

[Chairman: Mr. Pashak]

[10 a.m.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to order. The first item of business is the approval of the minutes from the June 1, 1988, committee meeting. Would anyone care to move those minutes? Moved by Mr. Moore. Any discussion on the minutes as distributed? Are you agreed that we adopt the minutes?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, today I'd like to indicate that we have before the committee the Auditor General and the Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Perhaps I should begin by introducing the minister to the committee and to the Auditor General and to Ken Smith, who is the auditor that I assume is responsible for the Attorney General's department and for FIGA both. I spoke briefly to the minister last night, and the minister indicated that he'd be willing to answer questions both with respect to the Attorney General's department and to FIGA.

Maybe I should just explain briefly how the committee operates, because the minister said, I think, that in his 14 years he'd never been before the Public Accounts Committee. Normally I would ask the minister to introduce his department, his guests, and maybe make some introductory remarks. We like to keep them within, say, 10, 15 minutes maximum, because there are lots of members of the committee, as you can see, that want to put questions to you.

What I attempt to do as chairman of the committee is keep the questions to the public accounts themselves, and I ask the members to refer to either a line in the accounts or to a page in the Auditor General's report. So with that, I'll begin taking names, and I'd invite you to make an opening statement, if you'd care to, hon. minister.

MR. HORSMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to introduce members of the two departments whom I have with me today. On my far right is Oryssia Lennie, who is the Acting Deputy Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs; Rob Simmons, who is the money man in the department — needless to say, the director of finance. On my far left is Keith Smith, the manager of financial operations for the Department of the Attorney General. Next to him is Doug Rae, the assistant deputy minister in the department; and Ian Hope on my immediate left, the director of finance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the time constraints that you have suggested, I have a few opening remarks. First of all, I would comment on my Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I've been minister of that particular department for almost six years now and therefore have much more experience with respect to the role of that particular department. With respect to my role as Attorney General, it's just over two years since I assumed the responsibilities for the Department of the Attorney General as well as retaining my position as Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

For the fiscal year in question which we are examining, it was an extremely busy year for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and involved the department with the first ministers' meetings. I can just indicate that it was an extremely busy year from the aspect of first ministers' conferences. In the budget which had been submitted, we had budgeted for four conferences involving the first minister, the Premier. In fact, there were eight conferences held in that particular year. There was

an unusually high level of intergovernmental activity involving free trade discussions, softwood lumber disputes, aboriginal constitutional issues, and pre-Meech Lake discussions, many of which were unanticipated. In addition, the Premier had undertaken the role as the chairman of the Premiers' Conference. There was a special Premiers' Conference in Toronto, for example, on February 9, '87, to deal with fisheries and three additional first ministers' meetings to deal with the free trade initiative. Therefore, my department was extremely busy in those areas.

In addition to the first minister's conferences on trade, there were eight ministerial meetings on trade in the fiscal year we're discussing and nine officials' meetings dealing with trade issues, on free trade and on the softwood lumber dispute — several meetings with respect to that. In addition, there were five ministerial meetings on aboriginal constitutional matters, and if members wondered from time to time where I was, that's where: at these various meetings. The only meeting that was held in Alberta, of course, was the Premiers' Conference, which was held here in August of that year. I mentioned the Meech Lake start-up meetings, which followed upon the heels of the Premiers' Conference here in Edmonton. In addition to that, of course, I undertook a number of trips to the United States, and I can touch on those later if there are questions on that. Members will recall that in the fall of 1986, as well, the federal government invited participation by four provincial ministers, including myself, in the opening round of the GATT discussions, which were held in Punta del Este. So given that, plus our foreign offices and the necessity of working with them, it was a very varied year for me in that particular portfolio.

With respect to the Department of the Attorney General I assumed the responsibilities as Attorney General partway into the fiscal year after the election, which of course was held in May. That's just about, I guess, two years almost from now that the Legislature began its sittings and I assumed the responsibilities in that department. Of course, when one compares the two departments, the expenditures are vastly different. The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is the smallest department of government in terms of the budget. The Department of the Attorney General is somewhere in between and, of course, provides a wide range of services for the people of Alberta, both in terms of court systems for the administration of justice and the systems required for protection of property: the Land Titles Office, the operation of the personal property securities registration. Those are extremely important for the benefit of Albertans. We also provide a wide range of legal aid assistance, and that of course is something that members may wish to ask questions on. In addition, crimes compensation is paid through the Department of the Attorney General, and as well we have responsibility for the gaming branch of the department, excluding those matters relating to lotteries, which do not fall within the purview of the Department of the Attorney General.

So, Mr. Chairman, those are some opening comments, and I'd be pleased to answer any questions on either department. I don't know whether you, Mr. Chairman, want them to deal with one or mix them up. It doesn't make much difference to me. I can try and deal with them no matter what department it is. It may be a little confusing if we go from one department to another, but I'll try and answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll ask the members how they'd like to deal with that. But I thank you for your opening remarks.

With respect to the point that the Attorney General just raised, would you prefer to deal with just the Attorney General for now and then move on to FIGA, or mix them up? Or does it matter to the members? Apparently, it doesn't matter. I'll just let it go, and we'll see how it works that way.

I'd just like to read the list of names that I have here, and if I've missed anybody, would you please indicate. I've got Heron, McEachern, Mitchell, Payne, Mirosh, Fischer, Jonson, Musgrove, Bradley. Is there anyone else that would like to have . . . ?

All right then. Mr. Heron.

MR. HERON: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to first focus on a point raised by the Auditor General, and perhaps he could elaborate on his recommendation; that is, recommendation 10:

It is recommended that the Department of the Attorney General institute procedures that will improve Senior Management's ability to monitor the completeness and accuracy of the Department's revenues.

Perhaps the Auditor General could elaborate on that recommendation first, and I could address my supplementaries to the minister.

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, that particular item in the Auditor General's report is pertaining to the various aspects of administration with respect to the systems that they have. We have discussed the details with the department and also issued letters to them, and their response was one of acceptance and positiveness. As far as follow-up is concerned, we will be doing that during the current audit. So we're not absolutely sure that all has been resolved, but they certainly have given that indication that it would be taken care of.

MR. HERON: Well, then, it necessarily follows -- perhaps we should ask the minister what steps the department has taken to address the Auditor General's recommendation so that it doesn't appear again in that format.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, a control log has been established by the administration division to ensure the regular receipt of moneys from all collection points. This control log has been operative since April 1, 1987, so that of course was operative just as we went into the subsequent fiscal year. Of course, as the Auditor has pointed out, they will be reviewing the effectiveness of that operation. Since that time the administration division has been preparing a monthly analysis of the department's miscellaneous revenue, and that analysis is now included within a monthly report to senior management. Similarly, a number of other revenue reports are now being prepared by the administration division on a monthly basis. They are prepared for senior management's use in identifying and monitoring the department's major sources of revenue. I am advised by senior management that their current requirements are now being met, although a more efficient and responsive revenue reporting system is being planned for implementation in the future.

Just a comment that, of course, since the department is represented and diverse in many parts of the province, we have to make sure that all receiving points -- that's the best way of putting it -- are aware of this procedure. So far I've been informed that it is working satisfactorily, but of course that will be determined as the just concluded fiscal year is audited.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have a further supplementary, Mr. Heron?

MR. HERON: Perhaps I could change the supplementary around then, Mr. Chairman, and ask the Auditor General directly. With the procedural requirements just outlined by the minister being implemented, will these steps satisfy your concerns?

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, yes, we believe they would. It's just a case that we need to monitor that when we do the current year's audit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I believe a few . . . I just want to correct the record, if I may. On a few occasions I've said Auditor General and I meant Attorney General.

In any event, Mr. McEachern.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question comes from page 4.6 of the second volume of public accounts. In vote 3.0.7 you have Constitutional and Energy Law. There's a little bit more spent than the estimates, but that's not particularly my concern. There's some \$923,000 spent in that area. I guess I'm wondering if the Attorney General could comment a little bit about just what that is about. I realize you can do a lot of constitutional and free trade conferences and things like that, but I suspect this is to do with figuring out how free trade will impact on our energy resources and ownership and control. Is that right, and what is that item all about?

MR. HORSMAN: Actually, that is basically what we have paid out for legal advice with respect to all constitutional issues which may come before the government. In that particular fiscal year we were not, at that stage, engaged in depth in the discussions relating to the free trade deal. If you think back to '86-87, the initiation of the discussions were under way, but those legal expenses would really have related to a broad range of constitutional issues and would have included such things as legal expenses relating to the various litigation that we are involved in with respect to such things as the Constitution and the impact of the Charter of Rights and such things as the new language requirements, in cases that we've had to engage counsel. Also such things as the *intervention in the Mercure case* and things of that nature would have been related more directly to these particular expenditures.

MR. McEACHERN: As a supplementary then, I guess I'm wondering why energy law gets thrown in with constitutional law. Were there some particular problems in the energy field that sort of made that a major part of that expenditure?

MR. HORSMAN: No. It's been traditionally designated as Constitutional and Energy Law, because energy, of course, is such a major item for the government of Alberta to consider. Just to give an example -- it probably wouldn't be reflected in this particular fiscal year. The constitutional energy issues related to determining the issue of provincial ownership and management and control in the *Smith Coulee case* would have been an example as to why it would have been referred to as constitutional energy. Because that was really a very major constitutional decision in favour of the province, although it wouldn't perhaps be reflected in this particular fiscal year.

MR. McEACHERN: My final supplementary, then, would be: was any of that energy money expended on the problems of formulating Alberta's laws in such a way as to make sure that we got our fair share of royalties? You remember that there's been some problem with the royalty structures and whether or not the companies were complying with the rules and reporting in a way that we could see to it that we got our fair share of the royalties and all that sort of problem.

MR. HORSMAN: I think that would probably have been done by the Department of Energy and would have been reflected in their budget rather than in this particular area. I know the problem and issue that the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Chairman, but it's not likely that this would have been part of that particular vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mitchell. [interjection]

MR. McEACHERN: The gentlemen over there was sort of nodding his head a little bit. I wondered if he had a supplementary, that's all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes Mr. Mitchell.

MR. MITCHELL: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. To the minister. The government of Alberta, along with the other provinces, signed the Edmonton declaration in August of 1986, if I'm not mistaken, which said that the first ministers would consider the requests of Quebec as conditions for its signing the Constitution. Prior to Alberta signing that agreement, was any consideration given within the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the effect that action would have on negotiations for Senate reform?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The lead-up to the Premiers' Conference which was held in August of 1986 in Edmonton -- the question of Quebec's concerns relative to becoming part of the Constitution, having not participated in the 1982 Act, were made known, of course, by the Liberal government when they were elected. The minister of intergovernmental affairs for Quebec laid out the Quebec points that they wanted to deal with in order to become part of the Constitution. So leading up to -- and really, it's part of the Edmonton conference, which is part of the expenditure that we're talking about here. We did have considerable discussions, recognizing that without Quebec in the Constitution it would be impossible in our view to have any meaningful constitutional reform, including reform respecting the Senate. So it was very much part of the Edmonton declaration, of course, that while they agreed to Quebec's five proposals as the basis for discussions which led eventually to the Meech Lake accord, there was also a declaration that further constitutional discussions would include, amongst other things, Senate reform as the number one item. And that, of course, was there at the insistence of the province of Alberta. So it was part of the whole process and part of that whole conference which was held here in Edmonton.

MR. MITCHELL: It's of course one thing to be able to talk and it's another thing to have leverage in a negotiation.

Was any consideration given to the fact that Alberta has political leverage over a Mr. Bourassa, who campaigned on getting Quebec into the Constitution, and over a Mr. Mulroney, who wants to run as the great statesman in the next federal election,

having established the Meech Lake accord and getting Quebec into the Constitution? Was any thought or research given to the fact that we have lost a very, very important political leverage over those two significant actors, which might have led to an advantage in achieving Senate reform had we not signed or accepted the Meech Lake accord?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're getting into the realm of political debate, I think, with that question.

MR. MITCHELL: This is research, and I want to know if they studied that and if they determined what the implications were.

MR. HORSMAN: Those were all issues that were carefully considered, and the department expended funds on meetings following the signing of the Edmonton declaration. And really, there were expenses associated with it, including some travel which I undertook to have bilateral discussion with Quebec and Alberta and with the federal government. As a result of that, I did undertake some additional travel, including meetings with Quebec in the fall of '86 and throughout the following winter and spring. Of course, the issues that the hon. member mentions were part of our consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. MITCHELL: Meetings, meetings, meetings. Was research given to the idea of not signing the Meech Lake accord but rather saying, "Quebec, we respect you; we want you in the Constitution."? There are two constitutional issues of equal importance to this country: one is Quebec; the other is regional imbalance, and Senate reform addresses that. Was consideration given to the possibility of simply walking away from the Meech Lake accord, and could that be implemented now?

MR. HORSMAN: We hired some additional constitutional experts . . .

MR. ADY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HORSMAN: . . . and they're part of the expenditure shown in the accounts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think I can anticipate the point of order that the gentleman is raising. We are moving away from expenditure, and we're getting into policy formulation.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to address that. The fact is that if these kinds of issues were to be considered at all, they would have to have been considered in the first part of the fiscal year that we are discussing. And if they weren't considered, then that would raise in my mind that the money for the expenditures of this department was not done properly. I think we have a right to know whether those questions were considered, one; and two, even what conclusions were drawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it's reasonable to ask the question: were these considered? I'm not sure that it's relevant to raise the further question as to what those conclusions were. That's not a matter for public accounts. [interjections]

MR. HERON: Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I'll recognize first of all Mr. Heron and then Mr. Mitchell on this presumed point of order.

MR. HERON: Mr. Chairman, I'm on record as complimenting your ability with the Chair of this committee, and in making that compliment, I've acknowledged the discipline in sticking to public accounts by page, by vote, when asked and when called upon. I know you've been lenient, but we've always had that in the back of our minds: that we can refer to a vote, a page, and ask for clarification. If our committee is to be meaningful and work, we can't wander all over the place into policy. I think we have to reserve that for question period and other places, Mr. Chairman. So I appeal to your past sense of fair play and discipline to maintain order and keep the questioning in the line that we've pursued in the year and a half.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mitchell, on that same purported point of order.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important point of order, because if I were to ask the minister of public works about the legitimacy of an expenditure on some leasehold improvement, that wouldn't be questioned in this committee. That is because it's very obvious that the money spent by that department would result in a leasehold improvement.

This is a different kind of department. This department does not build a widget. It deals in ideas and in theories to some extent. It deals in negotiations on those ideas, and its result is the result of its research and its thought. If we can't question that and question its legitimacy, then we have no role in this committee at all to question this department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm just going to point out that we're wasting the members' time in terms of being able to ask questions of the minister. But if you want to continue to pursue this point of order, I'll recognize Mr. McEachern, then Mr. Musgrove.

MR. McEACHERN: I'd just raise the point that if the government is going to bring ministers before the committee rather than technicians, then it's pretty hard to expect us not to ask for the political implications of the dollar amounts in the various votes. I mean, after all, they do reflect government policy to some extent. So they're not so easily separated as one might make out.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we're here to question the dollars spent in public accounts and not to have a political debate about the outcome of some of the missions that the minister went on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My view of this is that because of the relatively small sizes of the budgets we perhaps can move somewhat away from our general sort of tight reference to the expenditures themselves. But I think the hon. minister has had a chance to listen to the debate. He's heard the different points of view, and if it's all right with the minister, I'll give the minister a fair amount of discretion in determining whether he wants to deal with some of these questions that slip into the policy side. I can rule them out of order myself, but we can just see how they come down.

MR. HORSMAN: I can be quite precise with respect to what steps the government took in order to obtain the constitutional advice that we had. Other than people from within the department we did retain one of Canada's foremost constitutional authorities, Dr. Peter Meekison, a former deputy minister of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and now vice-president at the University of Alberta, to give us constitutional advice in terms of preparing for the Meech Lake meeting, which took place in the subsequent fiscal year. But in any event, he was retained, and the expenses associated with his additional expenses are included in the expenditures in the fiscal year in question. So certainly we did retain outside constitutional advice. Dr. Meekison is recognized as one of Canada's outstanding authorities. He was very much part of advising me and the Premier on aspects of the Meech Lake accord.

In addition, there are expenditures here, as I have indicated, relating to the bilateral ministerial meetings that took place between myself as minister and the minister of intergovernmental affairs for Quebec and the federal minister responsible for federal/provincial relations, Senator Lowell Murray. So those expenses are reflected here. I think it's quite useful to point out to members of the committee that that extensive negotiation and discussion was responsible for the government's position as we entered into the final discussions on Meech Lake on April 30 of '87, which was just outside the fiscal year we're discussing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

I might just advise the hon. minister that if at any point you want to turn to members of your department to supplement your answers, that's within our practice as well.

Mr. Payne.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question relates again to the Auditor General's report, a recommendation he made on page 47. I believe it's recommendation 20, wherein he recommended that the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs issue written procedures... to ensure that expenditures incurred by Alberta's Foreign Offices are properly controlled and reported.

The Auditor General's recommendation also recommended that foreign offices be required "to obtain prior written approvals" before making expenditures that they incur on behalf of other departments of the Crown.

My first question to the minister this morning, Mr. Chairman, is: has the Department of FIGA developed the kinds of procedures that were advocated by the Auditor General in his most recent annual report to in effect properly control these foreign office expenditures?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That of course has been a problem that the Auditor General quite correctly pointed out, and we have issued written procedures designed to ensure that the foreign office expenditures are properly controlled and reported. That expanded the financial policies and procedures for all Alberta offices, and they've been issued to the London office and will be issued to the other offices as well.

I make a point, I should point out as well, of having an annual meeting of all the Agents General and heads of our foreign offices. They are brought back in early July to Alberta. Those meetings involve discussions with senior officials, and the Auditor General's concerns are raised with them during the course of those meetings as well.

MR. PAYNE: I think just one supplementary on this one, Mr. Chairman. I think the minister would probably agree with me that there are a number of Albertans that periodically express concern that staff in these Alberta foreign offices live in comparatively great luxury in exotic locales at the taxpayers' expense with unlimited expense accounts. I wondered if the minister could share with the Public Accounts Committee some data to put those kinds of observations at rest or at least in a proper context, perhaps by reference to rates established for Alberta public servants on duty in Canada as opposed to Hong Kong or London or these other foreign office locations.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the question. I know that that is a perception that is bruited about from time to time. But I can assure members of the committee that we have a foreign staff allowances and benefits policy which tries to provide for the difference in cost of living between Edmonton specifically and the foreign cities in which our foreign staff are resident. They are set in such a way that each posted staff member is no better off or no worse off than they would be if they were living here.

Now obviously, when one hears about living in Hong Kong — let us use that for an example — it may sound very exotic, and it is different; there's no question about it. But the climate and other aspects of living in crowded conditions and cities of that kind are not as glamorous as they appear. Furthermore, their base salaries and benefits are the same as Alberta employers would pay at the same level. They do receive a housing subsidy and are required to pay what is known as Alberta equivalent by way of rent, so that's assessed. Other allowances such as a post allowance are made available, and they vary from office to office. That would account for the different costs of living that they experience in London, Tokyo — Tokyo, of course, being the most expensive. Without any question, the cost of living in Tokyo is very, very high in terms of food and everything else, so we have to make sure they are not disadvantaged.

With regard to travel and hosting expenses, of course that's part of their job. It's important that they travel throughout the territories for which they are responsible, and they must host people from the foreign countries in which they are located, as well as hosting visitors from Alberta who utilize the foreign offices that we have. For the benefit of members I just remind them that a foreign office is located in London, but the Agent General there has responsibilities for all of Europe, and that requires some travel onto continental Europe as well as in the United Kingdom. In Tokyo the responsibilities include Korea. In Hong Kong the responsibilities include southeast Asia and Australia. We have an Agent General for the United States located in New York, and his responsibilities also include Washington and general supervisory capacity for the offices located in Houston and Los Angeles. We also, of course, have an office in Ottawa. We don't consider that a foreign office, but it is, in fact, an important listening post for us on the Ottawa scene. So these allowances are all necessary.

But I just repeat in conclusion to your supplementary question that the base salaries and benefits they receive are the same as if they were located in Alberta.

MR. PAYNE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could just, for my final supplementary, get back to the minister's first response to the question flowing from the Auditor General's recommendation that written procedures be developed for expenditure control. As I recall the minister's opening response,

he implied that such written procedures had now been developed for the London office but left me with the impression that some of the other offices had not yet received these written procedures for expenditure control. My final supp is: what's the delay?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, it's being done, and we expect that it will be done very soon. We have been consulting with the department of Treasury with respect to the procedures that are appropriate, and we have prepared detailed guidelines for use by the offices. Certainly at the annual meeting with the Agents General, which will take place just under a month from now, this matter will be reviewed very carefully with them again to make sure that they are in complete understanding of the concerns the Auditor General has raised and the procedures that we've developed to ensure that we receive a clear accounting of all the expenditures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Mirosh.

MRS. MIROSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Referring to volume 2, page 4.2, vote 4, Support for Legal Aid, this vote has received a special warrant for a little over \$2 million and is expended under the grants category. Could the minister explain the need for this special warrant?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. During the fiscal year in question there was more than a 10 percent increase in the number of applications for legal aid. In addition, with the kicking in, if you will, of the implications of the Young Offenders Act, there was a very marked increase in the number of applications by persons charged with offences under that Act. That had a considerable impact on the Legal Aid Society. That was really the reason that we required that additional amount of money.

Now, it's anticipated, of course, that the current trend of increased activity will not stabilize in the near future. Accordingly, a \$3 million increase has been allocated to the Legal Aid Society in the current fiscal year. So what was required by way of a special warrant before is now budgeted for. It's really to recognize volume increases, but the underlying fact was the implications of the Young Offenders Act.

MRS. MIROSH: Could the minister explain how much money is expended under this legal aid system? Is the department billed by the lawyers directly, or is there another system?

MR. HORSMAN: The department provides the Legal Aid Society, which is comprised of representatives from the Law Society and the department, with an annual operating grant. We provide it to the Legal Aid Society, and the lawyers who are retained bill the society directly. The billings do not come to the department.

MRS. MIROSH: The department monitors this?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, and the society provides the department with monthly expenditure forecasts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Fischer.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. My question is on page 4.4 under vote 7, Crimes Compensation. I notice that \$13,500 was transferred out of the Supplies and Services, of which \$10,500 was

transferred to salaries. Could the minister tell us how many people are employed in this department?

MR. HORSMAN: Under Crimes Compensation there are two permanent positions and half a man-year for wage employees. So it's a relatively small component of the overall operation.

MR. FISCHER: Did this \$10,500, then, bring on a new employee?

MR. HORSMAN: No. It really related to the wage position and required some additional funding not for the permanent position but the person who was hired on wages.

MR. FISCHER: Okay. Could you give us a bit of information on what kind of service is provided by the Crimes Compensation?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the services, of course, are provided under the legislation which establishes the Crimes Compensation Board. The Crimes Compensation Board acts as a quasi-judicial body in the sense that they hear applications from people who have been victims of crime in order to determine the compensation that they might be entitled to receive. In that respect, it is somewhat difficult to maintain a budgetary control, because the amounts may vary from year to year. But the services are for the people of Alberta who have been victimized by crime.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you. I notice that you did overbudget, overestimate, in both '86 and '87, quite a lot in '86. What is the reason for that? Do you expect more crime coming along? Are you just being prepared?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, as I said, it's difficult to estimate. It's not necessarily more crime that involves additional expenditures, but it's the amount that the Crimes Compensation Board feels the victims may be entitled to. There may be no more cases dealt with or there may be even fewer cases dealt with, because there's no fixed formula for determining the amount of compensation. There are some precedents which have been built up, obviously. Really, the increased expenditure reflects larger awards handed down by the board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jonson.

MR. JONSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe that in a general sense these concerns may have been covered in the opening remarks of the minister. However, I'd just like to check on two or three things.

On page 14.3 of volume 2, FIGA's expenditures are given by program and object. I notice that the department exceeded its estimate of \$4,086,474 for salaries, wages, and benefits by approximately \$175,000, and this had to be covered by special warrant. What was the reason for this expenditure exceeding the estimate under salaries, wages, and benefits?

MR. HORSMAN: There are a number of reasons; three primarily, I guess. The annual Premiers' Conference: we had some additional expenditures there, and those were covered by a special warrant. The foreign offices ended the year over budget. This is a problem we have each year, and it relates to the fluctuation in exchange rates. Obviously, we can't predict with any

degree of accuracy what the exchange rates will be and the impact they will have upon the department, so we have to, towards the end of each year, make an adjustment to deal with foreign exchange fluctuations.

There were some additional expenses associated with my office, in the sense that having assumed the responsibility as Attorney General — there is no ministerial office expense in the Department of the Attorney General. It's all loaded onto the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Really, there's an additional executive assistant working with me to handle Attorney General matters. All of that is, of course, required to be paid from the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs' office. So that really accounts for part of that as well. I should point out, of course, for hon. members that the minister gets only one ministerial salary.

MR. JONSON: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. I was going to ask about the overexpenditure under Supplies and Services, but that is probably covered by such things as the hosting of the Premiers' Conference and so forth.

However, I do have another concern. The department's estimate in the area of Grants was set at \$88,000 and the actual expenditure recorded as \$119,823. Mr. Chairman, my main question here is: what are these grants for? I'm not so worried about the overexpenditure, but just what are we granting here in this department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the expenditure for Grants is in the neighbourhood of \$525,000, isn't it? Are we on the same line?

MR. HORSMAN: I think that Purchase of Fixed Assets was \$88,000. The overexpenditure there was \$119,000. It wasn't the Grants.

MR. JONSON: I'm sorry; could I clarify, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. JONSON: It's my mistake, and I apologize for copying down the wrong line of figures. I'd still like to ask the question about the grants, as to what is the nature of that.

MR. HORSMAN: Okay. Yes. During the fiscal year the department issued 16 grants, and the majority of these related to the promotion of Canadian studies programs at various institutions — postsecondary institutions primarily, of course — in the U.S., Korea, Hong Kong, and the United Kingdom. We made grants of \$10,000 U.S. each to the 49th Parallel institute at Montana State University and to the Association for Canadian Studies in the United States in Washington, D.C. We also made a \$10,000 Canadian grant to the Foundation for Canadian Studies in the United Kingdom.

All of these provide support for a number of useful projects. For example, the 49th Parallel institute publishes a *Borderlines* newsletter, which discusses economic and political developments in Canada and the U.S. — it's really come along very well — and provides handbooks on western Canada for use by state legislators and businesspeople in the U.S. Those are just some examples. The Association for Canadian Studies in the United States is, very interestingly enough, promoting Canadian studies and has been successful in more than doubling its membership, in the sense that universities and colleges in the U.S. are now engaged in an extensive amount of Canadian studies.

The biggest grant was \$200,000, and that was the grant to the Asia-Pacific Foundation, which is funded jointly by the federal government, the western provinces in particular, and by the private sector. They are located in Vancouver, and Alberta has four directors on that body.

The other grant was \$178,000, just over that amount, to the Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat, and they are the body which is responsible for putting on inter-governmental conferences. For example, in '86-87 the conference secretariat provided services to 100 intergovernmental meetings, including four first ministers' meetings, 47 ministers' meetings, and 49 senior officials' meetings. It's interesting to note that 11 of those 100 meetings were held in Alberta, including the Premiers' Conference here. They provide simultaneous translation and those services that are necessary for those programs.

So those cover the grants by and large.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Jonson?  
Mr. Musgrove.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to get back to the foreign offices again. I appreciate the information the minister has given us, but I notice that the costs of the Alberta offices is about 40 percent of the budget. Does the minister have a breakdown on the costs of each of the foreign offices?

MR. HORSMAN: Yes. It is important to note that Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs pays the operating costs relating to each office, and this includes salaries and benefits for the locally hired staff, nonprogram-related supplies and services, as well as salaries, benefits, and program costs for Agents General. Now, other departments will pay for the tourism personnel, for example, who work in those offices. In '86-87 expenditures for each office varied from \$950,000 in Tokyo to \$59,000 in Houston. London was \$650,000, New York \$380,000, Hong Kong \$430,000, and Los Angeles \$85,000. That also includes the element that I mentioned earlier, the Ottawa office; the total expenditures there were \$221,000. Those are rounded figures obviously.

MR. MUSGROVE: Does the minister or department keep any ledger on the benefits of the foreign offices versus the costs? I'm sure that that's hard to define because there are probably ongoing benefits that might turn up several years after that expense is incurred, but is there an estimate of the benefits as far as the cost is concerned?

MR. HORSMAN: It's hard to maintain a cost/benefit analysis on the foreign offices, and that's one of the difficult questions to answer. The offices really have one objective, and that's to, I guess, promote Alberta. They do it in a variety of ways, and they work obviously with foreign governments to promote Alberta's interests with respect to foreign governments. If one goes back just a few years, during the course of the constitutional debates the office in London was extremely active in promoting the interests of the provinces during that, yet we could never attach a cost/benefit to that particular activity. On the other hand, if you look at offices like Hong Kong, the work the Alberta office did there with respect to attracting the investment of Li Ka-Shing to Alberta, while it obviously wasn't entirely as a result of Alberta's activities, the Agent General played a major role there, and one recognizes that there was a several hundred

million dollar investment in Alberta as a result of that.

In addition to that, the offices work with foreign companies who are interested in investing in Alberta, and we also work with Alberta companies who are interested particularly in the field of trade. We've had some very interesting trade developments as a result of our offices.

We've got to keep in mind though, Mr. Chairman, that the offices differ. For example, the Hong Kong office has an officer there from the Department of Career Development and Employment, and his role has been to attract entrepreneurial immigration into Alberta from Hong Kong. We don't have a similar person in London anymore because the department doesn't feel that their resources should be directed there. So they vary considerably.

I think probably the one office that has done as much to promote trade -- and I can give specific examples -- is the Tokyo office. There are a number of examples that I could give you on that, but it would take quite some time. Food commodities, particularly in Japan: we're getting some niches carved out there as a result of initiatives by Alberta's offices. The offices too, I might point out, are used by Alberta businesspeople, agricultural exporters, at no charge for meeting purposes, so they serve a useful function there.

It's very difficult to give you a cost/benefit analysis, but in our view they're working very effectively, and they're certainly busy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bradley.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I first wanted to ask a supplementary that came to my mind after Mr. Jonson's questions and relates to the minister's reference to a *Borderlines* newsletter. I'm sure he meant that that was the title of the newsletter, not that it was a quasi type of newsletter. But it prompted a question with regards to the Alberta/Montana Boundary Advisory Committee, which has been active over a period of years. I wonder if the minister might comment on what had been accomplished by that advisory committee in the fiscal year under examination, if he feels that the work of the committee is useful in accomplishing what the department felt its mandate should be, and also, if possible, what the cost of operating that committee has been from the Alberta side?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Alberta/Montana Boundary Advisory Committee. I can't remember the exact inception date, but certainly there were some expenses related to that in the fiscal year in question. That came about as a result of the initiative of a member of the Montana House of Representatives who lives just south of the border. He put a motion before his House and obtained a cosponsor in the Senate in Montana to establish a statutory body in Montana. That was signed into law by the governor, Governor Schwinden, and is now in fact a legally constituted body in the state of Montana. We in this Legislature passed a resolution sponsored by the Member for Cypress-Redcliff to institute this body on the Canadian side of the border. I've been serving as the cochairman of that advisory committee with the Lieutenant Governor of Montana, and we have held two meetings a year, one in Alberta and one in Montana. Those meetings have been very useful in terms of identifying issues and trying to work together to resolve them.

The Milk River of course is an international body of water. The subject of the possible construction of a dam on the Milk River has been discussed at some length, and I think there's a

fair understanding on the part of the two governments as a result of those discussions. There have been discussions relative to meat import and export regulations. There have been discussions on noxious weed control. There have been discussions, certainly since the free trade discussions got under way, of the attitudes of the Montana government relative to that development. So it's been a very worthwhile committee to exchange views.

One specific example, though, is that the two departments of Tourism undertook a program to attract visitors to Montana and Alberta and engaged in an extensive advertising campaign called: take a two-nation vacation. That was one thing that came in a practical way from the existence of this committee.

So it's not long in its existence, but it's been useful so far, and I hope it will continue.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I wanted now to turn to the Department of the Attorney General. I phrased that first one as a supplementary to what Mr. Jonson had asked so I could now get back into the Department of the Attorney General.

I notice that the minister in the '86-87 fiscal year has really been very cost conscious in terms of the amounts of money that the Legislature has voted to his department and what in fact he expended. I note on page 4.6 that there was some \$149 million authorized, and the department expended only \$139 million, turning back to the Treasury some underexpenditure of some \$10 million, which is about a 7 percent reduction. Recognizing where we are in terms of a deficit position, I'd like to commend the minister for having been able to do that.

I note that in terms of the underexpenditure it was basically in two areas. One is with regards to the Land Titles Office in Calgary and Edmonton, where there's an almost \$2 million underexpenditure. The other is in the Court Services, the administration of justice I guess, some \$4.6 million turned back. I'd like to ask the minister with regards to those underexpenditures whether or not in Land Titles and Court Services there's been any reduction in service to the public by those underexpenditures. Particularly with regards to Court Services, has there been any effect on the access to the administration of justice by the public by those reductions?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, it is, of course, common that there is some lapsing of funds. But in regard to that particular fiscal year, there was a considerable amount in the Department of the Attorney General that was -- there was a very major effort made by the department and the staff to introduce efficiencies and to curb expenditures wherever possible. Specific efficiency and restraint measures were taken by the department to minimize the level of spending. Of course, you will recall that in that particular fiscal year we had to try and make some cuts in expenditures, but I believe that we were able to maintain efficiency and still provide the services.

With regard to personal property registry expenditures that you mention, Land Titles Office, in fact the number of transactions handled by that department showed some increases. In the central and vehicle registries as well -- that's part of that same area -- there were actually increases. So the reduction is brought about by enhanced efficiencies.

With regard to access to justice, I don't believe that the reduction has resulted in any less access. I think that we're still providing the services. During the course of the last two years since I became Attorney General I have visited each of the judi-

cial centres in the province, except Peace River, and visited the facilities, talked to the staff, to the members of the practising Bar in each of the communities. I believe that we are providing very good access through our court services system, leaving aside the question of affordability, which is always an issue that we will have to tackle.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member rolled at least two supplementals into that previous question, so I'd recognize Mr. Ady.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question refers to the Department of the Attorney General. The public accounts indicate that the department lapsed just over \$10 million in 1986-'87. Can you explain why this overall underexpenditure?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, I think I've dealt with some of the issues in the answer to my colleague Mr. Bradley just a few moments ago. Personal property registry expenditures were less and Court Services were less. We have tried to streamline the process, and there's been some automation that has actually been working. I'm not a technocrat; I don't understand how some of these automatic systems do work. Nonetheless, there have been a number of automation initiatives undertaken, and those account for some less expenditures. But by and large it was an overall effort to reduce expenditures and to be more efficient as a result of the fiscal situation that we found ourselves in.

MR. ADY: Thank you. My other supplemental had to do with the personal property registry, which you've covered in your reply to Mr. Bradley, at least to quite an extent.

My second one deals with Court Services, on page 4.2 of volume 2. I notice that that accounts for about 41 percent of the department's total expenditure, which is a pretty large percentage. Can the minister just comment on if there is any possibility of reduction in that area, initiatives to streamline it and still give the service? I realize the service has to be given there. Can he just enlarge on that to some extent?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the automation process is working. The introduction of a number of computers, word processors, devices of that kind, are assisting in streamlining the procedures that are in place. As I say, in my visits to these facilities, the court staff at each location has indicated to me how they are working towards efficiencies. Yet at the same time, there is no predictability as to the level of services that a given court may have to provide. If, for example, there's an extremely lengthy and complicated trial in, let us say, Lethbridge, it may require some extra work and overtime to provide those services. There's a certain degree of unpredictability about the procedures, so it's hard to streamline. I think we can still provide the services efficiently and effectively.

As I indicated, my meetings with the court staff and administrators in the system by personally visiting all of the facilities has, I think, been very useful for me in understanding how the system works. I don't know how we could be much more efficient than we are now, quite frankly. We're working at it, but that's something that will always be there, and we want to make sure the court system is available to the citizens of the province.

MR. ADY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The minister has covered my other supplementaries in his other answers to other



members' questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Heron.

MR. HERON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A few moments ago Mrs. Mirosh asked a question which referred to page 4.3. I'd like to turn back to volume 2, page 4.3, vote 3, Legal Services. I note that \$58,000 was transferred from salaries to the Purchase of Fixed Assets. First, could the minister tell us if this transfer required any reduction in staffing levels?

MR. HORSMAN: No, it did not. The money was transferred from allowances and benefits and not from salary provisions.

MR. HERON: Then, Mr. Minister, is it safe to assume that the transfer did not adversely affect the services performed by Legal Services?

MR. HORSMAN: No. It's my understanding that there was no adverse impact there.

MR. HERON: Then to use up my other supplementary, Mr. Chairman, if I might: what was the money that was transferred used for? What fixed asset was it used for?

MR. HORSMAN: This is part of this wonderful world of electronic data processing: in order to provide some additional fixed assets -- in this particular instance it was for the criminal justice division -- for the criminal justice information system, which has been introduced to provide better exchange of information in the area of criminal justice, so we can draw up more quickly information relating to criminal charges in the province. If I'm not mistaken, I think it's integrated with other provinces to some extent. Is that correct?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we haven't integrated it yet. That's one of our plans.

MR. HORSMAN: One of the plans is to integrate the Alberta criminal justice information that we have on these computers to correspond with other provinces. That has not yet been done, but this is one of the steps towards that end.

MR. HERON: Mr. Chairman, may I just make one suggestion that you have done in the past. Since we have a number of students in the gallery, I'll just draw that to your attention. You usually make an explanation of what's going on here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, from time to time I do that. For the benefit of the students, then, this is a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee of the province of Alberta. What we're doing is reviewing the Auditor General's report and the public accounts for the financial year that ended in March of 1987. We have before us today the Attorney General for the province of Alberta, who is also the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. He's answering questions that are being put to him by members of the committee.

I'd now like to recognize Mr. McEachern.

MR. McEACHERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask a question about the legal aid available to different classes of people. For instance, there is some aid available to people who have committed a criminal offence, or at least have been

charged with a criminal offence, but there really doesn't seem to be much in the way of help for litigating civil cases. I wonder if the Attorney General could speak to that problem.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can't really give a breakdown for '86-87 as to the amounts that were expended on that matter, criminal as opposed to civil. It is true that it has been the policy of the Legal Aid Society, which was developed in consultation with the Law Society of Alberta, to concentrate on providing legal aid for criminal charges, because it's in that field where most people without resources of their own find themselves in conflict with the law. I'm advised by my staff that about 20 percent of the total was expended on civil matters. Most of those, I would think, would have been in domestic relations issues, where it isn't a case of the parties fighting each other in court over personal injury actions or where there's a recoverability of legal expenditures. I think that's where most of the civil assistance went. I know there is a concern that has been expressed that we should expand that. I meet each year with the board of directors of the Legal Aid Society, and we seek their advice on the amount of moneys that they want. But at this stage they seem to have felt up till now that the balance has been about right.

MR. McEACHERN: And of course I would assume that a criminal case would be more important than a civil one, in the sense of wiping off somebody's record. But I see that the budget hasn't really increased in the last two years either, since this budget that we're now analyzing in some detail. The estimates show a 24 percent increase, but that's not allowing for the government warrants which are already appropriated by the Assembly for 1987-88.

In any case, to follow up on the civil cases and the problem there, if someone in our courts does get a civil decision in their favour in collection of a debt, for example, we don't seem to have any way to help them collect on that debt. I mean, I've run into a couple of cases where they just can't seem to, you know, make the other person pay up, and they are left with expensive attempts to collect it which may in fact be more than the amount of money they've got coming.

MR. HORSMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's an age-old problem for the legal profession and people who are creditors. Some people are very adept at avoiding their obligations, and of course some people just find themselves in a position where they cannot meet their obligations. That is one of the reasons we have courts, and that's one of the reasons we have sheriffs and all of the other paraphernalia that's in place to assist people in trying to collect on the indebtedness. But there comes a time, of course, when you can't get blood out of a stone, and some of those cases, unfortunately, are there. We do what we can to provide a system, but we can't, obviously, assure that every debt that's incurred will be collected.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. McEachern.

MR. McEACHERN: Yeah. When I asked my series of questions the first time around, I thought that I noticed one of the gentlemen with you nodding, the one two down, when I was asking about the money spent on constitution and energy. It seemed like he wanted to sort of jump in with something, and I didn't get a chance to ask him. That's what I was trying to say at the end of it. Do you have something more to add to that

answer?

MR. RAE: Mr. Chairman, I have a habit of nodding an understanding of the question, and that's all I was . . .

MR. McEACHERN: You didn't have anything to add then?

MR. RAE: No, I didn't.

MR. McEACHERN: Then I would ask a different third question, if I may.

MR. HORSMAN: Just quickly, I had an assistant deputy minister who nodded his head this way, so you never knew whether he was saying yes or no.

MR. McEACHERN: Anyway, I was looking at the money spent on gaming control and thinking about the casino application that has been before your government for some time and wondering if that committee, the gaming control committee, and perhaps yourself as having, of course, some say in the matter, might have considered holding public hearings and discussions on the casino proposal over the last couple of years. It seems to me what we got was a lot of silence and then finally a decision that most people have found somewhat unsatisfactory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Again, that question's out of order. It's not related to an expenditure, but I'll leave it to your discretion.

MR. McEACHERN: *The gaming control committee does spend a fair amount of money each year, including this year.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question about whether they'd considered holding public hearings, I don't know what that's got to do with the expenditure that's in the public account.

MR. HORSMAN: I can answer the question very quickly by saying that they did hold public hearings.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask questions of the Attorney General this time, please. Under the Maintenance Enforcement Act, I wonder if the minister could indicate what the policy was during this particular fiscal year, '86-87, on the use of garnishees. If they're not used automatically in all cases, I wonder if he could indicate why that is. Is that an expense issue, or . . .

MR. HORSMAN: The maintenance enforcement proceedings, of course, that were in place during the fiscal year in question were relatively new, and it doesn't really appear in the public accounts as such. It's really included in Crown counsel in vote 3, Legal Services. But as to the process by which the maintenance enforcement people try to collect, they use the methods that are available to them that they think will work, and garnishee proceedings are, in fact, instituted. I'm sure the hon. member, as well as other members of the Assembly, will have received representations on both sides of the question: that garnishees have not been used when they should have been and, likewise, that garnishees have been used to the very real disadvantage of the debtor in the sense that it's resulted in discriminatory practices or job loss. This is always one of the concerns that all of us as MLAs receive in this concern. So they have to use their judgment in terms of what procedures they use

to collect. Obviously, that's open to them, and it's used when appropriate.

MR. MITCHELL: What was the policy during this fiscal year on direction to prosecutors for pursuing minimum sentence levels in cases of sexual assault and for pursuing appeals of sentences that would be deemed to be inappropriately low?

MR. HORSMAN: Well, the policies, of course, are to seek the maximum and appropriate sentences in all levels of crime. And of course, the subject of sentencing is one that's a discretionary matter, to a considerable extent, by the court. It is, of course, a concern when there is a lack of uniformity, but each case must be judged on its own merits. The policy on the part of the Crown is to seek the appropriate sentences, and the penalties sometimes are not considered by the public to be sufficient. That's a difficult issue to deal with.

MR. MITCHELL: I recently saw an interview of a judge, not from this province, who indicated that one of the difficulties in sentencing for sexual assaults is the question of not progressing too far beyond society's mores or conventional wisdoms, the way they view that particular crime. The other side of that problem is that they don't keep up with society's views of that particular crime, or those views aren't necessarily commensurate with the severity. What programs did the department undertake in '86-87 to consult with judges or to establish seminars on the issue of sexual violence and sexual assault and sentencing for those crimes?

MR. HORSMAN: There was a major study undertaken in Canada on sentencing, and the Sentencing Commission brought forward a report. Now, I'm not just -- what was the date on that? I can't remember the date, but certainly a copy of that could be made available to the hon. member. This is an issue, of course, that is discussed at the annual meetings of the ministers of justice. It's always on the agenda, the subject of sentencing. The hon. member will recall recently in question period in the House that I undertook to raise with the judges in this province the concerns that were expressed on that particular subject. And at the annual meeting of the Law Society last weekend in Kananaskis, I met with the Court of Appeal justices, which I'm required to do by law under their legislation, and raised the matter with them and will do that with the chief judges and the Chief Justice. But it's a delicate area for an Attorney General in terms of dealing with the members of the Bench, because in each criminal case I, or the Attorney General, am there as a party to the prosecution. So while I have to deal with the justices and the members of the Bench, I cannot exert political influence with respect to their judgments.

So to go back to your question, however, the matter is best dealt with, in my view, by meetings with the ministers of justice, by studies such as the sentencing commission report, and by conferences such as the one which is coming up this summer to deal with sentencing in the broader context of the common law or Commonwealth, including U.S. jurisdictions, where we're trying to achieve some better understanding of what's taking place elsewhere. And then meetings with the judicial counsels, so that we avoid the appearance and, in fact, avoid entirely exerting the wrong kind of influence on judgments and sentencing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, we've gone beyond our normal ad-

jourment time. I wonder if Mr. Bradley would . . .

Mr. Moore.

MR. BRADLEY: That's fine.

MR. R. MOORE: I move that we adjourn until next Wednesday at 10 a.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, just before I recognize Mr. Moore, I'd just like to say that next week the hon. Mr. Adair, Minister of Transportation and Utilities, will be before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Are you agreed?

I'd like to thank the Hon. James Horsman for coming today and bringing members of his department with him. We always appreciate the fact that people do take time out of very busy schedules to be here, and we appreciate that.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The committee adjourned at 11:32 a.m.]

