

8:32 a.m.

Wednesday, May 20, 1992

[Chairman: Mr. Pashak]

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call this morning's meeting to order. The minister's a little delayed. He's just arrived, apparently, but we have a little routine we have to go through.

May I have a motion to adopt the minutes of the May 13, 1992, committee meeting?

MR. LUND: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Moved by Mr. Lund. Are there any errors, omissions, corrections? Hearing none, then, are you in favour of adopting the minutes as distributed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

The minister's here. I'd like to welcome him and his guests. In a moment I'll give you an opportunity to make a statement, hon. minister. I'd like to welcome the Auditor General, Mr. Salmon, who always attends our meetings.

This is the first time you've had the pleasure of appearing before the Public Accounts Committee, I take it, so perhaps I should provide a brief sketch of what we do in the committee. Essentially we're reviewing the public accounts for the year ended March 31, 1991. Members try to direct their questions either to the public accounts themselves, in which case they'll usually refer to a line in the public accounts so it's easier to pick up just where they're coming from, or they'll refer to the report of the Auditor General and perhaps ask questions about that, but there's not much comment by the Auditor General. With that, I'll provide you with an opportunity to make an opening statement, if you'd care to, and introduce members of your department.

MR. MAIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With me today is the deputy of Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, Jack O'Neill; our director of financial planning, Ramesh Manickchand; and my executive assistant, Stephen Shapiro.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today to talk a little bit about what we have been doing for the last while, specifically in the budget expenditures from 1990-91. Perhaps an overview of the department, then, would be helpful to see exactly what it is we have under our jurisdiction and what appears in the public accounts. Of course, the department itself as well as three arts-related foundations, the Alberta Arts Foundation, the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts, and the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts - those three foundations, of course, were amalgamated last year into the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. As well, we have the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation, which supplies funding for various historic enterprises around the province, and the Alberta Multicultural Fund, which is the funding organ for the multiculturalism development section of the department.

First of all, the major entity, of course, is the department itself, and the figures appear in your public accounts documents. We were budgeted at \$48,028,064. Of that we spent \$47.9 million and lapsed \$107,000, obviously under the appropriation. There were, however, some transfers of funds within each vote. The source of these transfer funds was primarily supplies and services control group. The majority of those transfers, \$811,00, went into the manpower control group in order to meet payroll, while some funds went into fixed asset control group. This is a situation you

will see in close examination of our public accounts: considerable transfers into the manpower control group. We use this essentially as a management tool to maintain the levels of employment within the department, at the same time meeting the budgetary restrictions that were placed on us as we attempted to continue to downsize government. We had been running a deficit on the manpower side for some period and would transfer money from supplies and services to meet that deficit at the end of the year, never vote to vote but certainly within each vote. In order to maintain our manpower obligations, we did those transfers, and you'll see that appear in several areas.

In '89-90 the department embarked on an exercise of strategic and implementation planning for a local area network to be installed at all major office and operational sites in our province over a three-year period, and the other recurring theme is the change in the fixed assets as we updated our computer network. The plan was completed after the budgetary process for '90-91 was finalized. We found that this was very cost beneficial - we had a payback in less than three years - so we implemented the system at three strategic locations in the department: the central offices, which form the hub of the LAN in the CN tower, my office here in the Legislative Assembly, and library services. During '90-91 library services were based in the industrial area in the west end of the city.

Another cost/benefit analysis of the mainframe computer operated on our behalf at the University of Alberta indicated that its replacement with a Unix-based system to be operated by the department was much more cost beneficial. Funds were transferred to a fixed asset control group in various votes to purchase that hardware. I'm happy to report that both the systems are functioning well, and the original cost/benefit projection relative to payback, less than three years, is holding true. You'll see evidence of the EDP emphasis we placed in changes in expenditures in the revolving fund in ministerial office lines, in the deputy's office, and elsewhere.

Now, of the total appropriated amounts of a shade over \$48 million, \$20 million was expended on financial assistance for libraries, museums, the Glenbow Institute in Calgary, and other organizations and individuals active in the cultural arena in this province. In other words, something approaching half our appropriation went from Treasury through the Legislature and out into the hands of various members of the public. Since these accounts we have made some changes in the way department granting on the performing arts side is done. Those obligations are now met by the Foundation for the Performing Arts, but in '90-91 there was still money in the department that provided a variety of granting.

On the Performing Arts side, \$696,000 to Music and Dance, \$873,000 to Theatre, and slightly over \$1 million to nonprofit organizations, for a total of \$2.6 million. There were Film and Literary Arts grants through the department of \$422,000 and individual Visual Arts grants of \$158,000. That total amount of money now is reflected in the Lottery Fund allocation to the Foundation for the Performing Arts, and were we doing this exercise a couple of years from now, looking at '92-93 - actually '91-92 - these particular grants would not appear in our department appropriation.

Library Services, however, continues to appear in our budget today, and it is a most important part of what we do. In the numbers we're looking at for this exercise, regional libraries received \$3.5 million, municipal libraries \$7.4 million, community libraries \$71,000, consulting services and resource sharing \$709,000, and research and education \$75,000. The total: just under \$12 million. There was an additional \$55,000 in ministerial

grants, for a total in Cultural Development in vote 2 of \$15,076,862. This is the cultural development side of the granting exercise.

Vote 3 is heritage preservation, our historic resources, museums, archives, and historic sites. The breakdown on grants to museums for heritage preservation: \$490,000; some small project grants totaling \$37,000. We take responsibility as well for the Government House Foundation, which is a volunteer group that essentially busies itself with the exercise of keeping Government House looking up to scratch and suitable for the purpose it was designed. They acquire a small amount of art. They make recommendations on decor, on furniture acquisition, and are involved in the planning of various social events that take place around Government House. This grant in subsequent years has been cut from \$50,000 to \$25,000. Nevertheless, the Government House Foundation, with an all-volunteer board, does good work for a small amount of money.

The Glenbow-Alberta Institute in this particular fiscal year received \$3.6 million. We continue to maintain a large commitment to the Glenbow-Alberta Institute; we're the largest single donor for that institute. It is unique among museum organizations in Alberta in that it is a partnership between the provincial government and the Devonian Foundation in essence. Eric Harvie, the long-time businessman, philanthropist, and collector from the southern Alberta to Calgary area, 25 years ago donated the bulk of his collection to the province on the understanding there would be a museum built, and the Glenbow is it. It has since grown considerably, but the Harvie family still has representation on the board, as does the government of Alberta and as do members at large. One of the members of your committee is on the board of the Glenbow: Bonnie Laing from Calgary-Bow. The Glenbow is still a very, very strong contributor to the knowledge and understanding of the heritage of this province. It's not just a museum. It's also an art gallery, an archives, and is used as a resource by a tremendous number of people doing historic research not only in this province but right across Canada and elsewhere.

8:42

As well, you'll see a line in our vote 3 for the Ex Terra Foundation, and I should say a few words about the foundation. This is another initiative that came to government that was brought together by members of the scientific community involved in palaeontology and palaeoarchaeology. They proposed a scientific expedition that would involve the National Museum of Natural Sciences, the Chinese Institute for Vertebrate Palaeontology and Palaeoanthropology, or the IVPP, in China, and the Royal Tyrrell Museum here in Alberta. The object of the exercise was to conduct extensive scientific investigations, to dig in areas of the high Arctic, in the Gobi Desert, and elsewhere in Alberta. As a result of this work, a tremendous number of dinosaur bones of species never before discovered were uncovered in both the Gobi and the high Arctic. As a result of that extensive international scientific work, an enormous collection of fossils has been gathered, and that collection will form the basis of something called the Dinosaur Project, which will be a traveling dinosaur exhibit. It is conceived that this exhibit will open in Edmonton sometime next year and then for the next six or eight years will travel the world to Japan, North America, Europe, all over.

The organization board features a number of prominent businesspeople from Edmonton and area. There is a strong team of display creators. There is a strong scientific team. The work continues to develop the Ex Terra Foundation's Dinosaur Project into a viable and active traveling exhibit the likes of which has

never been seen. This exhibit will be on the scale and in the scope of the Tutankhamen exhibit. I expect it will have broader and wider appeal. In our experience with these types of exhibits, the Hitachi Dinoventure in Japan, in which I participated a few years ago, gave me an indication that people want to see dinosaur exhibits. This one will be outstanding not only from just a visual aspect but certainly from the scientific material. There's a book, and a film has already been produced and released on PBS, *In Search of the Dragon*, that some of you may have seen.

Vote 4, multiculturalism project grants: \$9,000 is all that was expended. These are discretionary project grants. The bulk of the granting for the multiculturalism vote that exists in the multiculturalism foundation is something in the order of \$2.5 million. These multiculturalism project grants have also disappeared over the last few years from our voted appropriation. They've been absorbed by the Multicultural Fund, but in '90-91 there was a small amount of money granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

Our manpower allocation: 470 FTEs, 402 permanent full-time positions. We have reduced this considerably since 1991. For the fiscal year '92-93, our FTEs are at 439, and there's a permanent full-time allocation of 348, a substantial reduction. Mr. Chairman, the bulk of that reduction came in '91-92, when we reduced our manpower allocation by something in the order of 10 percent, approximately 40 people. We did not exceed our allocated numbers for FTEs and full-time positions during fiscal '90-91.

Just quickly, some of the expenditure priorities that will be evidenced throughout the document here today. I've mentioned libraries already. We have more than 300 library service locations that serve 95 percent of the population of Alberta, and maintaining library services, expanding our regional systems where possible, and continuing to provide a strong base for our libraries was then and continues to be one of my top priorities. The 1991 budgetary appropriations provided increased funding of \$486,000 over the previous year. This accommodated a number of things: population growth and, as well, an overall increase of 3 percent to the library grants budget.

It was my objective to re-establish a link in funding increases between libraries and those increases that are given annually in major granting departments that are announced in January: Health, Education, and municipalities. That link had been established a number of years ago; it evaporated during the mid-80s. My intent was to re-establish that link and maintain an ongoing increase in base library granting. I have managed to do that over the last three fiscal years I've had responsibility for this portfolio, and this was the increase in '90-91, \$486,000. Per capita grants to municipal libraries were increased to \$4.08 per capita from \$3.96 in '89-90. That became the highest level ever, and they've increased since.

Most libraries in small communities were also given a grant increase as a minimum. In other words, we established a floor for granting of either \$2,500 for those with a population of 600 or under or \$5,000 for those with a population of 600 or over. As you can see, with a \$4 grant, if you have a population of 300 people, you'd only be getting \$1,200 under the per capita, but we established a minimum of \$2,500 and that was well received. Libraries in smaller communities have a difficult time of it with a very minute municipal tax base, and we felt it was important to give them a bit of a leg up.

Another expenditure priority is the Reynolds-Alberta and the Remington museums, two major undertakings of our department that are set to open within the next little while. The Remington museum is in Cardston and will display the story of horse-drawn transportation basically in southern Alberta but essentially across

the west. This is the result of a generous donation from Don Remington, of Cardston, of his collection of carriages, supplemented by some from the Glenbow, which I've already mentioned, and our own Provincial Museum here in Alberta. The city of Cardston donated the land upon which this museum sits. Some of you who were in Cardston recently for the opening of the Mormon temple there toured Remington. It is truly going to be an impressive sight. The department builds it, the carriages have been donated, as I say, by the Remington family, and the city of Cardston donated the land. Its operating funds are \$236,000; four more full-time employees came on in '90-91 as this facility moved ahead.

The other major project we're undertaking is in Wetaskiwin: the Reynolds-Alberta Museum, which tells the story of motorized machinery and transportation. The basis of the Reynolds is the collection of Stan Reynolds, the collector of things mechanical who is well known across North America. I believe the Reynolds-Alberta Museum in Wetaskiwin, with its focus on agriculture, industry, and transportation, with the finest collection of heavy industrial machinery, farm equipment, and automobiles, will attract people who love machines and people who are fascinated by things mechanical from around the world. In addition, there is an aviation hangar which will house rotating displays, and we expect that collection will grow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm sure all members of the committee are finding your remarks very interesting, but I've got a long list of people who would like to ask questions. By the way, I think you're anticipating many of their questions in your remarks, but . . .

MR. MAIN: I appreciate your caution. I've got four more quick points to make about our funding priorities, and then I'll let you get at it.

Multiculturalism in '89-90: the commission completed its report Focus for the '90s, and as a result of that we implemented some new strategies, the spending for which appears in our Multiculturalism Commission documents. We completed capital construction at the Ukrainian Village, another historic site just east of Edmonton, and brought that up to where we wanted it to be.

In our program delivery and development areas, we've made a number of changes in the Jubilee Auditorium, our archives, and so on. Some organizational changes are evidenced in some of our manpower. Then, as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Chairman, the emphasis on implementing a new local area network, our electronic data processing emphasis. You'll see transfers of money from various programs into manpower to cover off the manpower problems and into Supplies and services on the EDP side. That, in essence, is the picture of our department in '90-91.

8:52

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, thank you very much for that comprehensive opening statement, hon. minister.

The first person to recognize is Ms Calahasen.

MS CALAHASEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I'd like to say good morning to the illustrious group sitting here facing us this morning.

My question is: In 1991 the budgetary appropriations provided increased funding of \$486,000 for libraries, and libraries are for my constituency, I think, one of the largest issues we have dealt with. Could the minister comment on what contributed to this increase in funding?

MR. MAIN: Certainly. As I mentioned in my remarks, the library component of what we do is critically important. At that time, we were running the library component at about 25 percent of our total spending, roughly \$12 million to \$13 million in granting out of a \$48 million budget.

As I said, I wanted to make sure libraries continued to receive an increase, and the \$486,000 reflects a 3 percent increase in that base per capita grant from \$396 to \$408, as well as an increase in population, which is mandated if you're on a per capita, and we have more per capita as the grant rate goes up just automatically. But 486 is partly that and partly the 3 percent increase in the base.

MS CALAHASEN: Something a lot of areas were looking forward to, I would think.

In vote 2.5 on page 3.30 of public accounts, there's an overexpenditure of \$6,758. Could you please comment on what contributed to this overexpenditure?

MR. MAIN: An overexpenditure of \$6,758.

MS CALAHASEN: Actually, when you look at it, compared to others it's not that great, but it's still an overexpenditure in what was being . . .

MR. MAIN: This likely would be the manpower. This would be a transfer of funds on the manpower side. The tool used to squeeze manpower is fixed appropriation. In other words, here's your money; manage it. We were faced with a choice of either having to let someone go for \$6,000 or transferring money in, and we chose the second option.

MS CALAHASEN: A good option then. Those are my questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thurber.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, Mr. Minister. You touched on this vaguely in your opening remarks. I know you have cut the permanent full-time positions from 479 to 402. Given the fact that this decrease will probably continue, could you give us an idea what kind of impact this has on the services and programs? Has it also backed off on them, or are you still able to provide the services and programs under your portfolio?

MR. MAIN: We have had a decline in the size of our department both in terms of money expended and in terms of manpower, and the two are obviously related. We had, for example, in the current fiscal year, which we're debating in Committee of the Whole, a very slight decrease. One or two positions out of 400 have been changed, but there nevertheless has been a decrease over the period of time of something in the order of in excess of 10 percent. The question is: has that affected service? Probably. But we tried to minimize the impact of that by extensive reorganization, and we have reorganized in two main areas in the department.

We have completely reorganized our cultural development side. That's the singing, the dancing, the arts, the violins, the symphonies. It used to be organized horizontally along disciplinary lines; we had a dance section, a visual arts section, a theatre section. We have reorganized that entirely to provide organization along functional lines: marketing, audience development, education, along those lines. So if you're developing markets as an example, trying to get people to come

and watch whatever it is you do, the techniques generally are the same whether you're a dance troupe, a symphony, or a theatre group. To have one expert on market development in each of those - we can do the same work having, for example, one person doing it for all three of the disciplines. So our organization has changed 90 degrees, and as a result we're able to do the same kind of consultation work with our arts groups in a more efficient manner with fewer people.

We've done a similar reorganization on the historic resources side of things. We have completely amalgamated a number of operations; taken the Archaeological Survey, which used to be a stand-alone, and drawn it into the management structure of the Provincial Museum and Archives, as an example. A number of restructuring exercises within the operation has allowed us to continue to do the work mandated by the various Acts we operate under and, at the same time, do it with less money.

MR. THURBER: So it's a combination of two things, not just a budget factor but a reorganization and a streamlining of the services you do provide.

MR. MAIN: Correct.

MR. THURBER: My final question, Mr. Chairman. Could you give us an idea of what kind of dollar factor is involved in the savings from this type of reorganization and budget cuts? Would you have a handle on that?

MR. MAIN: I think we could look at the budget appropriation. It might be easier to look at it on a longer term basis, from \$48 million in the year we're looking at to \$43 million now. Since that period of time, in which we lost 10 percent of our staff and \$45 million, we are about to open two new museums. We have two others that are in the ground and about to open. We have established a new arts foundation that right now, as we speak today, is conducting in Medicine Hat a series of public meetings on how better to serve the arts community. We completely refocused the directions of the Multiculturalism Commission and established several new directions in that period of time. So during the last three years: less money, fewer staff, and delivering better and more programs.

MR. THURBER: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Black.

MRS. BLACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd also like to welcome the minister and department people. It's nice to have you join us in Public Accounts.

One of the questions I'm wondering about, Mr. Chairman, is vote 2.7, Film Censorship. I wonder if the minister might explain the role of his department in film censorship.

MR. MAIN: I'd be glad to, Mr. Chairman. Film censorship is, in fact, a misnomer. We do not and have not for some considerable period of time censored films. In essence, this is a film classification branch. What it does is provide for the classification of films. This is the organization that decides whether the film you go to see is PG or M or R or G. It is a small group of professionals whose job it is to classify films.

As a matter of fact, it's interesting you would raise this now. We have been trying for the last considerable number of years to get out of this business and try to work with other provinces to create a national classification board. One of the problems you

have is that there are two problems. Something that is PG in Manitoba may be M in Alberta and R in Ontario. This creates an enormous amount of difficulty for film distributors who need to replicate their exercise of getting film classification done in 10 jurisdictions. It also makes it difficult for the viewing public, who travel a lot during the summer. They want to go to a movie and, expecting to see a certain kind of film rated PG, will go to a film in one community and find that in fact it would have been R back where they live. I can give you an example from my own experience. The film *Glory*, which dealt with the American civil war, was rated R in the States and it was PG in Alberta. The film was excellent and didn't need, in my mind, an R restriction. When I think of an R restriction, I'm thinking of mayhem and violence and swearing and sex and a whole variety of things. In fact there were one or two battle scenes and one or two small sections where fairly strong language was used. But that was it. The rest of the film, had it been rated R here, would have cut out a wide audience.

Our efforts are to move out of this business and try to get involved in a national film classification board that would have standard classifications across the country. It would help the audiences and also help film distributors in the bargain. That's essentially what they do. It's a small section, headed by Sharon McCann.

9:02

MRS. BLACK: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Now that you bring up the rating of films, I too have often wondered how the rating is determined. When you're selecting a film that is acceptable for the entire family, you're quite often at an extreme disadvantage to avoid the unnecessary use of profanity and explicit sexual scenes, et cetera. I'm wondering what criteria this body is using. We're spending \$243,000 for classification of films, and I'm wondering what criteria they're using in Alberta as opposed to what they're using in a different province.

MR. MAIN: Well, it's interesting. As we've gone through this exercise of meeting with different provincial authorities and trying to work on this national body, which I might say is going poorly because of lack of co-operation of some of the other provinces, they have different standards in every province. In some jurisdictions they have a list. If there are three "damns" or six explosions, it becomes M. In other words, there's a list. Too many bare naked ladies - it's strictly a formula thing. We don't operate that way in Alberta. Our people are experienced in this work and based on community standards take the film into context. It may be appropriate, such as in the film I referred to earlier, *Glory*. It's not possible to have a film about the civil war without showing people getting killed. Is that gratuitous violence? I don't think so. Some jurisdictions would take that as violence. If it's a war, 2,000 people died and therefore it's got to be R because there are too many dead people. You could have one person killed or one person just getting injured in a very graphic, gratuitous way, and in my view, that would be more violent than a thousand people dying in a battle scene, yet those jurisdictions that use formulas would rate one R and the other PG.

My effort has been to have the film classification exercise include information, not merely PG or R. Let's give the viewing public and parents of youngsters information about what they can expect to see. I would encourage our people to do that and encourage other jurisdictions to include more information. The chief of our film censorship section is an expert on media literacy; as a matter of fact, traveled the world to give lectures on media literacy. Understanding what it is you're going to see and what

the content of these materials is and does for you and how to be a better informed consumer of film and video: those are our objectives.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, as a final supplementary, I notice that under vote 2.7.1 there was an overexpenditure of \$22,000 for film censorship. I wonder if the minister might justify the overexpenditure of \$22,000 and where it came from.

MR. MAIN: You're talking about a transfer of \$22,000. Is that right?

MRS. BLACK: Yes.

MR. MAIN: Again, the same answer as for the other question. It's a manpower adjustment.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to draw the minister's attention to the items under vote 4, Heritage Development. We notice the three items: Multicultural Commission Board, Program Administration, and Multicultural Grants. What we don't see there is the item that was referred to very briefly by the minister: the \$2.5 million in grants administered by the Multiculturalism Commission. I know the Auditor General has made comments about the lack of accountability of these lottery funds that are not included in public accounts. I'm wondering, since we don't have those details here before us, if the minister would be prepared to supply to the committee the details of the grants made under the Multiculturalism Commission: the amounts, the organizations, and the purposes of the grants for the fiscal year under consideration.

MR. MAIN: That information, if I'm correct, has already been tabled in the Legislature in the annual report for the commission for '90-91.

MR. GIBEAULT: It didn't have all the details of the organization grants in that report.

MR. MAIN: Well, I'll take that matter up with the chairman of the commission. As you quite rightly pointed out, virtually all the funding for multiculturalism is handled through the lottery-based Multiculturalism Commission fund. It's about 2 and a half million dollars. The voted support covers off staff, and supplies and services is roughly a million and a half. Your question, I'm sure, has been asked of other lottery-based organizations, and our practices in disclosures of lottery-based expenditures are consistent. The annual report - and I don't have it in front of me - would provide some details, and if you have some specific requests, I'll take them up with the chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for clarification, is this an expenditure from your department or an expenditure that somehow you administer?

MR. MAIN: Which? The Multiculturalism Commission? The Multicultural Commission, I guess, is sort of analogous to some of the other foundations - the Historical Resources Foundation, the performing arts foundation - in that it is a lottery-funded entity operated by a citizen board. In this case, it's chaired by an MLA, Redwater-Andrew. The decisions on expenditures of those dollars are made by that citizen board, but it operates under the auspices of our department. In other words, staff of the department are staff of the commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was just trying to determine whether that was a reasonable request to have been made of you in terms of your function as the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism. From what you're saying, I guess it was.

MR. MAIN: Yes, it was a reasonable request. Whether the request can be met or will be met we'll discuss with the chairman.

Had the question been asked, though, with regard to the Alberta performing arts foundation, those three arts-based foundations, some of them do and some of them don't list the grant recipients. The Wild Rose Foundation, I believe, lists its grant recipients. The difficulty with the Multiculturalism Commission is that it's not in essence a granting body anymore. It is a project oriented thing, and we operate in partnership with a variety of organizations, companies, businesses, and universities in doing our work. We're out of the business of giving grants to organizations and individuals to pursue traditional multicultural four D activities. We're out of that business. We're into the business of partnerships on providing a more unified, integrated place in which to live along the lines the member has long been urging yet continually criticizing.

MR. GIBEAULT: My supplementary question to the minister. Under Multicultural Commission Board we've got an expenditure of \$140,275. I wonder if the minister could tell us how much of that allocation was directed toward studying the appropriateness of an employment equity policy for Alberta.

MR. MAIN: I can't give you that answer, but I will provide it to you. I can't give it to you today.

MR. GIBEAULT: Then perhaps a final supplementary. Under the multiculturalism grants, recognizing it's probably a good thing that the minister is getting out of the grant business, can he explain what the \$9,000 he did hand out went to?

9:12

MR. MAIN: This would be a small grant to an organization - and I don't have the allocation for it off the top of my head; I can easily get it for you - that didn't fit within the programming guidelines. There was a small amount of discretionary money available out of the General Revenue Fund to the minister when I got this portfolio. A small fraction of that money, \$9,000, was spent to cover off something that wasn't readily available or needed a quick fix. Those grant availabilities and that money have since been eliminated from our General Revenue Fund budget, and the minister no longer retains a discretionary multiculturalism grant line in his GRF allocation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lund.

MR. LUND: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, minister and staff. Following along on the Special Project Grants found on page 3.33 in vote 4.3.2, checking back into the '89-90 public accounts, I find there was \$50,000 allocated, and of that amount, only \$15,000 was expended. When we come into this '90-91 fiscal year, we find that \$50,000 again and \$9,000. I'm wondering, why is the department consistently overestimating the amount needed?

MR. MAIN: This amount of money, the Special Project Grants, was an amount added to the budget to provide flexibility for nonprogram granting. Something might come along in the middle of a year, a special project: can you give us a hand with this, Mr.

Minister? The amount of money that was in the budget when I got the portfolio was \$50,000. The amount of money in the budget today is zero just because of the situation you described. The demand wasn't there. I felt uncomfortable having access to funds such as that because you become an easy tap: give us the money, give us the money, give us the money. I didn't feel using these kinds of funds was appropriate and preferred to have all granting, including the vetting of special projects, done by the commission because that's the job it was hired to do. So we've eliminated this grant line from our budget.

MR. LUND: Well, that's good news. I certainly agree with that thrust. I find that of that \$41,000 remaining, some \$17,000 was transferred into Program Administration. That would then mean there was some \$24,000 still unallocated. What happened to that money?

MR. MAIN: These dollars either would have been lapsed, would have been transferred into manpower, or would have been transferred into the other off-appropriation expenditure, which was the electronic data processing.

MR. LUND: Did any of the money that wasn't expended find its way back into general revenues?

MR. MAIN: Some did. I couldn't tell you exactly where those specific dollars went. We did lapse a hundred and some odd thousand dollars, so the answer is yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. McFarland.

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Goeden morgen. That's good morning, an Irishman's attempt at Dutch. How's the minister?

MR. MAIN: Just fine.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's one question.

MR. McFARLAND: Could that be my final supplementary?

Mr. Minister, I should refer you to 3.32 under 1990 statutory estimates. The amount estimated at that time was \$42,000, and \$11,390 was expended. Yet in 1991 only \$600 was estimated as a total statutory amount required. Can you please explain why 1991 was so much lower than 1990?

MR. MAIN: This is all revolving fund accounting, at which I am poor. Ramesh, perhaps you could . . . You're on page 3.32 on the statutory '91 and the statutory '90.

MR. MANICKCHAND: This was a revolving account set up for the Northern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium and the Southern Alberta Jubilee Auditorium. What we do at the beginning of the year is project the amount of revenue each facility would generate and also try to project the amount of expenditures. In this particular year the expenditures projected exceeded the revenues by \$600. The actual expenditures at the end of the year exceeded the revenue projections by \$10,000. So at the beginning of the year what we do is try to project what will happen as far as revenue and expenditures go, and we projected a \$600 deficit.

In the subsequent year, if you have the records, you'd see we actually projected a surplus. The expenditures in subsequent years were less than the revenues.

MR. MAIN: If I might, I could just offer a little more information. We've got in essence two commercial facilities, the Jubilee auditoriums in Calgary and Edmonton. We have made an effort to make them as self-sufficient as conceivably possible by expanding their operations through a revolving - in other words, a float. So for every dollar we put out to buy a bottle of liquor and get back \$10 profit on that, that money stays in the revolving fund and allows us to use the \$10 to pay someone to sell the liquor. We do the same thing on coat checks. We're attempting to expand this so the operations are all contained within those revolving funds.

As you look out over the year, you try to guess. But if you get a couple of extra bookings - Reveen shows up for three nights instead of two, *Les Miz* is extended instead of canceled, something is a bust, or you have a sellout when you didn't expect a sellout - your revenues of course are fluctuating. Our mandate is to balance that revolving fund account over a span of three years. So you see numbers here that seem to wildly fluctuate, but the effort is over a three-year period. It balances. Any excess revenue or profit at the end of that period of time is returned to the General Revenue Fund. We have a revolving fund that operates the two Jubilee auditoria, and in subsequent public accounts you'll see a new revolving fund, a regulated fund, that helps us with the revenue received on admissions from historic sites. That money stays in a regulated fund, and it is used to pay expenditures incurred in receiving those receipts. Same deal here.

MR. McFARLAND: Supplementary to that, if I could, Mr. Chairman. If there is a profit, then, in either the northern or the southern Jubilee auditoriums, are these extra moneys also used to help with ongoing maintenance costs? Is it a self-perpetuating situation there as much as possible, where they try to be stand-alone?

MR. MAIN: That's what we're attempting to do. Maintenance of the facilities is the responsibility of Public Works, Supply and Services. Our role is to run them: turn on the lights, make sure the spotlights follow the people, take the tickets, and book the place. So in essence we do the operating, whereas the other department is responsible for the maintenance. Our effort has been to make them as self-sufficient as conceivably possible, at the same time understanding their origin, which is to provide a service to the people of Alberta. These belong to the people of Alberta. That's why you see a tremendous amount of activity there, school graduations, university convocations: these types of nonprofit, public-based groups as opposed to a constant string of commercial venues. The commercial activity allows us to do the other, but we're very mindful of the original purpose of the Jubilees.

MR. McFARLAND: Final supplementary then. I think I understand the gist of the operation, Mr. Minister. In 1991 the revolving fund required was actually over \$10,000, far in excess of the \$600, and I can understand that from your past explanation. What types of things would that \$10,000 have been spent on in a year when you had underestimated it, if that's the proper word?

9:22

MR. MAIN: The Jubilee auditorium was no different from our other departmental requirements. As I said earlier, we expanded our electronic data processing equipment in there. It required a large up-front outlay of cash, and the bulk of that is reflected there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Drobot.

MR. DROBOT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My question to the minister. In 1990-91 the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism prepared a multicultural development strategy to implement the Focus for the 90's report. Can the minister explain to the committee the cost of formulating the development strategy and, further down the road, the cost of implementing the recommendations?

MR. MAIN: The deputy of the department, Mr. O'Neill, was previously the secretary of the commission and took part in this Interchange '88 and the Focus for the 90's exercise, so perhaps he could provide some of those details.

MR. O'NEILL: I think your question, if I understand it, is: how much is the implementation of that review costing? Whatever implementation is in there that does have costs attached will be paid for through the lottery funds given to the commission. The staff of the department is the administration arm of the commission and has a general revenue budget of \$1.3 million, but the actual costs of putting in an awareness program, a participation side, those things which will allow people to participate in public institutions and so on, the educational programs: all those will be paid by the commission through the Lottery Fund.

MR. DROBOT: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman. Could you provide the committee with some specifics on the survey devised to implement the Focus for the 90's and the impact it will have on departmental financial direction?

MR. MAIN: I can talk to that for a moment, Mr. Chairman. The history of the multiculturalism development side of our department is quite interesting, and it has undergone an evolutionary type of process. The old cultural heritage foundation had a small amount of money with which to deal with these projects. It was involved generally in what I would refer to as historic multiculturalism, or the four Ds - diet, dance, dialect, and dress - type of multiculturalism. The government felt in 1987 that this required some change. The department's name was changed from the Department of Culture to the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism. That was Bill 1 in that session. In 1988 the commission that was then established began a series of meetings around the province called Interchange '88. In '89 the report Focus for the 90's that you referenced, Mr. Drobot, was produced, and it called for some dramatic changes in the way multiculturalism was done.

As a result of that exercise, we completely changed our direction. As I described earlier to the Member for Edmonton-Mill Woods, we went from funding individuals to pursuing what would be called multicultural activities, to addressing the entire population and the multicultural reality of our population and trying to ensure that everybody was able to live and work and enjoy themselves together in this province. We set up three basic program areas: access, participation, and awareness. Each of these programs was roughly assigned a third of the lottery allocation, roughly \$750,000 per year for each of those three subprograms, and then under that projects and occasionally grants were administered by the commission to do that work. The big awareness program is this One Heart, Many Colours program that you see around. We have bands traveling to fairs, buttons - the Member for Lacombe is a proud wearer of one of our buttons - a series of videos, music, and various programs there. In the access program we're working with colleges, universities, and other institutions to make sure everybody, no matter what their background or their place of origin is, has access to the things

Alberta has to offer. Participation is an opportunity and effort to have everybody participate in the fullness of Alberta society. So we allocate funds to each of those.

So the impact on the financial side is not great, but the impact on the philosophical, the direction side of this exercise has been enormous. We have the funds allocated: roughly, as I say, 2 and a half million dollars from the lottery fund and a million and a half or some similar amount to cover off staff. And that work continues. It's just the direction that that work takes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary. Are you finished? Okay.

Ms Mjolsness.

MS MJOLSNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Minister and other guests. I'd like to ask some questions under the revenue section on page 3.34. I'm noticing under Fees, Permits and Licences that the revenue increased substantially from 1990 to 1991. I'm wondering if the minister or someone could give an explanation in terms of where the revenue came from - was it fees, permits, or licences? - and the implications this might have had on Albertans, if any.

MR. O'NEILL: We're on page 3.34, Fees, Permits and Licences? Most of that would come from - for instance, the distributor of a film has to pay a fee to have his film reviewed and so on, so we get a considerable fee over the year from distributors for our films. That's basically the only place where we charge that I can think of at the moment. That would come to about \$193,000 in that year.

MR. MAIN: I don't think the Jubilee auditorium revenue shows there. It would be in the revolving fund, right?

MR. O'NEILL: Yes.

MS MJOLSNESS: Okay. So this section, Fees, Permits and Licences, would have nothing to do with fees, say, charged at museums or . . .

MR. O'NEILL: That came in later.

MS MJOLSNESS: Oh, right. I'm sorry. Okay.

MR. MAIN: That came in later and would also show up in a regulated fund account, not in the general with department revenues.

MS MJOLSNESS: Okay. Thank you.

Under Refunds of Expenditure, I also notice a significant decrease. Could I get an explanation in terms of what that means? Under Other Revenue.

MR. MAIN: We'll get that for you.

MS MJOLSNESS: Yes, there was a substantial decrease there.

MR. MAIN: Yes. In 1990 we refunded \$1.1 million; in '91 we refunded \$22,000.

MR. O'NEILL: If I may, that may be a one-time expenditure that we had in a grant to the Ex Terra Foundation. It was a one-time expenditure that doesn't exist as part of the base budget; hence it would appear in this way. It was \$1,444,000 or something of that

nature, so that figure is out. It balances off in our figures here, but it was a one-time grant made to the Ex Terra Foundation.

MS MJOLSNESS: Payments from Government of Canada, if it's a grant, stayed the same, and I'm just wondering what money . . . I mean, that's a revenue. Could I get some explanation in terms of what that would be spent on, where that goes?

MR. MAIN: Yes, it's a transfer from a federal museums program through our department out to museums. They pay us, and we pay it out. It's a federal museums assistance program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the benefit of the people who have just joined us in the gallery, I might interrupt our proceedings for a moment to explain very briefly what we're doing. We're examining the public accounts of the province of Alberta for the financial year that ended March 31, 1991, and today we're investigating expenditures by the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism. We have with us today the minister and some officials from his department.

Mr. Clegg.

MR. CLEGG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Minister, for the review of your department. I'm glad to see that the Auditor General is back again. We're starting to really like him because he's always here. My question is to the Auditor General, firstly, and then to the minister would be my supplementary. In the report you expressed reservation regarding the financial statements of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute because the institute receives donation revenue. Could you explain what you really mean by audit verification? I'm not a good auditor myself.

9:32

MR. SALMON: Mr. Chairman, this is one of those standard reservation problems with respect to determining whether or not all of the donation revenue has been recorded. Because it's recorded on a cash basis, all auditors take the cautionary of putting in this type of a reservation. We have approximately 10 of these, I think, within all of the ones that we did, so it's a pretty standard reservation. It could be eliminated by something that would cost a considerable amount of money. It's really something that's just a cautionary to any reader of the financial statement, to know that you've only verified the revenue according to what they receive.

MR. CLEGG: Well, thank you, Auditor General. You know, we as a government always like to listen to the Auditor General when we have the best in Canada.

I was going to ask the Minister of Culture and Multiculturalism: has the department taken any measures to address the Auditor General's concern, or would it be too costly?

MR. MAIN: Well, I think, as the Auditor General just explained, this is one of the standard cautions that he notes when someone reporting to government creates some concerns. We, of course, are in close contact with the Glenbow, but they operate independently of government. They, of course, are sensitive to the needs of both the government and the Legislature through the Auditor General. I don't expect it would cost much more than a phone call to have them address those concerns.

MR. CLEGG: Thank you.

My final, then, is to the Auditor General, back again because of what I said earlier: we always like to listen to the Auditor

General. If this isn't straightened out in next year's accounts, are you going to be making the same recommendation?

MR. SALMON: Yeah. I'll continue to make that recommendation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Laing.

MRS. B. LAING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's good to see the minister here today and his staff as well. I have a question about the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation. Following an administrative reorganization, the general administrative costs were reduced by nearly \$250,000 annually. The minister states that this money will now be allocated for grants. Can the minister expand on the extent of this reorganization and what measures were taken to make available such a large amount?

MR. MAIN: Certainly. The Historical Resources Foundation, of course, provides a valuable service to Albertans by providing a variety of grants to museums, local archives, and individuals who are doing restoration projects, for example, on an historic building or an historic site.

Over time the staff that grew up around and was hired by the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation became rather large, and in many instances it was replicating the work that was being done by professional staff that had been hired in the department. In other words, you would come in with a project - you want to restore a railroad station in your town - and you would take that to the Historical Resources Foundation. A member of the staff there would come out and look at it and say, "Yes, that's a nice building, and yes, we'd like to restore it." Time and effort would be spent doing that exercise. Then that individual from the Historical Resources Foundation would go to the department and speak to one of the professionals in the department. That person from the department would come out and look at the building and say: "Yes, that's a nice building. It deserves restoration. We'd recommend that you get some money for that." In other words, we have two people doing essentially the same work.

What the reorganization accomplished was to replace the staff hired by the foundation with existing staff that had already been in place in the department. We released the staff of the foundation, replaced the executive director and the support staff with people who were already doing that same work in the department, and the resulting savings was, as you describe, something in the order of \$20,000 a month. That money now instead of being spent twice on staff is being spent once on staff, and the savings are back in the grant pool.

MRS. B. LAING: Can the minister inform the committee as to whether any other foundations or organizations under his jurisdiction have undergone or can undergo such an extensive reorganization?

MR. MAIN: We've done essentially the same thing last year with the arts foundations. You'll see in these accounts three arts-related foundations reporting through various Acts to the minister and the Legislature. We now have one, and the same staff of the department are now staff of this one foundation. The consultative work that was done previously by staff of three foundations is now being done by staff of the department. The savings realized through that reorganization are something in the order of \$450,000 to \$500,000 a year. It may be more as we work our way through this process, but the initial savings, minimum, are \$400,000 to \$500,000 a year, and that money is also in the grant pool.

MRS. B. LAING: It's very encouraging to see that removal of resources to where people can actually use them in the community.

My last question, Mr. Minister, is: was the role of the citizens' board, which handles grant decision-making and policy creation for the Historical Resources Foundation, also affected by the administrative reorganization of the foundation in 1990?

MR. MAIN: Of course, for each of these foundations that has a lot of reallocation, legislation requires that citizen boards, independent boards, handle the granting. The foundation has taken on more work, the members of the board have taken on more work, and as a matter of fact in our current legislative session we're asking them to take on even more work with a further amalgamation of the Historic Sites Board into the Historical Resources Foundation. That Bill is now awaiting third reading. Our effort is to try to do the work that is required by the various Acts that we have responsibility for in the most efficient manner possible, and we're going to continue to look for those savings. As a result, we're shifting work without question on to volunteer boards, but they are willing to do this work, seeing it as very, very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Cardinal.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. I, too, have a question for the minister or the staff. Looking at the report here, page 3.33, I cannot seem to find a mention of the public accounts for any funding provided to the Reynolds-Alberta and Remington museums. Did these facilities receive any funding from Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism in 1991? I believe you mentioned they did, but I can't find it anywhere in the report. I believe you mentioned that you spent \$200,000, but it doesn't really show up in the report.

MR. MAIN: It probably wouldn't show up specifically because these are generally staff of the historic resources division. There's not direct money being allocated to the construction through this department. That money is handled through public works, and the funds for exhibits and so on were handled through the Lottery Fund. We've hired, in this fiscal year, another four people at Reynolds, and they show up in our manpower allocation.

MR. CARDINAL: My first supplement is: can the minister expand on the direct and indirect economic benefit to the surrounding communities because of facilities of this nature?

MR. MAIN: Oh, sure. I guess the example that is most often pointed to is the Tyrrell museum in Drumheller. The addition of a facility of that size that draws half a million people to a town every year, the impact is enormous. You also see empirical evidence that people anticipate this happening: the long list of individuals who want to develop historic resources, interpretive centres, and museums in their communities. My guess is that in the Reynolds situation in Wetaskiwin, attendance figures will be close to, if not in excess of, those visiting Tyrrell. I expect another department may have a different view. They may be a little more conservative, but I think that facility will be enormous.

In Cardston we expect 200,000 to 300,000 people to visit that place on an annual basis, and anytime you add 300,000 people to a community, the economic spin-offs are enormous. It's in the millions: gasoline, cheeseburgers, motels, hotels, recreation activities, and other things. What we're trying to do is draw people who come on rubber-tire traffic to the northern part of the province. We have a good inventory in the south. We'll try to

add to our inventory in the north. With recent developments at Elk Point at Fort George-Buckingham House, with our expansions at historic Dunvegan on the Peace – the MLAs for those two areas are represented on the committee – with developments in Wetaskiwin and other things that are going on in the north, including the Lac La Biche Mission, we expect the tourism draw will be enormous. It's in the millions. It's literally in the millions, and depending upon what multiplier you use, I guess you can create virtually any scenario. One of the things that the department has used is an attempt to pay back the capital cost . . . [interjection] This is an important answer, Mr. Chairman. Through economic activity we see payback of the capital cost of these projects within five to six years.

9:42

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize that from a certain perspective it's an important answer. I just want to caution the members of the committee again that earlier in our meetings we had decided that we're going to try to stay away from policy-type issues. By asking a question like that, it invites other members of the committee maybe to suggest other policy alternatives. We try to stay away from that. We try to stay at least as closely as we can to explanations of expenditures. I'm just trying to draw that to the attention of the hon. member.

Mr. Cardinal, if you have a final supplementary.

MR. CARDINAL: Mr. Chairman, if it takes so much time, I could ask my question very quickly and get it done with.

My final question is just as important. You talked about staffing in relation to the proposed opening of the Remington museum this fall. Will the current funding and staffing be sufficient to be able to have this important project open this fall?

MR. MAIN: Yes, it's all moving on schedule. The full staff complement is there, and plans are afoot both in Cardston and Wetaskiwin for pretty big, splashy openings coming up very soon.

MR. CARDINAL: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bruseker.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. I'd like to ask the minister to have a look at page 8.13. There's a \$370,000 loan guarantee issued under the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism Act, and I wonder if the minister could provide the details of that loan guarantee in terms of to whom, what for, details of repayment, and so forth.

MR. MAIN: We've got a small number of loan guarantees out, the bulk of them to publishing firms. We have some small guarantees, for example, to the Alberta Ballet Company. These are small, fully active, and current loan guarantees. I should point out that in all the guarantees advanced and backed by the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism, we haven't lost a nickel. They're all current, and they're all being paid, and we'll continue to provide that service.

MR. BRUSEKER: So this \$370,000, then, represents a number of loan guarantees; it's not just one?

MR. MAIN: I think that would be the total of a number of small guarantees.

MR. BRUSEKER: Okay, thank you. My final supplementary. Just turning back to page 3.31 under a number of votes, we see in

votes 2, 3, and 4 a line for grants allocated, and further on we see a number of foundations. I'm not clear how the foundations work on one hand and the grants disbursement works on the other hand. I wonder if the minister could explain how those two apparently different yet similar, related items dovetail together.

MR. MAIN: You're on page 3.31?

MR. BRUSEKER: Yes.

MR. MAIN: Okay. Well, I'll look at item 2, then, under Cultural Development Grants, \$15 million. That's libraries, which does not appear in foundations. Number 3, historical resources grants: the bulk of that is Glenbow and Ex Terra and the federal museums grant. Number 4, Heritage Development, for \$50,000. I discussed that with the Member for Rocky Mountain House. This was a small project grant in the minister's purview that has since been eliminated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Severtson.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope the minister is enjoying his first Public Accounts appearance.

My question is with reference to 3.31 of the '90-91 public accounts. Actually, in all four votes there's a transfer of money for Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits, but I'd like to focus in on Heritage Development, vote 4, where there's a transfer of \$17,000 from the Grants section to Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits. Can the minister explain the reason for this transfer?

MR. MAIN: Well, first of all, in that Grants line only \$9,000 was expended, so there were funds available. As we've mentioned in some of the earlier remarks, there was a need to adjust the manpower lines in a variety of votes because of the manpower deficit that we had been running when the increases in wages and benefits, allocated through the bargaining unit, were greater than the amount of funds allocated to us through the General Revenue Fund. We were using dollars available to us in various votes as a management tool to be able to keep our staff complement at a level that would allow us to do our work. So the transfer of these dollars helped to pay wages and settlements to our unionized staff.

MR. SEVERTSON: My supplementary would be to the Auditor General then. The diverting of funds from Grants to cover Salaries, Wages, and Employee Benefits: is that an acceptable, standard practice in accounting?

MR. SALMON: It is the practice within the General Revenue Fund; that's right.

MR. SEVERTSON: Thank you.
That's all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have four other people who've already asked questions that have indicated they'd like to be recognized again. I'd just suggest, perhaps in the interest of dealing with all four questions, that people could just ask one question, or at least consider that. You're entitled to ask all three.

Mr. Thurber.

MR. THURBER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the interests of time I will just do one question.

My question, Mr. Minister, relates to your statements regarding the expenditure of \$477,000 for replacement of older computer

equipment. Can you provide us with a kind of breakdown of this expenditure and elaborate on whether there were any cost savings and whether any of these costs can be recovered by the sale of this used equipment?

MR. MAIN: In terms of the cost saving, in my opening remarks I indicated that the payback was in something less than three years. In terms of the disposition of those assets, I believe that that is the responsibility of PWSS, and how that is handled on disposition of government assets, I'm not sure. Perhaps we have some more information here, but I think in essence that's it.

As you know, we had an awful lot of old, outdated equipment. In the computer business things get outdated quite quickly. In our office we had what were affectionately referred to as boat anchors to handle our word processing and correspondence, Wang dedicated word processing material. They've since been replaced by an IBM stand-alone, PC-based unit that's tied in to the department. In terms of just efficiency and our ability to do things, we've advanced a long way. I'm not sure what the surplus value of the old Wang equipment is; my guess would be close to zero.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Black.

MRS. BLACK: Mr. Chairman, my question's been asked. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibeault.

MR. GIBEAULT: Mr. Chairman, let me congratulate the minister actually, to begin with, in keeping his budget within the budget overall. That's certainly commendable. But I'd like to point his attention to page 3.33 and votes 1.0.1 and 1.0.2 and ask him why it was that his office was over budget by 13 percent and the deputy minister's office was over budget by 11 percent?

MR. MAIN: Here again, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I've explained several times and annotated, we were running a manpower deficit throughout the entire department of something in the order of \$450,000. We felt that that was manageable given the flexibility we had within our votes and in our various abilities to transfer funds between lines. Here again, in the minister's office and the deputy's office the increase in expenditures is reflective not of our flagrant spending of money but just this manpower deficit. We had to transfer money in to cover off the cost of staff. Also, there was a cost of computer equipment, as I mentioned in my opening remarks. The minister's office here, as one of the key spokes in the communications wheel, required an expenditure on five computer terminals, and that began as reflected in that expenditure. I didn't get a big raise and nobody in my staff did either.

9:52

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bruseker.

MR. BRUSEKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to draw the minister's attention down to page 3.33 and there's vote 3.1.4, Historic Sites Preservation, an \$8 million expenditure. I'm wondering, with respect to historic sites, if the minister could explain how it is that sites are selected to have money allocated towards them. I'm wondering in particular about the Patrick Burns house down in Fish Creek park, if it will come into a cycle of preservation under that vote.

MR. MAIN: The Historic Sites Preservation that you see annotated under 3.1.4 is those historic sites owned and operated by the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism. Fort Victoria, Leitch Collieries, Leduc No. 1, Ukrainian Village, Rutherford House just across the river: these are historic sites that we own and we operate, and the cost of maintaining staff, interpretive guides, and services at those historic sites is reflected in this line.

Other historic sites and other projects, such as the one you mentioned, are funded through their owners, which may be an historical society, with supplementary funds from the Historical Resources Foundation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, that concludes the list of questioners for today. I'd just like to apologize for the fact that the minutes didn't get out to all members as early as I would have liked. There's a staff shortage in the Clerk's office, but that'll be corrected shortly.

The date of the next meeting will May 27, at which time we'll have the Hon. Jim Dinning, the Minister of Education, before the committee.

I'd like to thank the hon. minister for appearing before the committee today and for providing interesting and informative answers to the questions that were put to him, and I'd like to thank the officials of his department as well.

MR. MAIN: I found it exhilarating, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm glad that you found it that way.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, the minutes are out in good time. Everybody had lots of time to read them.

I move that we adjourn.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion to adjourn. Those in favour?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The committee adjourned at 9:55 a.m.]

