

Standing Committee on Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act

Wednesday, June 9, 1982

Chairman: Dr. Reid

2:30 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good afternoon. I would like the committee to come to order.

The meeting this afternoon really is called to organize the committee's business for this summer and fall. For the benefit of the new committee member, the Member for Olds-Didsbury, the committee is a standing committee of the Legislature and is appointed under the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. That's where it derives its name. In the narrow sense, the purpose of the committee is to receive the annual report on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund and write a report to the Legislative Assembly. That's Section 13(3) of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act. In the past, before I was ever on the committee -- I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview have been on the committee since its inception -- that has been rather broadly interpreted. It hasn't been restricted only to reporting on that annual report. Several other things have been done by the committee of its own volition and under the authority of the Legislative Assembly.

The essential matter before us today is to try to organize how we are going to allocate our time so that we can report to the Legislative Assembly in October, as we are now directed by the standing rules of the Assembly. I've tentatively drawn up a rough agenda so that we can try to progress with some reasonable order through the items to be discussed. In view of Section 13(3), I thought that first we should perhaps get on to the subject of considering the report which, I understand from the Provincial Treasurer, will probably be available towards the end of July this year and will, of course, be distributed to members of the committee as soon as it's available. That of itself is going to have some effect upon when we can start our meetings with the ministers to discuss the report. Perhaps if any members of the committee have any ideas on when we should start our meetings with ministers in relation to that report's being submitted to us by the Provincial Treasurer . . .

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, in regard to the annual report and waiting for it to be presented to us near the end of July, I wonder if we might be able to get a copy of the annual report before it is distributed but after it goes to the printer; that is, I don't think we actually need to get "the" annual report, but if we get a xerox copy of that which did go to the printer, we could start earlier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I think that's possible. Once the proof goes to the printer, that's what's going to be printed. That might give us another week or two. I was thinking that because of summer vacation problems, there is not much chance of getting started through July and August. That's a bit difficult, because it causes difficulties for you and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, for instance, where there is no other member to replace you. My own impression is that in any event we can't start much before the beginning of August. I don't know if anybody else has any ideas on that.

MR. NOTLEY: If we started in early August, I think that would be reasonable. One of the concerns I have about waiting until September is that we just can't do justice either to our job of considering the various departments or to our recommendations. We have always got ourselves into the situation where at the last minute we've been pressed for time. This has now gone on for five or six

years, and I just don't think that we do justice to our responsibilities. Last year we started a little earlier. I believe it was around August 15 or 16, wasn't it? I would recommend that we start no later than that.

As the Member for Calgary Buffalo points out, if we can obtain copies of the xeroxed report ahead of time it could even be a few days earlier than the middle. I don't think we can start in July; I would be willing to accept that. But I think it should be as early as possible, so we don't get into the time frame situation where we just haven't the time to do the job properly and end up doing all kinds of things and rushing it through at the last minute. I just don't think that's at all the correct procedure to follow.

MR. R. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] members are away that first week in August, I understand, myself included I think. It would be acceptable to me if we could aim at the second week in August, and thereafter have as many meetings as we need.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I checked the calendar. The first week of August includes many local constituency events as well, and often a civic holiday. The second week starts Monday, August 9. Two days a week would give us eight days in August before the 31st because, again, the first weekend of September is a long weekend. Is it acceptable to members that we aim at starting that second week of August?

MR. SINDLINGER: That's acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman. I was thinking not only in terms of beginning our meetings earlier but also, if we had the report earlier, that it would give us more time to assess it and prepare material for the committee. Again, I'm just asking that we get the report in our hands as soon as possible. That is one way of doing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I made a note about that, and I'll speak to the Provincial Treasurer about getting it to members of the committee as soon as we possibly can.

The next item, considering the report, has a lot to do with the scheduling of meetings. Last year, instead of having meetings scattered through the week, we made an attempt to meet on Mondays and Tuesdays of each week. Is that acceptable to the members of the committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's an acceptable date for everybody? It minimizes travelling for those who, like me, have a fair distance to come and don't necessarily have public transport.

The time factor that I think caused all of us some difficulty last year has been brought up by two members already. Last year, as a rule we met Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning, and Tuesday afternoon. Would there be any advantage or disadvantage to meeting Monday morning and possibly Monday evening, the night that most of us would be staying over in Edmonton? Again, that would give us more time in the month of August. It's just a proposal I'm throwing to the committee.

MR. R. SPEAKER: [Inaudible] meeting on Tuesday as well? Is that what you're thinking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was suggesting Monday morning, afternoon, and possibly evening; Tuesday morning and possibly afternoon. I don't know how that fits in with people's airline schedules and similar problems. It's an attempt to try to get the committee's work, with the ministers in particular, completed

earlier so that we can spend more time on consideration of resolutions without the time pressures we had last year.

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible] With the schedules now, Monday morning is a bit tricky. A person doesn't really want to leave on Sunday night. I wouldn't mind Monday afternoon and evening, then Tuesday morning and afternoon. Monday morning is a little tricky. I could do it if it's acceptable to other members, but schedules at that time are not convenient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other members . . .

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say that I think the ministers would probably be more available on Monday from noon on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll try to be selective with the ministers who live in Edmonton. We can try to fit schedules in there perhaps.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I sympathize with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I think I'd prefer Monday afternoon, Monday evening, all day Tuesday, and all Tuesday night if need be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's another suggestion. What about Monday afternoon, Monday evening, Tuesday morning, afternoon, and evening? Or is that going to cause a similar difficulty?

MR. KNAAK: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's agreeable to Whitemud. What about those who have to travel a little farther than Whitemud?

MR. NOTLEY: [Inaudible]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Exactly. I take it from that that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview would prefer to have the Tuesday evening off to get home. Is that it? Does it fit in with schedules? It doesn't matter to me.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Was the suggestion Tuesday evening?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that's what the Member for Calgary McKnight was suggesting. Is that going to cause difficulties?

MR. NOTLEY: Why don't we try the Monday afternoon and evening, and then Tuesday morning and afternoon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: And see how it goes? Okay.

The next item on this very rough agenda is the appearance of ministers. Last year we had all the ministers appear who had any funding for their departments derived, directly or indirectly, from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, with the exception of the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, where it's essentially a matter of the debentures of Alberta Government Telephones. Has any member of the committee any feelings about which ministers it is useful or not too useful to have appear before the committee? I seem to remember that some of the appearances last year were remarkably brief.

MR. SINDLINGER: Whichever ministers we do have, I wonder if we could give consideration to first having appear before us the Provincial Treasurer and the Auditor General. The reason for that is we would then be able to deal

with old business first -- when I refer to old business, I'm referring to the recommendations this committee has made over the last year -- and ask the Provincial Treasurer what consideration has been given not only to the recommendations made by this committee but to the recommendations made by the Auditor General in his special report to the Legislative Assembly in February this year, I believe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In my notes about the agenda I have whether we would have the Auditor General appear again in front of the committee, as we did last year; whether we would do that, because we didn't establish it as a policy last year. I think Mr. Rogers volunteered his complete willingness to appear before us again in the future. Is the Member for Calgary Buffalo addressing the sequencing of the appearance of the Provincial Treasurer, the Auditor General, and the ministers?

MR. SINDLINGER: I'd better make two, to clear up any misunderstanding. I say unequivocally that we should again invite the Auditor General to appear before this committee. That's one point.

The second point would be that prior to having any other ministers appear before the committee, the Auditor General and the Provincial Treasurer should come so that we can determine what consideration has been given to (a) the recommendations made by this committee, and (b) the recommendations made by the Auditor General in his special report of this year.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the suggestion by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I hold a somewhat different view in that because of the time commitments and constraints he would have, we will likely have some difficulty in scheduling the Treasurer's time. I'm not certain that we can't accomplish what is being suggested when the Auditor General appears before the committee and when the Treasurer appears before the committee. We might best deal with the various ministers at the times when they are available to the committee. In most cases, it's probably much easier as far as rescheduling their time to appear before the committee. Insofar as the Treasurer and Auditor General are concerned, particularly the Treasurer, the time constraints on their time would probably be far more restrictive.

I would therefore not agree that we hear and discuss the recommendations and what was done with those recommendations, prior to reviewing the report, as has been suggested. I suggest we deal with the report as it relates to the specific ministers and, when we bring in the Treasurer, deal with all the areas he would be able to respond to, and similarly with the Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I might say I haven't yet checked with the Provincial Treasurer or with the Premier as to when they are available.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I suggest the way we proceed is to identify those ministers and/or individuals we wish to have come before the committee, and then leave the scheduling and negotiations with their time schedules up to you.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think the points the Member for Calgary Buffalo has made are strong. The only caveat I would put on is: if it's not possible to arrange it for our first set of meetings, then fair enough; I don't think we want to be arbitrary about it. But if it's with lots of advance notice now, we indicate through you to the Provincial Treasurer that we would like to start with the Provincial Treasurer -- after all, his comments are the very first observations in the report in any event. So it seems to me if we're going to start with the report, we start at the beginning. Therefore, the

normal course would be to have the Provincial Treasurer and the Auditor General. If that's not possible and the minister happens to be away, although I'm told the ministers are going to be around all summer so I think there should be no problem . . . That being the case, I don't think there's any overwhelming obstacle. But I think that's what we should try for as a target: that the first persons should be the Provincial Treasurer and the Auditor General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The suggestion is the Provincial Treasurer before the Auditor General, if possible. I presume the Auditor General is going to be on the agenda fairly early.

MR. NOTLEY: Hopefully fairly early, perhaps in that first couple of days' session. I think that's where we should start.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that we haven't got three proposals going here. Let's clarify it. The suggestion is that we should have the Auditor General and the Provincial Treasurer appear early, depending on their availability, and that I negotiate that with them as soon as possible, with a view to the second week of August. If, because of their schedules, that doesn't work out, we will accept their coming later on. Is that what's being said? I'm wondering if that's compatible with what the others have said. That's the problem.

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm nodding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're nodding your head from Buffalo. So that's acceptable to the committee. We dealt with three items in that discussion.

The difficulty we had last year with discussing the resolutions was brought up by two members, as well as me, because there were a fair number, if I remember correctly. Last year when I gave an indication of our time problem -- I don't like to use the word "deadline" -- we really had to push to get to the end of the resolutions in time to get the report completed. Do any members of the committee have any ideas of a reasonable deadline for getting submissions of proposed resolutions to me for discussion by the committee? I think it worked out last year when I organized all the resolutions that came forward into the various divisions of the fund and tried to group them together. It's not always the easiest thing to do. Is it acceptable to the committee if I do that? Has anybody any suggestions of a reasonable deadline for the submission of proposed resolutions, on the presumption that we get through hearings with the ministers in August?

MR. SINDLINGER: I was very comfortable working within the guidelines and deadlines set by you last year, and I think it worked out quite well. The only thing I would say in regard to a deadline this time around is that it be within a reasonable time after hearing our last witness, so we can take into account the testimony provided by that individual. From my point of view, I could do that quite easily within a week's time, if you would like to take that into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Looking at the calendar again, Labor Day is a fair distance into September, because the last two days of August are a Monday and a Tuesday, and presumably those would be the last two days we would be hearing ministers. On the basis that in the next week Monday is a public holiday -- presumably we wouldn't meet just on the Tuesday -- would the week after that be acceptable for the first meeting to consider resolutions, which means that the deadline

would be to get them to my office Labor Day weekend? Hopefully, that would be the Tuesday after the Labor Day weekend.

MR. R. SPEAKER: September 7.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's right. On the presumption that in August we finish with all the ministers, the Provincial Treasurer, the Auditor General, and the Premier.

The next one is the difficulty: the scheduling from there on. We don't know how many resolutions we will get. I think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and I had a discussion last year about a fair number of proposed resolutions he wished to submit. Of course, the number of resolutions is to some extent going to dictate how much time we need to discuss them. And we now have the requirement that we table the report in the Legislature by a certain date in October, or I think the wording is that it is deemed to have been tabled. I presume we'll have to do it *ad hoc* on the amount of time it takes to discuss proposed resolutions and dispose of them one way or another.

Perhaps for the Member for Olds-Didsbury, in the past the committee has visited certain projects funded by divisions of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund: a housing project in Airdrie and, last year, the Kananaskis Country development southwest of Calgary. There are many other projects around the province that can be visited by the committee. I don't have any particular concerns about which ones, but perhaps members of the committee have some ideas on that type of visit or tour of projects and entities funded, either by loans or by direct funding, from the Heritage Savings Trust Fund or by the Crown corporations funded from the fund.

MR. NOTLEY: We've tentatively scheduled our first meeting for August 9. Since not all the members are here, I wonder if we could propose that as a result of the minutes of this meeting, members are asked to relay their proposals to you prior to the 9th. Then, as a group, we could consider them. That way, all members would have an opportunity to advance suggestions. That would seem to me still to be enough time for you to follow through. We could only make decisions as a committee, in any event. The more advance information you had would seem to be better. So if we were to get our proposals to you by the 9th, then perhaps in that first session we could maybe take a half hour or so to discuss that on the basis of proposals people have made.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I was just going to suggest that maybe we could look at the Walter C. Mackenzie hospital this year as one of the projects.

MR. KNAAK: First of all, I think we should make a decision now as to whether or not we want to see a project and where we want to go. I think the time to view something should be prior to starting the formal meetings. In other words, possibly we should use the month of July and the early part of August to view any project, not use up the time during August and September when we're involved with the ministers and debating the resolutions.

One of the things I think would be worth examining would be irrigation projects in southern Alberta.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, I concur with the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud in that we should determine the areas we would be visiting and attempt to do that in July. There's just no way we would have the kind of time if we waited till August before we do that. I further suggest that we seriously consider visiting the renewable resource, the reforestation project that is in the northeastern area, the Smoky Lake or Redwater area.

Further to that, I think there is tremendous merit for this committee -- it's considered the watchdog committee, if you will; that characterization has been attached to it -- basically to have a fairly thorough opportunity of getting a very thorough introduction to the systems which the Treasury employs and operates under in the actual department. I strongly recommend that the committee give serious consideration to visiting the Treasurer's Department that handles the heritage savings trust funds and get a very thorough introduction to the systems and processes, particularly as it would relate to the short-term investments area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Section 9 investments.

MR. SINDLINGER: I would like to support very strongly what has just been said by Mr. Mack. I was going to put it in another way. I was going to say that we should go to the place where they keep the money and visit the money -- just facetiously say it that way. But I think it is important to do what has just been suggested and get a first-hand instructional tour of the management and accounting control procedures in place for the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I can't say enough times how important that would be for us in demonstrating to the public that we are being diligent in reviewing the Heritage Savings Trust Fund.

MR. NOTLEY: Good point.

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont in the visit to the Treasury. In doing that, I suppose I'm agreeing with the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. However, I would question the value of any other tours or visits. I question them for two reasons. A number of members of the committee are familiar with some and have desires to go to others, and vice versa. I think most of us have been in this Legislature for three years and, on our own, should have become familiar with projects out there that are of concern to us, and hence can bring that knowledge to our discussions. I really don't see anything accomplished by the group of us touring around to this or that point in the province, other than using up some more public funds. In this time of restraint, I would suggest that we do our business in Edmonton with a visit to Treasury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We seem to be into a discussion now. We now have two very different approaches. First of all, with regard to the remarks made by the Member for Edmonton Whitemud about scheduling, I wrote down a note that perhaps we should try to do any visits in July because those do not necessarily require that we have the report in front of us or have met with the ministers ahead of time. To try to leave as much time as possible after receiving the report for discussion of the report and the discussions with ministers, I had thought we might do any visits during the month of July or right at the beginning of August, before we got onto the discussion of the annual report of the trust fund.

I think what we now have is a suggestion from the Member for Bonnyville that we do no visits other than the potential visit to the Department of Treasury facilities, which seems to have approval. Was that essentially the intent?

MR. ISLEY: That was the intent of my comments, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, the very first time the committee travelled was to Airdrie in the fall of 1978, I believe, to look at an Alberta Housing trailer park. That was not a premeditated decision. As a matter of fact, it came out of the discussions with the minister. It came out of a sense that perhaps

answers needed to be obtained, and therefore it was commissioned when we discovered there was a reason for a field trip. If we're concerned about not wasting taxpayers money, that's one reason I'm a little reluctant to get ourselves into a situation where we just go for the sake of going. If, as a result of our hearings with the ministers or some concern brought forward by members of the committee, there's a reason to go and, as a committee, we want to judge that by taking a field trip, then I think we should take a field trip.

The suggestion the Member for Edmonton Belmont and the Member for Little Bow made is perfectly appropriate because it's not going to cost us anything, and I think it's a place to start. The idea that we see the actual operation of investment in the Treasury Department is a first class idea. We should do that, and that could well be done in July. I don't see any problem there. And Walter C. Mackenzie isn't going to cost us anything. But if we're looking at other trips, I think there is some real argument that perhaps we should defer that until our discussions lead us to the conclusion that there's a need, and there may or may not be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's another point the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is making.

MR. ISLEY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he says there's no cost even to a visit in the city. There's a cost to this committee wherever it meets and whatever it meets for. The only cost you're saving by a visit in the city as opposed to one out in the country is one of transportation and accommodation. I would put forward a motion for debate that this year the committee consider no tours other than the visit to Treasury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I take it that it's moved by the Member for Bonnyville that tours in 1982 be limited to the Department of Treasury? Debate on the motion now.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I really think that handicaps us as a committee. The Member for Spirit River-Fairview has indicated that, one, we can agree on the Treasury visit. That seems to be a consensus here, and I accept that. It's a good idea. But secondly, if there are projects where there is overexpenditure and where it seems that information is unclear to us -- the minister can't describe what has happened on the scene -- we should be open and able to move there as a committee fairly quickly, if necessary. The reason I raised the question of going to the Walter C. Mackenzie is that I think it's obvious to the committee that the minister had to take some rather drastic action and intervene with the board, supposedly to hold down costs. What has happened to that facility? Is it still the adequate facility it started out to be? It was a current subject in our last debate. I raised the caveat saying that if we want to make the decision on August 9 or thereafter, fine; but if we are going to visit, I put it as one of the items on the agenda.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, responding to the hon. Member for Little Bow, there has been a tremendous amount of debate and discussion both in the Legislature and at committee level on the proposal. I think the committee would probably utilize their time and efforts in terms of the public purse and public good if they would perhaps leave that particular area until phase two, which has been approved by the government, is well on its way, rather than recultivating the ground already covered very, very thoroughly in many different arenas. I could not support that, particularly on the basis of the committee's time. I would much rather we apply our efforts in getting a solid handle on what's



happening in Treasury and what's happening in the investments of those funds. I think we would spend our time far more meaningfully and beneficially if we addressed that one single area in a sense of thoroughness rather than trying to replough old ground. I think there's a tremendous amount of merit in visiting that complex, but let's wait until phase two gets well on its way. We've certainly covered phase one very well. The minister has of course raised concerns, and we all have raised those very same concerns, as to the cost escalation.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, I think we're being very specific on the items, and we're getting bogged down on that. The proposal was made to visit Treasury and then leave ourselves enough latitude, as different situations arise or if some questions arise that can't be answered here, to get out in the field and check a certain project if we feel it necessary. If we leave ourselves that latitude, we can deal with any problems.

MR. NOTLEY: I really think we would be -- not ridiculed, but people would have some doubts about our common sense if at this stage of the game we say that we're not going to go on any field trips. There's no point in having hearings. One of the ironies of what happened in 1978 -- and the Member for Little Bow was on the committee; I don't know if other members were -- was that there was a great discussion in the committee over the problems at Airdrie. Interestingly enough, one of the things the field trip did was diffuse the problems. After the problems had been raised, and we as a committee had a chance to see it in action, we had certain recommendations. But it was a very positive thing. The point was that it came out of the discussions of the committee. We went to Airdrie because there was a reason to go to Airdrie. Surely that's a flexibility we have to have.

I think the suggestion of the Member for Edmonton Belmont of starting with the Treasury Department is a common-sense one. We should do that automatically. But beyond that, let's not close the door. That's the objection I have at this stage to the proposal by the Member for Bonnyville. Let's not close the door. We don't need to open up 50 doors and spend \$100,000 chasing all over the place, but let's not close the door to what may come out of our hearings.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking up the committee's time, but I'd like to respond to that once again. I have no problem with the suggestion of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. But I would place on it the caveat that unless the extenuating circumstance is similar to that in Airdrie articulated by him, the position be that we do not plan field trips other than if, during the discussions with ministers, it is determined that one is merited. We could make the decision at that point in time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have some difficulty with this because if we pass the motion put in front of us, we would then have to reverse it in order to do what the Member for Edmonton Belmont and others are talking about. I get the impression that there is a consensus that we should definitely make arrangements -- and I'll have to discuss what time of day is suitable with the Provincial Treasurer -- to visit the Treasury Department's facilities for handling the investments, particularly those under Section 9. I can quite easily do that, and we can make a booking for it. I don't imagine they want a bunch of people crawling all over their desks during their working day, but I'm sure arrangements can be made.

As far as other proposals, I also get a feeling -- and it may be a wrong one -- that there's an antipathy to the idea of precommitting to visit any other facility in the province. There's also a feeling that a door should be open

so that if something arises during the hearings, we could then go and visit any specific entity that was causing some concern.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, could we just have the motion read back? There may be some way of amending that to deal with the concerns raised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we pass the motion, even in an amended form, it may be restrictive on other visits arising. Do you have the motion in writing?

SECRETARY: That no consideration be given to public hearings other than the Treasury Department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Public hearings or visits?

SECRETARY: Visits. Visitations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We would need an amendment, something along the lines of: unless such visit becomes evident during the hearings.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't want to get to the question quite yet. If we did pass this, I think we'd have real difficulties. We would then actually have to reverse it by a further motion, and that doesn't seem too wise a way of doing it. Can anybody think of an amendment that would cover the situation?

MR. ISLEY: I'm not sure I have the wording of an amendment, Mr. Chairman, but the intent of the motion basically was that at this point in time, we don't lay out plans for public tours. I have no problem with the committee's saying at some future point in time, as a result of evidence that comes from witnesses or other sources: hey, we should go look at something. My concern is that we shouldn't sit here and start planning an itinerary, because I have certain questions about the worth of it.

I'd be quite comfortable with an amendment in words similar to those you and the hon. Member for Edmonton Whitemud used: unless necessitated by evidence that comes before the committee or at the discretion of the committee in view of evidence that comes before it during its deliberations.

MR. CHAIRMAN: With what's proposed and what's going to be in *Hansard* this afternoon, I think we all know what we mean by what is being said. So can we word the resolution: Be it moved that the committee visit the facilities at the Treasury Department and that other public visits be held only if there is indication during the hearings.

AN HON. MEMBER: For the need of such visits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes: for the need of such visits. That's the legal beagle. Now, is that acceptable to the committee? Those in favor? Those against? It's unanimous.

On my agenda we are now down to the subject of "other" which, in the past, has included discussions about having consultants. Consultants have been hired on, I think, two occasions in the past, going over all the minutes.

Is there anything else members of the committee wish to bring up?

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess it would be appropriate to give notice at this time that, as a member of this committee, I ask that you contact the Provincial Treasurer to advise us whether a major public opinion survey on the

Heritage Savings Trust Fund has been commissioned by the government. I have copies of a survey which, to my knowledge, is certainly not done by any of the opposition parties: a 20-page, in-depth survey on the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which I presume is a government-sponsored survey. I'm not sure of that. That's why I would like to know. Because if it is, the information obtained on the survey would be extremely useful to all the members of the committee in our deliberations this fall.

If members have an opportunity to look over it, the survey goes into almost every aspect of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund: public attitudes toward the trust fund, who they think started the trust fund, recommendations in terms of what changes could be made to strengthen the trust fund, and concerns people have about the efficiency of the trust fund. Almost everything that, in one way or another, we debate in the deliberation of our recommendations every year is covered in this rather intensive survey.

I don't pretend to be an expert on public opinion surveys, but I am advised that this survey is considered an in-depth survey and is done not on the telephone but home to home. In other words, the interviewer goes to the home. So it's a very expensive one. If it's done by some organization other than the government of Alberta, then it really isn't in the purview of this committee. But if it is done by the government of Alberta, I think the information should be disclosed to the members of the committee. Perhaps we might even ask Thompson Lightstone & Company Limited to come before the committee. Again, I preface this by saying: if it's a government survey.

Mr. Chairman, my request to you would be for you to obtain for the information of the committee whether or not it is a government study. If it is, I just advise you that I give notice that on the 9th I will propose a motion that the information be made available to members of the committee. But I'm not in a position to do that at this stage, because I don't know whether it's a government survey, and I think it's only appropriate that you find that out. I do know that it's about the heritage trust fund and that it's a very in-depth survey, information which would be of benefit to all members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Certainly I can do that. I have no problem with approaching the Provincial Treasurer. If it's a government survey, I imagine that's under whose agency it would be done. Perhaps I should check with the Provincial Treasurer and then notify members of the committee, including the Member for Spirit River-Fairview obviously, whether it is a government survey, whether a survey has been performed, or whether it's a working document.

AN HON. MEMBER: It sure looks like a good idea to have a survey done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm glad to see somebody's doing it. [interjections] I think how much the contract's going to be depends on the number of people surveyed.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Chairman, under the item "other business", I might say that inasmuch as it is our responsibility to review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund annual report and inasmuch as to do this thoroughly it is necessary to have as much information as possible, I would therefore like to move that this committee respectfully request the Auditor General and/or the Provincial Treasurer to provide this committee a copy of the Auditor General's management report of February 1982 dealing with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund and provided to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the management . . .

MR. SINDLINGER: Repeating the motion: that this committee respectfully request the Auditor General and/or the Provincial Treasurer to provide this committee a copy of the Auditor General's management report, February 1982, dealing with the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and which was provided to the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's a formal motion. Any debate on the motion put forward by the Member for Calgary Buffalo? Any remarks by the Member for Calgary Buffalo included in that debate?

MR. SINDLINGER: Do you want me to close debate or do you want members to debate the motion first, then have me close it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't know if the member had any comments he wished to add to the motion he just read.

MR. SINDLINGER: I thought perhaps I might. But maybe we should listen to other members, then I could close debate on it. That might be the most expedient way to do it.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'd like to hear from the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo his reasons for proposing that motion, so I could respond.

MR. SINDLINGER: Certainly. The reason is simply this: in order to review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, we have to have all the information we can possibly get in order to make an informed, reasonable, and responsible assessment and evaluation of the trust fund management over the last year. We are now aware that these management reports are provided. At this point in our deliberations last year, we were not aware that these things were in fact done. Since becoming aware of it, the Auditor General himself has seen fit to provide that management report to us. He included it in his special report to the Legislative Assembly in the spring of this year. I see no harm in placing a request before him to provide this year's management report to us. All he can do is say no, but at least we have gone through our responsibilities. We have asked for that type of information, and we have fulfilled our obligation and duties as committee members to review the Heritage Savings Trust Fund annual report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody else has anything to say?

MR. KNAAK: Mr. Chairman, from listening to the Provincial Treasurer last year, my impression is that one of the Acts that establishes the relationship between the Auditor General and the government makes it illegal to table such information in the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think there's a difference between demanding and, as I understand the Member for Calgary Buffalo, a request to the Auditor General. As I recall, the Auditor General Act is that he can report to the Legislature if certain actions aren't taken. But there is some discretion -- and perhaps we might check the Act -- in terms of what he can do. The Member for Calgary Buffalo has simply asked that this information be made available. If the Auditor General by law isn't able to do so, then that's that; he'll simply say no. But if he can, it seems to me we can hardly be doing our job as a committee unless we are prepared to evaluate the management report.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to add my interpretation from all that discussion: the Provincial Auditor can table the matter if he so desires.

It's his discretion. But there is the part in the Act which says there are certain matters which he may communicate to a respective minister, and that's the discretionary part of it. I think the request is that we do want that information, or the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is requesting it, and the Provincial Auditor can provide it, if so desired. By example, he has already done so in that special report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought the Auditor General in his report did specify the limitations on what shall and what shall not be tabled in the Legislature. I have a feeling it's exclusive. I can't find it this quickly in here.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, while you're looking at the document, if I may speak in opposition to the motion. There has been at least innuendo, if not open criticism of the Auditor General, who is an officer of this Legislature, independent of government. And that troubles me some, when this committee is questioning the integrity of the Auditor General. As Chairman of the Select Standing Committee on Legislative Offices, I feel that the Auditor General would be the first to share with this committee, and with the Legislature, any areas of concern which he as an independent auditor, looking after the interests of Albertans, would find. To some degree it's reprehensible that we are questioning -- if not directly, indirectly -- that autonomous integrity of the officer of this Legislature.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, we've gone through this exercise before. As the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont mentioned, we know that the innuendoes and the rest were greatly played up in the press and a lot of doubt was expressed in the community as to the management of the fund, the ability of the auditors, and whether this committee was performing its function. In view of the nature of this particular motion, I suggest we table it to the next meeting to give you, as chairman, an opportunity to consult with the Auditor to see whether he has the legal ability to do what is requested before we vote on the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps that's better, because my memory is that the legislation is exclusive.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I think to table the motion takes precedent over everything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's correct. It's tabled. Nor is it debatable.  
Those in favor?

MR. SINDLINGER: I'm sorry you object [inaudible]. I'm very concerned about what's happening here. First of all, with regard to Mr. Mack talking about innuendoes with regard to the Auditor General and it being reprehensible, there's no innuendo whatsoever. There's just a simple request asking for this information and if, in his judgment, the Auditor General felt it was contrary to legislation, I'm sure he'd be the first to say so. But the important thing is that we just ask it. I don't want to get into the arguments we had before, but just to table this thing like this without debate or voting on it I think raises more questions than it answers. The public's going to ask why we aren't doing this, what we are trying to hide. Why not just ask for this material? The Auditor General or the Provincial Treasurer can say no, you don't get it. Just to sweep it under the table like that is rather cavalier and leaves the government open to the criticism that it's not open government. I sure wouldn't want to have anyone say that about this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have in front of us a motion to table the motion, and a motion to table isn't debatable. I think we should vote on that motion before we know where we're going elsewhere. The motion to table is only so that I can check with the Auditor General on whether or not the motion of the Member for Calgary Buffalo is acceptable to him. That information is obviously going to come back to the committee at the meeting on August 9.

MR. NOTLEY: On a point of information, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that Section 29 of the Auditor General Act is fairly clear.

The Auditor General may, at the request of a department, Provincial agency or Crown . . . organization or any other organization or body of which he is the auditor, provide advice relating to the organization, systems and proposed course of action of the department, Provincial agency or Crown-controlled or other organization or body.

It's certainly discretionary. It's "may", and the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo is that we "request". So it would be up to the Auditor General. It would be discretionary; he would have the power.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As we know from the discussions that caused us some difficulty last year. Those in favor of the motion to table the motion by the Member for Calgary Buffalo that was presented by the Member for Calgary McKnight? Those against that motion? I don't know. Can you abstain in this situation? I don't think so.

MR. NOTLEY: Against.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Against the motion to table. Okay. Can we have the count again?

Those in favor of the motion to table the motion by the Member for Calgary Buffalo? Those against the motion to table the matter? The motion is defeated, so we're back on the original motion.

MR. KNAAK: First of all, I must say I don't have much confidence in the Member for Spirit River-Fairview to read the law. He's made errors before, and he could be making one again. [interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER: Thanks, Peter.

MR. NOTLEY: I do have the Act.

MR. KNAAK: You've had other acts before -- hard to follow. First of all, my impression is that even if there is dispute on the matter of law, that matter has to be clarified. But there's another very important element here that goes to the heart of the issue. What does the Auditor's report represent? He's explained to us that his report represents those matters that, pursuant to his responsibilities under the Act, should in his view be brought to the attention of the public.

He acts in a double role. He's just one individual when he's acting as an adviser. There are a lot of advisers to the government and the Provincial Treasurer with respect to the proper operation of his department. As far as I know, it's customary in all governments that advice given to a government is kept confidential, because if advisers knew that all their advice became public they'd soon cease to give advice. That basic principle has been followed by this government and other governments. We went through this whole

debate last year, and it seems to me that a management report in the nature that it's given to the Treasury Department is a matter of advice. To the extent that, pursuant to his responsibilities, the Auditor feels that matters should be reported to the public, he does that, and we deal with it here. So I speak against the motion.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess I too have to speak against the motion, though my preference would certainly have been for us to table it. In light of not having an opportunity to gauge the Auditor General's interpretation of a request from this committee, my problem with respect to voting for this motion is that we may be putting him in a precarious position: requiring some information from that individual, or requesting it as a committee. While he may well feel that it's not legislatively inappropriate, at the same time it would be, in terms of the overall running of the fund. I couldn't vote for the motion unless the chairman had an opportunity to discuss that with the Auditor General and have some understanding as to what a request would mean to him; whether he would feel free to reject that request, not just on a legislative basis but on a judgment basis, with regard to the fund. That may have been different if members had passed the motion to table.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Chairman, we keep hearing these implications of innuendo against the Auditor General. The statement was made that his responsibility is to the people of Alberta. But that's our responsibility as well. That's what we're elected to do. I don't think it's our responsibility to pass the buck onto to someone else and let them look after our job. If the information in the management report is of value in the discussions of this committee, I think it should be made available. I think that if we scrutinize that management report, it has nothing to do with the individual who put it together. We're scrutinizing the material, not the individual. I think we have to separate the two and recognize that there is a difference. If it will contribute to decision-making in this committee for betterment and for information for the people of this province, I think it should be made available.

MR. NOTLEY: First of all, I'd like to make the observation that I don't know where this business of impugning the motives of the work of the Auditor General is coming from because, to my knowledge, it certainly is not coming from members of this committee. That doesn't mean that one always agrees with everything that any person does, servant of the Legislature or otherwise. But there's certainly been no question ever of impugning the integrity of the Auditor General of this province by any member of the Assembly, at least not to my knowledge. I take exception to any suggestion that there has been.

However, I do just want to offer the observation -- I don't want to upset the Member for Edmonton Whitemud too much -- but if one looks through the Auditor General Act, in addition to Section 29, Section 19 is fairly straightforward. The Auditor General "shall report to the . . . Assembly" on certain things if, in his judgment, things haven't been rectified, but he "may" report otherwise. And it's all there in Section 19(5).

The Auditor General need not report on deficiencies in systems or procedures otherwise subject to report under subsection (2)(d) or (e) which, in his opinion, have been . . . rectified.

That's fair enough. He need not report. That doesn't mean he can't report. The motion the Member for Calgary Buffalo has put before the committee is not that we demand, that we order him to report. We request that he make the management letter available. If, in his judgment, under Section 19(5) the

concerns have been rectified, he will simply not report. The Act is very clear. As I see it, the motion the Member for Calgary Buffalo put is completely consistent with the Auditor General Act. It seems to me that it's a question of whether we as a committee feel this management letter would be useful. If we do, I think we should ask for it. If the Auditor General feels that, in his judgment, matters have been rectified pursuant to the Act, he will simply say no. To say no is no discredit to him; he has the power to do that in the Act. But it seems to me that it's certainly clearly within our obligation as a watchdog committee to request the information. That's all the member's notion has suggested: that we request the information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My interpretation is that the member's motion is asking for a document. I have a memory -- I'm not a lawyer either -- that there are provisions in the Auditor General Act which exclude certain documents from being tabled. I think the interpretation has been that this is the type of document that is excluded from being tabled in the Legislative Assembly. That's why I'm having difficulty with the motion from the beginning. Did the Member for Calgary McKnight want back into the discussion?

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, this is probably a surprise to the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, but I could support the motion, because I feel that we should have any information we can get that will help us do our job. However, I made the tabling motion for the simple reason that there's a doubt in my mind and, listening to the debate, there's obviously doubt in the minds of many members of this committee as to whether the Auditor General is in the position to provide it. If the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo had listened carefully, the tabling motion simply said that I asked the chairman to investigate with the Auditor General if it could be released and to report back at the next meeting of this committee, which is only a few short weeks from now.

I do not intend for this committee to go through all the wrangles we went through before, which were nothing more than an exercise for the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo to get a lot of press out of. But the regrettable thing was that it planted in the minds of many citizens of our province the fear or suspicion that the funds were being mishandled, that money was disappearing, that illegal operations were going on, and all the rest of it. I'm not suggesting that the hon. member said this, but the innuendo was there. If this committee is going to function properly, it has a far bigger mandate than to be fussing around with this kind of thing.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury mentioned that we should have it because it would help us make decisions. I ask hon. committee members how many of them took into consideration what was in the management letter the hon. member for Calgary Buffalo had, before they made any decisions when they were making their recommendations on the report last fall? I suggest that very few considerations were taken as to that letter. Again, certainly I support the motion, but I'm going to vote against it because, as I said earlier, you should be in the position to know whether or not what we're asking for is legally obtainable and, in my opinion, that should be determined with the Auditor General by you, as our chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I refer the committee to pages 27 and 28 of the special report from the Auditor. Summarizing it very quickly, the Auditor General says that according to Section 25, in the opinion of the Auditor General, matters that are immaterial or insignificant can be reported or not reported. If he so feels, the Auditor General can go to that management letter of February 1982 -- I'm interpreting what he's saying here -- and report matters that he feels may be significant or matters of which the



committee should be aware. If there are other personal or confidential items which he lists later, in terms of health records or other kinds of things, he could maintain the confidence of that and not report it to us. So right here from this report, that is an option the Auditor General leaves open.

On the bottom of page 27 and onto page 28, the Auditor General goes on to say that he feels strongly about not tabling the management letter as such in total. That would be a position he would take on our request. On that basis, I see nothing wrong with making the request. If part of the management letter can be submitted to us, he would do that; if not, he wouldn't. He would make the decision according to what's here. I don't think we should prejudge how he would respond to it. Maybe there are some significant things he'd like to tell us.

MR. KNAAK: It seems that the argument is almost defeating itself. The Auditor General has the discretion in deciding what information he would like to report to the House. He'll be giving us a report shortly. He'll include in that report that which he in his discretion chooses to report. Everyone has confirmed the support and the integrity of the Auditor General. He will disclose to the people of Alberta that information which, in his discretion, he believes is important for the people of Alberta. I too have integrity. Sometimes he hits the government hard if need be, and I'm glad he does, because I want to see it as well. I have confidence that he'll report to us that which he feels he should. He has done so in the past and will do so in the future. We know that he does not feel that all the management letters should be reported. It seems to me that it's just a political manoeuvre at this particular point in time, knowing that that kind of information won't be made available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Perhaps for the benefit of members, I should read the paragraphs on pages 27 and 28 to which the Member for Little Bow is referring.

As explained more fully in sub-section B.2 of this report, management letters are issued pursuant to section 28 of the Auditor General Act to communicate systems weaknesses and deficiencies to management, as well as other matters observed during audits. Because all observations and recommendations are discussed thoroughly with auditees during audits, management letters contain only abbreviated versions of audit findings and, therefore, are unsuitable for distribution to people unfamiliar with the matters reported. In addition, management letters are normally considered to be part of an auditor's working papers and section 27 of the Auditor General Act states that "Audit working papers of the Office of the Auditor General shall not be tabled in the Legislative Assembly or before a Committee of the Legislative Assembly." For a legislative auditor to operate effectively, he must be able to communicate audit concerns in their formative stages to management, and receive responses thereto, without such communications being public. Most of these audit concerns are dealt with by management without delay and are not sufficiently important to warrant bringing to the attention of the Legislative Assembly. The Legislature recognizes this in the Auditor General Act by giving the Auditor General certain discretion when deciding what he should report to the Legislative Assembly. If management letters were tabled in the Legislative Assembly, the Auditor General's legislatively approved discretion would be rendered redundant and the Assembly would receive much insignificant and maybe potentially misleading information.

I think those are the two paragraphs out of the special report of the Auditor General to the Assembly on certain matters related to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund of last year, to which the Member for Little Bow was referring.

That's exactly the legal point I was having difficulty with: that certain documents shall not be tabled in the Assembly nor in front of a committee. I think we have to take the interpretation of the officer of this Assembly, the Auditor General. A tabling motion was put that I should discuss this with him, and that motion was defeated. So we are now back to the motion of the Member for Calgary Buffalo. That's the matter in front of the committee, but I think it has to be taken with reference to the information in those two paragraphs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we have the question on the motion by the Member for Calgary Buffalo? Does the Member for Calgary Buffalo wish to make any concluding remarks?

MR. SINDLINGER: No, Mr. Chairman, except I wish to thank all the members for the consideration and deliberation they gave this motion. Let's go on to the vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the motion by the Member for Calgary Buffalo? Those against? The motion is defeated.

MR. SINDLINGER: I have another motion for consideration, please, Mr. Chairman. It is this:

Moved that this committee respectfully request the Auditor General and/or the Provincial Treasurer to provide this committee in camera a copy of the Auditor General management report, February 1982, on the heritage fund provided to the Provincial Treasurer.

It's the same motion as the one prior, except that it asks that it be given to us in camera, rather than tabled in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure that this committee can meet in camera as a committee of the Legislature.

First of all, before we get into another long and unnecessary repeat discussion, would the Member for Calgary Buffalo accept a tabling motion from a member of the committee so that this can be checked out?

MR. SINDLINGER: Yes. And I respectfully ask you also to consider the term "in camera"; that is, if it would be provided to us in confidence, as opposed to in camera. All I'm saying is, the essence of this motion is that we be able to look at it so that it isn't publicly disseminated, if that's the criterion, qualification, condition, or caveat that the committee or Auditor General would place upon our review of that management letter.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Chairman, I have problems with this motion, because the hon. member said earlier that this committee should be doing everything in its power to show the people of Alberta that we're concerned about the management of the fund, where it's going, and how the money is being handled. I can't think of anything that would create suspicion in the minds of people more quickly than going into an in camera meeting. We're not a cabinet, we don't have responsibilities under the Crown, and we're not sworn to certain things as is a minister.

I urge that this motion be defeated. If anything, I suggest that committee members support the first motion as originally tabled, because this motion is the same one we just defeated, just adding the one word, and I think that word is frightening to the people of Alberta.

MR. MACK: Mr. Chairman, I totally agree with the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. I further suggest that the committee reject the previous motion. This motion is basically the same, and it's really out of order.

MR. KNAAK: I want to say that a long history has been developed in the democratic process that government trials and so on be held in public. For anyone now to suggest that we take information in secret is absolutely ridiculous. Even more ridiculous is to think that it would be kept secret by the opposition.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, number one, I don't think the motion is out of order; we should agree to that. Government members here talk about matters being done behind closed doors; they don't believe in that, and it should be done in public. The Auditor General's legislation is so designed that through the form of management letters, information is kept secret and away from this committee. If members of the government feel strongly about that, then that legislation should be changed. That's number one, and part of our concern in debate in this Legislature.

Secondly, I can't support the resolution itself because I feel that anything I do with this government, and in this Legislature, should be done in this room, in the open. I don't want to be partner to something I find out behind closed doors. If I can't repeat it after I come out from those closed doors, I'm part of the crime, if there is any there. I don't even want to be part of that. On that basis, I can't support the resolution. But the solution to the problem being created here is a change in the Auditor General's legislation. When we discussed the Auditor General's report earlier this spring, I advised the Auditor General that I didn't support that section in his Act where he could keep information, or anything he finds, confidential between him, the Provincial Treasurer, and any other minister of government. The principle there is wrong. The Auditor General is not responsible for the inadequacies of this government; it is the elected people. He's intervening in a process that I don't accept. I've said this to him in committee. I know the Auditor General doesn't agree with it, because he feels responsible to make change happen.

I add those comments to the members of the Conservative caucus. If they feel so strongly about business being done in public and the Auditor General reporting everything, let's have an amendment to the legislation. We wouldn't have to go through these little gymnastics. But on the basis of doing something behind closed doors, I'm sorry; I can't be part of that and can't support the resolution.

MR. D. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I agree substantially with the initial comments of the Leader of the Opposition. I don't believe the in camera proposal would solve the difficulties involved in releasing information that may affect the management of the fund. That is simply because the members of this committee aren't bound -- and, indeed, I think the Leader of the Opposition is correct -- and should not be bound to withhold information they receive from their colleagues or the public. As well, I think it doesn't solve the problem articulated in the previous discussion, which is simply that the Auditor General may feel required to present information which would not be in the best interests of the management of the fund -- not of the government, but of the fund.

In quickly dealing with the latter comments of the Leader of the Opposition, clearly the legislation is designed in such a way to ensure that the fund is both protected, managed properly, and at the same time invested in the best interests of Albertans. If we opened all information to the public, clearly that would limit our ability to invest properly and wisely on a long-term basis or a short-term, day-to-day basis. That wouldn't be in the best interests of Albertans.

So, agreeing with the substantial arguments of the Leader of the Opposition, I would have to vote against this motion in a very definite way. As I say, at the same time I would have supported a motion to table previously, but not in this case. This wouldn't solve the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any last comments by the Member for Calgary Buffalo?

MR. SINDLINGER: I withdraw it. I made the motion to make a point, and I think it has been made very well by many of the members.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does that mean the motion is withdrawn, or do we vote on it? The motion is withdrawn?

MR. SINDLINGER: If I may, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the committee in favor of withdrawing the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other matters members wish to bring forward with regard to the function of the committee this summer and fall?

MR. D. ANDERSON: A motion to adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I accept a motion to adjourn. The timetable will be sent from the office to members of the committee.

Thank you.

*The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.*