

[Chairman: Mr. Ady]

[2:01 p.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We'll call the meeting to order. I appreciate all of you assembling on relatively short notice. This meeting was called primarily to discuss, if necessary, and to approve the annual report of the standing committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Each of you, I think, has received a copy of it, and hopefully you've had time to peruse it.

Just prior to moving on to that, I'd just like to go on record and express appreciation to Corinne, our legislative secretary, for the work that she's done in the past year in arranging our schedules and getting all the information in front of us that we've had. I think she's done a really good job, and I'd just like to . . . [applause]

MR. TAYLOR: She's too good at finding us, though.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. And now back to the draft of the annual report that you have in front of you. I might mention that there is one change in the format of the report from previous years, and that is that in previous years we've always been a year behind in the responses to the recommendations, but at the discretion of the Chair, I felt that it would be more effective if we had those responses in the current year, if it was at all possible. So at some insistence we had the responses included in this year's report so that we can deal with things on a more current basis with our report. Hopefully, everyone in the committee can agree to that process, but I did want to draw to your attention that that change did take place. Any discussion on the report?

Yes, Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: It might be just typographical, but at the top of page 8 you said, "[Mr.] Klein . . . appeared before the Committee . . . The Minister was joined by Mr. John McInnis, M.L.A." Is that true? I don't . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I think what happened there is that John McInnis did come into the committee meeting that day. Perhaps the choice of words is not . . .

MR. TAYLOR: But everywhere else you've got the minister joined by their deputy minister and so on. Mind you, John might have thought it was a promotion. Wouldn't it be better to say that he joined the committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We could still make the correction, couldn't we? Just change it to read "John McInnis," and then identify him, "also visited the committee." That says it, and I think that's fair.

MR. TAYLOR: I know John feels he should be judged by the birds he's flying with, and I think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anything else? Thanks for drawing that to our attention. It probably should be changed, and we can do that prior to sending it to print.

Member for Ponoka-Rimbey.

MR. JONSON: I don't think, Mr. Chairman, this will hinder further questions - I see there's another over here - but I would move approval of the report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Then we should have discussion on the motion.

MR. MOORE: I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll entertain discussion on the motion to approve the report.

Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: I have a bit of a problem in . . .

MR. MOORE: I've noticed that, Nick.

MR. TAYLOR: . . . approving the report - I was all right until I got sitting next to you - to the extent that I feel a report such as this should leave either room for a minority report, if you want to call it, or at least put on record in the report the motions that were discussed that we asked to be recorded. I'll agree that we use a motion system as sort of a discussion motion, and it might be silly to put all 50. I think we had 50 motions, didn't we, or something . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you talking about recommendations?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. In other words, it looks like a monolithic report that a hundred percent agreed with. I think that there are motions made by different people here, maybe some on the opposition and some on the government side, that were important enough to be put in the report as having been moved and defeated, if you want. I feel that particularly the motions we asked for a recorded vote on should be shown as having been moved and defeated. I think it shows a couple of things. One, I think it shows that the committee discussed some of the issues that somebody might later on say, "how come this isn't in there?" but because we defeated it, there's no sign of it. Secondly, I think it gives almost a minority report, not necessarily in the party sense, because I think some motions that may be on there that were defeated were put forward by government members too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Lacombe, on that issue.

MR. MOORE: Yes, on that issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon comes forward with very good ideas. However, all recommendations are adequately reported in *Hansard* during our sessions. They're public documents. The press is there with full coverage in the paper. There should be; they sometimes don't give us the coverage I think we should get. But that part of the process is out there with the public. If you're going to just put that in, then we should put in everything that went on in all those meetings, and I don't think that's necessary. They're public documents now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, certainly if we start expanding the report, it would really bring us to the point of publishing *Hansard*. I'd have some concern with that.

Member for Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Actually, Mr. Chairman, my point was made by the Member for Lacombe. I do think that the idea is very good, and we certainly want to make sure that people realize that we are in fact going through this fund with a fine-tooth comb. I think that by way of the *Hansard*, that's maybe even the best

vehicle that we should be using, because it's always the official transcript of any select meeting and it is made available to the public and to the media. So I really would object to that. The final report is basically the final items that were voted on by the committee as a whole, and even though some of the ideas didn't meet the final approval, they certainly were brought up. So I would leave it at that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, from the perspective of the student or the journalist, I suppose, or the citizen at large that's interested in the heritage fund who's relying perhaps solely or at least initially on the annual report, I think there's merit in the suggestion made by the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon.

However, on page 16 of the draft in the second paragraph, of course, there is the sentence that indicates that sixty-five proposals were moved and, after careful consideration and deliberation, the Standing Committee approved the following 10 recommendations for inclusion in this report.

Perhaps for the student and other interested person as I described him or her, it might be useful to consider some kind of a footnote by the 65 that indicates the dates of the *Hansards* where those could be found for that particular individual or person who in fact wants to pursue the matter further.

I guess what I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, is rather than reproduce all of the proposals in this report, perhaps we could strike a compromise and simply have a footnote indication of the *Hansards* and their dates in which they could be found.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Of the recommendations. Is that . . .

MR. PAYNE: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Discussion on that point. Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: On that point. Right in the introduction, on page 1 it says that this

contains the consensus of the members of the Standing Committee.

It must be noted that the democratic principle of decision making was followed throughout the Committee's proceedings.

Then it goes on to say that they're recorded and anybody can go to the Legislature Library and find them. I don't think you can go any further than that unless you want to have another big book here and write them out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support my colleague's suggestion that a summary of all recommendations should be placed in this report. To say that *Hansard* is good enough for representation or reporting for defeated motions is to say that we don't need this report at all. I can turn that same argument around and say, well, let's just hand *Hansard* out; everybody will see what was passed, and everybody will see what was defeated.

Therefore, that argument that is made against my colleague's suggestion is just a spurious argument. To argue that there isn't sufficient space, well, I would say we certainly don't need appendix 1 here if you want to say that you people can look at the annual report of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committees to find out what their asset levels are. We don't need the

1988-89 response of the Treasurer, or in future years we wouldn't. So we've already expanded this particular report by two or three pages.

The fact of the matter is that 10 of the recommendations are already in this report. We would merely be adding a listing of the remaining 55. That wouldn't take very many pages, wouldn't be cumbersome, and would give a broader view to the public of the nature of the thoughts of people on this committee, and I believe it would be very, very useful to all of us and to the government to learn of the response and the debate that other ideas might solicit from the public. To send out this report without the broader reflection of ideas from this committee is to skew the report and, I believe, to provide a somewhat misleading report. Any argument against that that I've heard here is really just so much spurious argument.

MS M. LAING: I would have to agree with the Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark. I think that just having an appendix with all of the additional recommendations would not be very onerous and would not in any way have to change the format of this particular report. Suggesting to people that they go to *Hansard* is not always a very good solution for people who don't have access to our library or who have to go through all of the mechanisms to get copies of *Hansard*. So I would certainly support the motion that they be included in the appendix.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, on that particular point I might just ask, then, what's the use of having our committee? Why don't we all just send in our recommendations?

MS M. LAING: Well, because we've passed some and defeated others.

MR. CHERRY: That's not the way the report's done.

MR. JONSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion is well intended, but we could, I suppose, if a person such as myself weren't charitable in these things, call it spurious. We have hundreds and hundreds of examples of reports from committees and commissions and so forth where, I'm sure, in the preparation of those reports, there were many motions, many suggestions that were put forward and are in the minutes of those groups but do not become part of the final report. The report is a report on the decisions that are made, and that is a very standard format across all of our activities. When a Bill or an amendment to a Bill is defeated in the Legislature, it doesn't become part of the *Statutes of Alberta*. The fact that it was introduced and so on is recorded in the *Hansard* or the minutes of the Assembly. This is just an add-on which I don't think serves any particular purpose and would set a very expansionary precedent for all future reports of a whole bunch of other committees.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would like to raise. I don't agree with the argument that we need to include all of the recommendations. It doesn't seem to make sense, because if we do that, then the next argument will be that we should also include all of the discussion on those recommendations. And there were some flights of fancy by certain of the members when discussing some of the recommendations, that were off the target completely. This is a report of the consensus that this committee has reached. It's a report of the recommendations that we are making jointly, not of the areas that we have

disagreed on.

I appreciate the point that's been raised by the Member for Calgary-Fish Creek that we should perhaps compromise and footnote, and he referenced page 16. I would entertain that if it were not for page 25, which very clearly lists the dates when we discussed recommendations in *Hansard* and also when the voting on the recommendations took place. So there's an effective trail here that any journalist or researcher should be able to follow if they wanted to get the detailed information and the specifics of what was discussed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHERRY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess everyone has pretty well spoken what my thoughts were, but I want to say again that in any committee, no matter what committee you're on – you know, I just came off a committee with 197 submissions. Now, for gosh sakes, we don't put 197 submissions in the report. We take out the ones that we feel are very important. That's exactly what we've done here through the democratic system: taken out the important ones and put 'em in the report. I think it's a waste of time, what we're doing here right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

The Chair apologizes to the Member for Edmonton-Centre. I had him on the speaker's list and overlooked him. I recognize the Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: I'd like to add my voice to this debate too, not just to break it further along partisan lines. Certainly the members here must realize that in several other parliamentary jurisdictions – notably the House of Commons; I'm not sure about other provinces – issuing a minority report attached to the will of the tyranny of the majority report is something that is often done. We hear all the time, out of all-party committees – and thankfully there are a number of all-party committees in the House of Commons and here – that the voice and will and ideas and creativity of the minority also get their rightful place. I mean, as a parliamentary democracy there's the Leader of the Official Opposition to give a counterpoint to the government position. So there'd be a minority report and review to sum up the wisdom of the minority, in this case. Even in the United States, I recall when I was there that there would be majority and minority House leaders, and they would often function in a similar way.

We know through the debates that we've had that there are a number of very vital issues, whether they're deemed assets or other ways in which the fund is accounted for, that there is a minority view which government, in its intransigence, won't pay attention to. So I don't see why, if we're talking about democracy and freedom of information and fairness – I think it's basically that. I mean, everyone understands that, you know, there's a majority at work here, but there is a rightful place for a minority to work.

I guess since there seems to be a lack of goodwill with respect to this question here, at this point it might just have to be that the Liberal members and we the New Democrats would have to get together ourselves afterward and put such a report together and issue it at every point down the line. I mean, certainly if it's not going to be done under the auspices of the entire committee, we'll take matters into our own hands. I don't think that needs to be the case, if there was a greater sense of fairness and

understanding how the precedent is set in other jurisdictions. So smarten up.

MR. MOORE: Well, I think we should vote on it. We've had a good discussion both ways, and let's settle it. We don't settle it under threats. That's not the democratic process; they may do that in socialist countries, but here we have the democratic process. Let's vote on it, Mr. Chairman. [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I will allow the Member for Westlock-Sturgeon to close the discussion on his suggestion.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point I had in filing that sort of as a addendum – and let's remember, it's not much. It was eight pages double-spaced with all the recommendations in it. Now we took a bunch out that we passed, so we'd be adding maybe six pages to this report; if we printed on both sides, three pages. So there is very little it's adding. But actually I proposed the thing to try to depoliticize and try to get the thing away from the right/left or up/down or whatever it is. In fact, the first three resolutions turned down were by government members: Mr. Payne one and Mr. Gesell two.

I think it does two things. One, it does show to the public that'll get a copy of this thing that this committee, we MLAs, did our work, that we looked at a broad spectrum of thoughts and ideas. The public is not going to get that by just looking at this; they'll say, "Oh well, it's a short one." In other words, they'd be getting value for their money. I think that would be good.

Secondly, I've already mentioned the space doesn't amount to a row of damns; three pages printed on both sides would handle that. But, lastly, what this'll lead into: I think if we don't do this, it leads into minority reports. I think in a parliamentary system minority reports are quite within our rights. We'll take that up again in case this doesn't go, but I think if this doesn't go, we have to look at the whole question of minority reports and the right to a minority report. But this is a way of depoliticizing it, getting around it, and showing that it was a group of well-meaning, well-thinking people who got together and had their suggestions turned down: maybe in large part political but maybe not either, because they come from the government side as well as the other.

The mention that you can see *Hansard*. Don't forget that *Hansard* is a record of the discussion. We put out a Votes and Proceedings to say what Bills, their titles, and the resolutions. Don't mix this up with *Hansard*. You can mix this up with the Votes and Proceedings, but not with *Hansard*, when I talk about adding it on. We put out a Votes and Proceedings for libraries to see, and all that this would be is a Votes and Proceedings. That's all it would be doing onto the back of that report; nothing really new.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are we ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pardon me, but there's no motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, there is.

AN HON. MEMBER: There's no amendment to the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's no amendment to the motion, so we raise the question.

MRS. BLACK: There's a motion on the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, to adopt the report. All those in favour? Those opposed? Thank you. The motion carries. The report is approved.

MR. TAYLOR: Can I move, then, that the minority report be printed and circulated with the final report?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member, I think we have a difficulty with that in that this report needs to be filed the first Monday after the session goes in. The reason for this meeting today is so we can gain approval of the report and we can do that. It's called for in the Standing Orders, and it's the intent of the Chair to be on time. So a minority report, if there is to be one, would have to be compiled and filed at a later date.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I don't think it's a reason, Mr. Chairman, that because the committee didn't call the meeting early enough, the minority report not be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To be clear, I don't believe it's at the discretion of the Chair to decide whether you can file a minority report. The point I'm making is that you would necessarily have to have it completed and ready to be filed next Monday.

MR. TAYLOR: With this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, the Chair is not clear on the process, not having been involved with a minority report before. So I'm not clear on whether it necessarily has to be filed with this. I don't believe that it does. It can be filed at any later date that those preparing it have it ready and want to have it filed.

MR. TAYLOR: We'll have it ready Monday to file with this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, the Chair may have to report back to you on the process for filing a minority report. Is there someone in the committee who can give us some direction on that issue?

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I'm unaware of a select committee minority report in my limited experience, but I have certainly seen a number of minority reports issued in conjunction with or parallel to other types of committee documents. In those instances they did not necessarily accompany each other or had simultaneous filing or tabling.

REV. ROBERTS: That's just in Alberta.

MR. PAYNE: Yes. I was simply commenting on the Alberta Legislature.

MR. MITCHELL: What about in western democracies?

MR. PAYNE: I'm not very conversant with western democracies.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be wise for the committee to reserve consideration of this matter until you've had a chance to check on the rules and so forth that may be involved with the publication of a minority report. In the meantime those that might be interested in that kind of activity

can consult to see if they could agree on three or four minority reports or one. In any case, I think we do need some time for you to do some research on the matter since this is a relatively new matter before us today. I think it would be wise for the committee to follow that path.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a bit of difficulty with the time, because we're so close to when the session is scheduled to open, for us to follow that advice and be able to get back to the committee with some direction. Do you have a more definite proposal there on how that could work?

MR. JONSON: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's simply this. The Member for Westlock-Sturgeon is now contemplating making a motion with respect to a minority report. This is something, as far as I understand it, that would be, if it's approved, a precedent for the operation of this committee. I respectfully say that I do not think there is anyone around this table who is really up to speed on the rules and procedures that would be followed if a motion such as this were passed. Therefore, I think it's only sensible for the committee to reserve judgment on this matter until we do have some more information on the question.

I think, with respect, Mr. Chairman, that the point you make about the deadline is really a point in favour of my suggestion, because we would be rushing something if we made a decision at this time. It's a rather important matter procedurally, and I think it should be left in abeyance for the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

If I could just quote from Standing Order 65. I'll read the whole section. It's entitled committee reports and documents.

65(1) The report of a committee shall be signed only by the chairman, even if the chairman dissents from the majority of the committee.

(2) The report of a committee is the report as determined by the committee as a whole or the majority of it, and no minority report may be presented to or received by the Assembly, but a committee may, in its discretion, include any dissenting opinions in its report.

(3) All documents which come into the possession of a committee or which are prepared by or for a committee belong to the committee until . . .

I believe Standing Orders clearly indicates that there's not a provision for a minority report from a standing committee.

MR. TAYLOR: But the committee can, if they're broad-minded, intelligent, and well-handled, include dissenting opinions.

MR. MITCHELL: I would like to change the subject. Mr. Chairman, may I do that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but at a later time. I have another item on the agenda that I'd like to deal with.

MR. MITCHELL: Can I add something to the agenda then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I guess you can.

MR. MITCHELL: Great. I would just like to move that . . .

MR. GESELL: Just a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We've got a motion on the floor here. It's out of order.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I moved that we include a minority report. The chairman has ruled it out of order according to Standing Orders, but I want to be on record as asking for a minority report. You have ruled it out of order, which I think it's fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order 65.

MR. TAYLOR: If I may be allowed to continue, then, because I never had a chance to move it, I would like to make a motion that all the defeated resolutions and their proposers be filed at the back of this report.

MR. GESELL: Mr. Chairman, that's out of order as well. We've already dealt with that motion.

MR. TAYLOR: No. It was in discussion of the original motion that I brought this up, but we didn't vote on this.

MRS. BLACK: Point of order on this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order.

MRS. BLACK: We've already accepted the report as presented.

MR. GESELL: That's right.

MRS. BLACK: We've already passed it.

MR. TAYLOR: No, not as presented. You accepted the report. I'm just saying that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. With respect, hon. member, I believe we have accepted the report that was tabled. Based on that, it would be my understanding that we could not amend it at this point now. We passed a motion to accept that report.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm not talking about amending the report. I'm talking about adding to the report the resolutions that were defeated and their proposers. Will you move me out of order then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, hon. member, I don't believe it is in order to add to, subtract from, or amend a report that has been adopted and approved. I really don't believe that would be in order.

MR. TAYLOR: You wouldn't last any time in eastern Europe.

MR. GESELL: For a group that professes such concern for the environment, here go another couple of trees.

MR. MITCHELL: That raises my point. I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, that this report be printed on recycled paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair will take that under advisement, and if it's possible to do that, we will entertain that as a consideration. Is that agreeable? Will you make that in the form of a motion?

MR. MITCHELL: I would like to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a seconder?

REV. ROBERTS: I'll second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favour of the motion? Any more discussion? I'm sorry. The Member for Ponoka.

MR. JONSON: I guess it's a small point, but was it that the committee recommend that it be, or is it that it will be?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommend.

MR. MITCHELL: Sure.

MR. MOORE: Okay, if it's recommended, not will be. Mr. Chairman, we're normally doing that wherever possible now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would ask that the committee doesn't tie my hands in getting the report printed and completed, but we will certainly investigate the possibility of doing it on recycled paper.

MRS. BLACK: The motion, Mr. Chairman, was a recommendation that it be printed on recycled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Fine.

MRS. BLACK: A strong recommendation.

MR. FISCHER: I think if we want our recommendations and so on to be paid attention to, we shouldn't two-bit it to death with the stuff that we're trying to put it on. We already put all of the stuff on recycled paper that we can. Why would we put that in?

MR. MITCHELL: It's not a recommendation that goes in here. It's just a recommendation for the chairman of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would make the point that I'm sure all the committee members took time to look at last year's report, and they will notice how humble it is. It's certainly not an expensively done report. I believe the cost was about \$500, which is very nominal, and we printed only as many copies as we felt would be required. So we've been very careful with our expenditure in that area.

Are we ready for the question? All those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? The motion carries.

The Chair has one other item for discussion, and I'm not asking for a motion on it. I would entertain discussion or suggestions from the committee as to facilities funded by the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund that might be appropriate to visit during 1990 by the committee.

The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to remake the recommendation that I unsuccessfully presented last year, and that is to undertake some tour of irrigation canals, irrigation headworks, and irrigation systems in general. Although this is just a detail, if it could be done comparatively inexpensively by air, by helicopter, much like the tour undertaken by the Minister of the Environment last year, that would make it an even more effective use of the committee's time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I could just question the hon. member on that. You're suggesting that it be done by helicopter and that

the helicopter set down at appropriate places and off-load and get information from irrigation people who might be on-site.

MR. PAYNE: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, if we were to do it by van, it would really prolong the outing, and we may not have the luxury of that kind of additional time.

MR. JONSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest that if we have the time and resources, we should as a committee visit the Millar-Western mill at Whitecourt, and I'd like to suggest that it be a tour which is a little bit more comprehensive than that, because I think to appreciate that particular site, we should be looking at some of the other integrated aspects of the forest industry, at least in that area, perhaps Blue Ridge and the site for the newsprint mill and so forth. I think we should have a fairly broad look at the industry up there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Calgary-Foothills.

MRS. BLACK: Actually, Mr. Chairman, that was the site I was going to recommend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.
Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: Given the importance of the OSLO project to the Alberta economy, I think a tour to the tar sands might be in order to look at the Underground Test Facility and maybe look at Syncrude. I don't know if it would be possible to visit the OSLO site, but have somebody, perhaps in Fort McMurray, who could go over the status of that project and how it might differ from the existing Syncrude operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair endorses that suggestion. Thank you.
Redwater-Andrew.

MR. ZARUSKY: The Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn covered mine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Edmonton-Centre.

REV. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I don't know how feasible this might be, but it seems to me that Alberta Mortgage and Housing Corporation, particularly with respect to a number of their housing projects that might be innovative, some of the new seniors' residences, some kinds of housing, might be a suggestion, not to intrude on people's private premises but to get a look at some of the housing stock that is either available or wanting to be sold or that may be created under Alberta Mortgage and Housing. It's just off the top of my head. It may be in the inner city or elsewhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Bearing in mind that Alberta Home Mortgage in conjunction with CMHC funds a variety of facilities that are available to seniors and so on, perhaps the member would be prepared to submit a more comprehensive suggestion on that line to the Chair.

REV. ROBERTS: Sure. I'll give it some more thought and get back.

I have another suggestion as well. I know how members would

dearly love to fly up to Alaska to see how their fund operates there. Short of that, could we arrange for a visit from someone from the Alaska Permanent Fund to come and be questioned at one of our hearings at some point? This has been an issue of comparison before. I think those who've studied capital trust funds like ours and others enter into these questions, and I would like to get some firsthand knowledge in terms of how their fund operates, which may give us some insight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There has been a suggestion made to the Chair that we make some attempt to gather information from Alaska and their fund. I suspect that there might be some difficulty in bringing them here. If we're going to entertain that, we may have to strike some type of ad hoc committee to represent this committee to go to Alaska on a fact-finding tour. That's a possibility, so we'll put that in the minutes and explore the possibility of that.

REV. ROBERTS: Could I just ask, Mr. Chairman: is there a deadline for some of these suggestions? In terms of planning, I guess, I'd like to know by the summer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to have the direction set for these by the time the session is out to give everybody notice so they can plan their calendars, we won't have a conflict, and we can have good attendance at them.

REV. ROBERTS: Particularly if there's a fall session.

MR. TAYLOR: I think . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a moment. On that particular issue, or do you just want on the speakers' list?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, no. I want to add a possibility.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'll put you on the speakers' list.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Edmonton-Meadowlark, did you have your hand up?

MR. MITCHELL: No; it's okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calgary-Forest Lawn.

MR. PASHAK: We've heard about trips. I'd like to put another suggestion on the table, if I may, that has nothing to do with a trip as such but I think is nevertheless a meritorious suggestion. That would be that the Heritage Savings Trust Fund committee, to begin its deliberations, have a very informal session with someone from the Treasurer's office who could outline various aspects of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund itself and be there to answer questions that the members might want to put to them about the way the funds are invested or whatever to get a better sense of the fund itself and spending priorities before they begin their trips and before they begin meeting with ministers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we defer that and discuss it later on the agenda and finish this portion?

MR. PASHAK: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Westlock-Sturgeon.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I would like to suggest that we pay for a couple of people to come from Quebec who manage the Caisse de dépôt, which is a huge fund. They don't call it a heritage trust fund, but it appears to be used in much the same way ours is, and maybe more so, in order to develop economic growth. It's been highly successful in the last 10, 12 years in Quebec. I'd be interested if we could get a couple of their leading members up here, and then we could ask questions on how they tongue-and-groove in with the private enterprise sector.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
The Member for Wainwright.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. I thought you forgot about me, Jack.

I think Prince Rupert was nice. We learned a lot from the Prince Rupert trip. I've been there before, and I enjoy it each time I go out. I think it's valuable to us. We've got quite a few dollars out there, and I think we should go. That's my suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
The Member for Lloydminster.

MR. CHERRY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest that later on, in the summer or whenever the tour is, we take a look at the upgrader site in Lloydminster. It will be, you know, quite well along in construction by then. It would certainly be an eye opener to all members of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.
The Member for Lacombe.

MR. MOORE: I was going to make the recommendation for Prince Rupert. It's very, very important to all the agricultural sector. It's a good one for us to get up to date on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Has everyone had an opportunity to make their suggestions?
Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: I would like to suggest that we invite a private-sector portfolio manager or somebody who's an expert in that area who could comment on the investment management of the heritage trust fund, who we could quiz about that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, but could we deal with that under the other portion of the agenda?

MR. MITCHELL: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're just dealing with suggestions of places that the committee may want to visit this coming year. Everyone has had an opportunity to voice their preference. Last year we put a lot of priority on health facilities, and it was very productive, and I think we all learned a lot from that. This year probably the committee should move into some different areas. If everyone's completed, we'll close off that portion. The Chair appreciates your suggestions. Certainly we'll not be able

to visit all of them, but I'll try to prioritize them in some manner.
Member for Lloydminster, you had your hand up.

MR. CHERRY: I was going to make the motion to adjourn, Mr. Chairman, if it's in order.

MS M. LAING: It's not. We've got more items.

MR. MOORE: We have one point left to bury.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We should hear this point.

MR. PASHAK: This is just by way of a suggestion, Mr. Chairman. I think that it would be useful, at least for new members coming on the committee, to get an overview of how the Heritage Savings Trust Fund works and how it ties in with the General Revenue Fund and the Capital Fund and to get an explanation of the major divisions within the fund, that sort of thing. I'm not suggesting a formal meeting by any means. I think it should be very informal, without any transcripts, where the people from the Treasurer's office might be here to just answer questions that members might want to put to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to be clear, are you suggesting that this meeting would be one that would not be formally called by the chairman and wouldn't be in *Hansard*, and it would be held informally?

MR. PASHAK: No. I think that the Chair could arrange for the meeting. It would be an official part of the committee, but it wouldn't have to be formal to the extent that you'd need transcripts or motions. It would be just a general kind of information and discussion kind of meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then would the Member for Calgary-Forest Lawn be willing to leave it with the Chair to be discussed with the Treasurer to see what can be arranged on that basis?

MR. PASHAK: Yes, very much so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay; the Chair will take that as an assignment from the committee then.
The Member for Edmonton-Meadowlark.

MR. MITCHELL: Are we at the part . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: One moment. Is it on that point, Member for Ponoka-Rimbey?

MR. JONSON: I'm not opposing the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, but I'd like to add to it. I think it would be even better if we could get the Treasurer to engage in that type of semiformal or informal discussion. It might be a challenging exercise. We might as well have the fellow who is most responsible for the area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. The Chair would give assurance to the committee that if that were the case, we would not let that substitute for the Treasurer's appearance before the committee in a formal way. So I'll take that into consideration in my discussions with him.

The Member for Calgary-Fish Creek.

MR. PAYNE: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey pretty well made my point. You know, middle managers tend to preoccupy themselves with the hows of government, and cabinet ministers in charge of government policy tend to focus on the why. I share the Member for Ponoka-Rimbey's interest in having the how and the why discussions happening together. My suggestion would have been to have the Provincial Treasurer and his deputy. I think together they could make a very worthwhile presentation, again subject to the obvious qualification that that would not supersede or replace in any way the traditional appearance before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. Okay. Well, with those loose guidelines the Chair will explore the possibility of putting together a meeting for the committee with the Treasurer or department. Okay?

Now, I think we could entertain a motion for adjournment.

MR. MITCHELL: We were going to talk about those other items, and people could go on to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you had made your point.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay. I made my point. The only thing is

that there are what look to be a couple of editorial corrections that would be required in this report. Is it too late to suggest those? You've got pages 15, 88, and 90 in the annual report.

MS SKURA: Oh, I've already done that.

MR. MITCHELL: Okay, but there's also one: "Net income of \$1.25 billion was used to provide superior services to Albertans and to reduce the province's debt." Clearly, it didn't reduce the province's debt. This is page 15. At best it only reduced the province's deficit with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The province's what?

MR. MITCHELL: Deficit. It didn't reduce its debt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can make that change.
Now, are we ready?

MR. CHERRY: I move that we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. The meeting stands adjourned. Thank you for your attendance.

[The committee adjourned at 2:50 p.m.]