, then the majority of the committee members would probably rather that we were approached in advance. So I've just asked the secretary of the committee to so notify the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Do we want to deal with this, though? Does anyone wish to make a motion with respect to inviting television cameras, I guess, into the Assembly for these meetings? Mr. Bruseker.

MR. BRUSEKER: I'll move

that if they give advance notice, a week in advance, that we invite the television to come and film our meetings.

MR. GIBEAULT: I'd like to speak again to that motion. Mr. Chairman, if you ask the average Albertan on the street what the Public Accounts Committee of this province does, they won't have an idea, and the more difficult we make it for the members of the media to cover our affairs – we should be thanking ITV and anybody else who expresses any interest in what we do here. I'm shocked that the Liberal Party wants to put a week's notice on the media. I mean, the media operates on an hour-by-hour, day-by-day basis, and I think it's ridiculous to ask them to submit a week's notice to come to our committee. We ought to forget that, and we ought to thank them for their interest and invite them in right away.

MR. PASZKOWSKI: I'm a little surprised at the hon. Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods not recognizing the fact that the meetings are open. They always have been open. The media gallery is open at all times; there is absolutely no closure to the media gallery. To suggest that these meetings are now being closed is totally out of order.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, I understand this hinges around the filming of our actions here. I would have hoped that we'd have been getting into the meat of the meeting, and for somebody to have a camera in here should not interrupt in any way this

meeting. I don't know what these members are afraid of. Open the doors to the public and to the press. So what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a point of information that you might find interesting, and that is that the Sergeant-at-Arms has refused members of the media entry to the Chamber because they are dressed inappropriately.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I find it very odd that the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods would bring up this question of the public not having access to what goes on in Public Accounts. That very member brought it up at the national conference and misled the entire conference and had to be put straight. Exactly what happened there – to bring it up here again, I find it hard to understand.

The public have full access. The press have. I don't see them up there; I think there was one or two after he heard our debate on his intercom. I can see how the public is up here. I look at both galleries: they're open, they aren't crowded, nobody is turned away. To start saying that we have to have cameras in every corner and all that for the public, I think is going too far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion, by the way, and the motion is that we permit media to attend our meetings and to film proceedings of the meetings provided that they give one week's notice. So try to keep your remarks to the motion.

Did you have a point of order, Mr. Gibeault, that you wanted to raise first of all? That would take precedence.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Moore made some imputations and allegations that are totally false, and I think he ought to retract them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll give Mr. Moore an opportunity to do that. Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: A point of order? On what?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order was made that you made an inaccurate statement with respect to the behaviour of the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods.

MR. MOORE: At the national conference there was a statement made to the effect that in the process in Alberta it wasn't communicated to the public, there was no effort made to the public, the public was closed out. I immediately had to enter into the area and point out that the press was here, we had *Hansard* here; it was very, very open. I corrected that so that the image didn't go across Canada that we were a closed organization in this area, and that's in *Hansard*.

9:41

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll let the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods respond to that, and then I'll close debate. If it's still an ongoing issue, I'll meet with you for coffee and we'll try to settle this.

Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, at that meeting of the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, I pointed out that this committee . . .

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I let him finish, and I'll get back to you, Mr. Moore?

MR. GIBEAULT: I pointed out that there is no mechanism for public input into the deliberations of our committee. We don't have any way. We haven't in the past had any public interest groups have an opportunity to make submissions before our committee. That is a fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there's certainly a difference of interpretation in terms of what happened at that event.

Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Chairman, those were unparliamentary words, and I'm just trying to think back. I withdraw them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. That solves that.

Now, we're still dealing with the motion from the Member for Calgary-North West. Ms Mjolsness.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the motion, it seems to me that the comments that have been made are in contradiction to the motion that we have before us. On the one hand people are saying that this is open, we can invite anyone anytime, they can be in the gallery, they can be in the press gallery, that this is not private accounts, this is Public Accounts. Our motion says that the media must request permission one week in advance. I find the comments being made in pure contradiction with the motion, so I would urge members to defeat the motion.

MR. LUND: Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that I welcome the cameras to come into this Assembly and let the people across the province see the Public Accounts Committee in operation. I've certainly got no problem with that. However, I do have a problem with them just walking in unannounced right this morning. Look at the way we are scattered around the Chamber sitting here. If the cameras come in, what perception is that going to leave out in the public? It looks like a bunch of the members of the committee are not present this morning. In fact, I think we probably have one of the best turnouts we've ever had. That's my only reservation about having them come in unannounced like this morning, and I don't have a problem with the motion.

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Chairman, it just occurs to me whether this committee has the right to allow cameras in the Chamber. I would recommend that maybe the Chairman check with the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the right. I just deferred the right to the committee. I could take it back and make these decisions unilaterally, if you wish.

MR. SEVERTSON: Mr. Chairman, that was the point I wanted to . . . I didn't know in my own mind. I was just checking whether you did have the right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll just read Standing Order 112 to you.

In the case of a subcommittee of the Committee of Supply or any standing or special committee of the Assembly, the recording and broadcasting of proceedings by the broadcast media and the taking of photographs shall be at the discretion of the chairman of the committee and subject to any conditions set by him.

MR. SEVERTSON: Very good.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

Mrs. Osterman.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to reinforce what you just said, and that is that the committee can set their own procedure here through the chairman if the chairman wishes to give that latitude to the committee. At no time have I heard any members, including the Member for Calgary-North West who has made the motion, other than express the need for common courtesy in terms of notice. So if this committee wants the additional coverage of cameras for those who like the camera, the media, as has been mentioned by all members here, is absolutely free to cover the proceedings. But I feel in my own self that cameras and picture taking are very different than the recording of words and audio recordings of any kind. I feel that's very different, and so, Mr. Chairman, I would say that there should be consideration given to that and notice given at any time when somebody wants to take pictures.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Chairman, you have indicated, by reading, my question basically, but to me the question is up to you as chairman. It's polite and courteous of you to allow the committee to debate this, and perhaps we'd have to change the rules of the House if we took this right away from you, but it seems to me that it's quite silly that we get into this type of debate when there are much more important things to discuss. The Auditor General has wasted perhaps more than an hour of his time by being here, and maybe only a couple of questions have been asked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, there are a few other people who haven't dealt with it. There's Mr. Payne and then Mr. Moore, and then maybe we can settle the matter.

Mr. Payne.

MR. MOORE: I move we table this.

MR. PAYNE: Well, I just heard a tabling motion over my left shoulder, so maybe you had better deal with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognized you before I recognized Mr. Moore.

MR. PAYNE: Well, I'm happy to know I'm recognized, but like I say, I heard a tabling motion.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, in the years that I have served on this committee, the government members have, I think, always performed extremely well. Consequently, I'm more than happy to supplement the currently meagre news coverage of the work of this committee with television coverage. As I say, I'm very proud to be associated with the government members of this committee, whose performance traditionally has been first-class.

Having said that, however, in my experience both as an MLA and as a reporter who covered the Assembly, I have noted from time to time that (a) there are some politicians who when the television cameras are on perform differently than they otherwise do, and (b) from time to time they find it difficult to resist the temptation to do a little stage managing. If we do expand the media coverage of our deliberations with the invitation to cameras, I do hope that our members, opposition and government, will resist the aforementioned temptations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Moore.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Bruseker's motion? Those in favour of the motion as presented? Those opposed?

Would people indicate who's opposed. Could I get another count, because hands are going like this. There's a lot of uncertainty.

Mr. Cardinal.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Chairman, I'm a bit confused. The person making this motion was opposed to the motion at the last vote, and that confuses people like myself. Is that a normal procedure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll recognize Mr. Moore before I take the vote again.

MR. MOORE: I just wondered if the member who made the motion would repeat his motion, so we could understand what he's voting against.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion, as I understand it, is that we would permit the television media to attend these meetings and to photograph . . . Read the motion.

MRS. DACYSHYN: Moved by Mr. Bruseker that the Public Accounts Committee permit television media to follow the proceedings of this committee upon one week's notice to the chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have the motion. Those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

Mr. Gibeault.

9:51

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Since this vote has now been taken, which I hope you've noted, I request that it be recorded for the record. I would now, as a subsequent follow-up to that, ask that the chairman or the secretary of the committee convey a message of this resolution to the media so that anyone who might be interested in covering our proceedings next week will be able to give the appropriate notice. Perhaps we could encourage them that it's the wish of the committee that our proceedings be covered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll take that under advisement.

Mr. McFarland, were you attempting to get recognized on this?

MR. McFARLAND: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments that you made and the courtesy that you extended us by allowing us to vote on it. I'm a little confused that Mr. Gibeault would request a recorded vote, because I was looking to the guidance of the mover of the motion. He's changed his vote three different times, and I don't know which one you're going to record.

MR. BRUSEKER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since the member opposite is new and is confused, I made the motion because we were spending a lot of time on a silly matter. I made a motion so it could get on the table and hopefully we would deal with it. Unfortunately, the government members, who perform so poorly, couldn't vote on it quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I get an indication of those who in the last vote voted against the motion? I'll just record your names.

[For the motion: Ms Calahasen, Mr. Cardinal, Mr. Clegg, Mr. Drobot, Mr. Jonson, Mrs. B. Laing, Mr. Lund, Mr. McFarland, Mr. Moore, Mrs. Osterman, Mr. Paszkowski, Mr. Payne, Mr. Severtson, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Thurber]

[Against the motion: Mr. Bruseker, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Gibeault, Ms Mjolsness]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we were going to invite the Auditor General to make some introductory remarks today, but our time has almost expired. He'll be here next week, and that will be how we'll begin the meeting next week.

I think Mr. Gibeault wanted to give notice of a motion under Other Business.

MR. GIBEAULT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to give notice of my intention to move at next week's meeting the following resolution:

Be it resolved that the Public Accounts Committee request that the Provincial Treasurer produce the 1991-92 public accounts by July 31, 1992, and in subsequent years within four months of the end of the fiscal year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Clegg.

MR. CLEGG: I had a hundred questions for the Auditor General. Because of the time, I move we adjourn.

[The committee adjourned at 9:54 a.m.]

