

8:32 a.m.

Wednesday, March 29, 1995

[Chairman: Mr. Friedel]

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I might as well call the meeting to order. We're already a couple of minutes late.

We have with us this morning Mr. Peter Valentine and Nick Shandro from the Auditor General's office and the Minister of Community Development, Gary Mar.

Gary, perhaps I'll ask you to introduce the members of your department.

MR. MAR: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. On my immediate right is my deputy minister, Mr. Julian Nowicki; on my immediate left financial officer Mr. Rai Batra; Gary Braeuer two over from me. Behind me, going from my right to my left, are Mr. Terry Keyko, Mr. Alan Davey, Dr. William Byrne, and Dr. Clive Padfield.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The first item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. Could we have a motion to approve?

AN HON. MEMBER: I'll so move.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. All in favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Undecided?

MR. CHADI: Gee.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, there were a few behind you, Sine, that weren't sure whether they were in favour or not.

Approval of the minutes of the March 22, 1995, committee meeting. Can we have a mover?

MS HALEY: So moved.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Moved by Carol. All in favour?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Opposed? Carried.

Okay. Now that the levity is over, we'll get down to some serious business. I'll ask the minister if he wishes to make some opening remarks before we get into heavy-duty questioning.

MR. MAR: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I do have some brief comments to make on the 1993-94 public accounts of my Ministry of Community Development. At the outset, I'll be happy to report to this committee that the public accounts from my department show no significant variances; no votes have been broken.

Secondly, 1993-94 was a year of considerable transition for my department. Created in 1992 out of two existing departments and parts of nine more, the department underwent a complex reorganization and restructuring. Spending within and between elements saw considerable change as the department reoriented itself under the new operational configuration.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, 1993-94 witnessed the introduction of the government's fiscal plan to balance the budget. This plan has called for the re-engineering of government, the refocusing of priorities, and a rethinking of what our business was

in order to produce a smaller, less costly public sector, a public sector which is both affordable and sustainable.

The 1993-94 actual expenditures of \$56.7 million were some \$25.2 million, or 31 percent, lower than the 1992-93 comparable expenditure of \$81.9 million. The significant changes that produced this reduction included the following: a \$15.8 million reduction owing to the termination of the community recreation/cultural grant program or CRC program, as it is often known; a \$3.4 million reduction resulting from the transfer of the annual grant to the Glenbow-Alberta Institute from the GRF to the lottery funding through the Historical Resources Foundation; a \$2 million reduction owing to the transfer of funding responsibility for provincial recreation and sport associations to the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, which absorbed these costs through a combination of administrative downsizing and the use of surplus funds; and \$4 million in administrative savings resulting from the downsizing and restructuring.

In terms of the actual expenditures for 1993-94 on a program-by-program basis, on pages 55 and 56 I would note no significant variances in program 1, departmental support services.

Program 2, community services, overall was \$726,000 underexpended. Element 2.1.1 was overspent owing to separation payments resulting from the downsizing and restructuring. The underexpenditures related primarily to savings resulting from the restructuring and because operational requirements changed over the course of the year. I note that a portion of the savings in program 2 was utilized to offset the overexpenditure in program 4, individual rights and citizenship services, owing to the costs associated with the consultation, communications, and start-up of the Alberta seniors' benefit, which was announced in February of 1994.

In program 3, cultural facilities and historical resources, there was significant movement of funds between elements. The committee is no doubt aware that 1993-94 was the first year that transfers have not been shown in public accounts. The changes between program 3 elements resulted from the movement of funds among elements to meet the changing operational needs. I should also note that 1993-94 saw an expansion in the number of elements listed for this program from five to nine. Because of the integrated nature of division operations, it was difficult for managers to allocate funds with certainty to the newly listed elements. The interyear changes reflected the adjustment of element budgets to accurately reflect where the money was in fact spent.

Program 4 was overspent by some \$213,000. This included a \$142,000 overexpenditure by the Human Rights Commission as a result of an accrued liability for the settlement of legal costs in a case and the dollars required for severance payments to downsize the area. In addition, the announcement of the Alberta seniors' benefit program in the February 1994 business plan was followed by a period of intensive consultations with Alberta's seniors. Some \$287,000 in additional costs was incurred by element 4.0.6, advice on seniors' issues, in pursuit of the consultation and introduction of the Alberta seniors' benefit program. On the general revenue side, noted on page 58, there was a decline in anticipated earnings by the GRF of approximately \$244,000 owing to the discontinuation of the Blue Lake Centre and the lower rental revenues at the Jubilee auditoria, which did not see blockbuster performances that year compared to the previous year.

The primary reason for the significant increase under "other revenue" categories of \$955,000 was the payment of two years' worth of transfers from the historical resources regulated fund to the GRF in 1993-94. These transfers are required to compensate the GRF for costs incurred in the collection and control of admission fees at the department's museums and historical sites.

Ordinarily this payment would be half and therefore would be approximately \$475,000 per year.

The performance of the culture and multiculturalism revolving fund, page 144, which handles earnings and expenditures at the Jubilee auditoria, saw normal earnings and expenses, reflecting the fact that no big shows were booked for that year.

One note regarding the recreation component of the tourism, parks, and recreation revolving fund, page 149, which saw a loss of \$187,000 in 1993-94. This loss occurred because of lower earnings from fee revenues resulting from the phased introduction of increases and higher operating costs owing to employee settlements and equipment write-offs.

The historical resources regulated fund, page 196, enjoyed better performance in 1993-94 than was anticipated, with revenues up by some \$1.3 million. Much of this additional revenue was the result of staff conceiving and implementing various entrepreneurial activities at various heritage sites which allowed them to offer more services and attractions to the public. The double transfer to the GRF that I referred to earlier is referenced under expenditures.

With regard to my lottery funded agencies, there are no significant variances of note. My officials will be able to answer any questions you might have pertaining to the Alberta Foundation for the Arts, the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation, the Multiculturalism Commission, and the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I take my responsibilities before this committee seriously, and would welcome any questions you or other committee members might have.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Gary. The questions will be addressed to yourself, and you can hand them off to staff members for elaboration if you wish.

First on the list is Julius Yankowsky.

8:42

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, everyone. I have a couple of questions that are sort of general and then one deals with actual numbers. My reference is volume 2, page 56, program 4.0.2. There we have the expenditures of the Citizenship and Heritage Secretariat shown. My question is: what functions does the secretariat carry out?

MR. MAR: The secretariat is responsible for providing the Alberta Multiculturalism Commission with human and administrative resources which are required by the commission to carry out its mandate as set out in the legislation, which is the Alberta Multiculturalism Act. The secretariat provides the commission with policy and administrative support, program development and delivery, and consultation.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your supplementary.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My supplementary is: what kinds of activities does the Alberta Multiculturalism Commission support?

MR. MAR: Well, of course the chair of that commission, the hon. Member for Calgary-Cross, is intimately familiar with these programs. But I can tell you that in 1991 the commission introduced its first three-year multiculturalism action plan or MAP, as it is often referred to, to assist Albertans to appreciate and benefit from the province's unique cultural and ethnic mix. MAP

involved a number and variety of initiatives to increase cultural understanding among Albertans and break down the barriers which hinder social, economic, and cultural understanding between diverse cultures. Specific strategies were developed to involve young people and private-sector executives in partnerships to establish health, education, and municipal service organizations to develop effective approaches to deal positively with the diversity of our population.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My next question deals with some numbers actually. The program reference is 4.0.1. Here we see an overexpenditure of \$8,000 for program support. Could the minister please explain the reason for this overexpenditure?

MR. BATRA: The overexpenditure of \$8,000 is due to the following reasons. Approximately \$4,400 was for management holiday payout. A \$2,540 overexpenditure is in supplies and services. Another \$2,100 relates to merit increments for unionized staff. That comes to approximately \$9,000. However, an underexpenditure of \$1,000 within that element will bring the figure down to \$8,000.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sine Chadi.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, Mr. Minister, staff, the Auditor General, and Mr. Shandro. It's good to see you all again. I'm going to take you with my questioning to volume 3, page 48, the Alberta multiculturalism fund. I'll give you a second to get there. Page 48 of volume 3.

It seems to me that we are always looking towards or should be looking towards revenue wherever we can find revenue in the programs we deliver to Albertans. The area that concerns me is under revenue in the financial statements. The sales of 1993 were \$14,800 in the Alberta multiculturalism fund. Projected income in terms of sales was zero, but we actually got \$7,000. Can you give us an indication as to what actually goes on there and why we budgeted zip?

MR. KEYKO: In 1993 the \$14,000 in sales was directly from a campaign that we had for the sale of various promotional materials around One Heart Many Colours. That campaign had wrapped up that year, so no further budget was indicated for 1994. However, there were some additional sales in that year.

MR. CHADI: Again, under the expenditures now, we see the grants as somewhat less than 1993 but certainly less than what we budgeted for, and it amounts to \$1.3 million in actual 1994 grants. Is there a list of the different recipients of these grants that was tabled in the House, or can you provide us with a list?

MR. MAR: That list is available.

MR. CHADI: Would you undertake to provide it to us then?

MR. MAR: I'll do that.

MR. CHADI: Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any undertaking should be done through the office and will be distributed to all the members then. Final supplementary.

MR. CHADI: Yes. Note 8 on page 50 goes on to say that there were commitments totaling \$550,000 as at the fiscal year-end for grants approved but not disbursed because of certain conditions still not being met by the applicants. I'm wondering if you could give us an indication as to whether or not those funds won't be disbursed. You know you're holding them in terms of a commitment, but it's been some time now since this has all happened. I'm wondering: were they solid commitments or were they weak? Are we not going to fulfill our commitment here? What's the story on those?

MR. MAR: The commission has a February 1 grant deadline, and often what happens is that we're not able to obtain full information from the applicants, so those are carried over to the fiscal year. In normal circumstances the full amount that you see here has been approved by the commission board and is paid out in the following year as we're able to obtain the information from the applicant.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The next question is from Barry McFarland.

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, minister and everyone else over there. I can't remember everyone's name. This morning in your comments you spoke about an overexpenditure as a result of what I gather was a civil action on human rights. Mr. Minister, is that a result of our own staff within government that would have a claim that we were subject to payout, or is that from the general public?

MR. MAR: No. What it involved was a case called Watters against Co-operators Insurance. It was a case where a young man – I think he was 18 or 19 years of age – felt he was being discriminated against because his premiums were higher than the premiums paid by his girlfriend who was about the same age. He paid higher premiums because he was a male driver as opposed to a female driver. That case was brought forward to the Human Rights Commission. Throughout the process it ultimately went to the Supreme Court of Canada, where it was decided that he was discriminated against but it wasn't unreasonable because young male drivers on average tend to have poorer driving records than young female drivers. The cost of the case being taken forward by the Human Rights Commission, through the process to the Supreme Court of Canada, is what resulted in approximately \$100,000 being spent.

MR. McFARLAND: I guess the nub of the question I have, Mr. Minister: in the case of court proceedings or actions being taken, shouldn't more of the onus be placed on the individual bringing those forward rather than a commission or a government handling the case or at least taking care of the financial end of it?

8:52

MR. MAR: Well, ultimately cases like that would never be brought forward by individuals because the cost would be prohibitive.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Final supplemental.

MR. McFARLAND: Could I come back, please? It's on another topic, and it's rather disjointed from this one. I'll put my hand up again.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.
Then we go on to Nick Taylor.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you, and good morning. I hope somebody's minding the shop. They've got two rows of people in here.

The first one's a simple one – it maybe applies to everyone here – on support services, issue 1, volume 2, page 341. I just notice that all the salaries for the ADMs increased in '94 over '93, yet the lower levels or the peasants were taking a 5 to 7 percent cutback. I'm just wondering why. Can you explain the difference? Was it the heartache of being able to cut the lower people who had to be compensated for the upper ones, or what?

MR. BATRA: There has been no salary increase for the executives of the department. These additional payouts are simply holiday payouts. The managers were quite busy that year in terms of the consultation for the seniors and other programs brought about by restructuring, so they simply could not take holidays. This represents nothing more than one or two weeks of holiday payout for each one of the executives.

MR. N. TAYLOR: So for staying on the job, they got holiday pay. Or they got the holiday pay for not taking holidays.

MR. BATRA: For not taking holidays for previous years.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I'll jump over to human rights, then, and program 4.0.3. It appears that Alberta spends 6 and a half cents per capita on human rights, but you'll remember the Human Rights Review Panel said the average in Canada is \$1.20 per capita. It's about 50 or 40 times more for the rest of Canada. Are we such clean-living souls here that we only have to spend 6 and a half cents per capita, or is the rest of Canada \$1.20?

MR. MAR: Well, it's always difficult to make direct comparisons of budgets on a per capita basis, because of course human rights commissions across Canada are set up pursuant to their own legislation and the mandates given to such agencies, boards, and commissions may differ from province to province. So it's not possible really to make a direct comparison between what we spend on a per capita basis versus other jurisdictions. For example, many of the educational functions that are covered under the Multiculturalism Commission may well be assumed as responsibilities by human rights commissions in other jurisdictions. Frankly, I have not examined the legislation from every other province.

MR. N. TAYLOR: So you have sort of broadened the English language. It used to be comparing apples and oranges; now it's comparing Alberta and other provinces.

The next one is also in that area. There's \$107,000 for the position of chief human rights commissioner. Why wasn't there an open competition for this?

MR. MAR: Well, we brought in Mr. Charlach Mackintosh to be our acting chief commissioner at the time the contract expired for Mr. Jack O'Neill. Mr. Mackintosh has an outstanding background in his work with the workers' compensation appeal board. In his capacity as the chair of that commission, he had to deal with a serious backlog of cases that the WCB Appeals Commission had. Because of his administrative strength that has been demonstrated in his work in that area, we brought him in as the acting chief commissioner for the Human Rights Commission. As a result, he's put together an 18-month plan to deal with the backlog of the Human Rights Commission, which at this time is many cases waiting, on average, nine months to be dealt with. We feel that

that is the most important thing the Human Rights Commission can deal with at this time, and because he was the best person available for the job and has demonstrated a good track record – in fact, an excellent track record – and now has an 18-month plan that he's in the process of putting in place and working on very effectively, we will retain him for this time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dave Coutts.

MR. COUTTS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, gentlemen. I'd like to deal with volume 2 of the public accounts, page 55, and in particular reference 2.1.6 where the community service expenditures of libraries is shown. I wonder if the minister could explain what the priorities in library development were in the '93-94 fiscal year.

MR. MAR: There were really three activities that were the most significant, the first of which was a public review of the library grants structure. If one looks at the current legislation and regulations which are in place, what you will find is a myriad of statutory provisions and regulations that are very difficult to go through. So that is one of the most significant activities and priorities at this time. The second one is the decentralization of the talking book service. At one time the talking book service was held exclusively within the department. It has now been distributed in public libraries throughout the province. Finally, our third most important activity is participation in a provincewide library strategy planning process. There are, of course, many things happening in the libraries area which, frankly, have been very, very exciting to Albertans and the library community, and we're taking part in that process.

MR. COUTTS: Thank you. In going around the province on another committee I'm on, I'm finding that your comments are exactly true. We get a lot of presentations from libraries, and it is important.

In this review where you receive input from Albertans, can you tell us of any progress that was made by the committee?

MR. MAR: Well, at this time the public library review committee is reviewing all the submissions that have come to it. There have been many written submissions, of course, and many public meetings. The public meetings have now come to a conclusion, and the public library review committee is looking at the submissions and I expect will have a report to me sometime this summer. Our scheduled date for getting that report is August 15, 1995.

MR. COUTTS: Is there any progress being made on the multiple library strategic planning initiative?

MR. MAR: A second round of regional meetings was held in the fall of 1994 to receive comments on the draft vision statement and to seek input on potential strategies and actions to achieve the vision. The process culminated in a forum which was held in Red Deer from February 24 through February 26, and the participants included members from the library community throughout the province. The forum was very successful and resulted in a high degree of commitment by members of the library community. A key component will be the development of an electronic network to facilitate access to information and the sharing of resources among libraries. I'm certainly looking forward to a copy of that report. I can tell you that people in the library community are very, very committed to this.

MR. COUTTS: Thank you very much.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mike Percy.

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Auditor General, Mr. Minister, staff, my questions will be from volume 3 of the public accounts, and they will relate to the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. I'd like to focus on page 72, notes 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The first question relates to note 10, related party transactions. The note states that the foundation paid \$415,175 on behalf of the corporation Moser Management Limited, owned by the executive director of the foundation, and then it details some of the financial flows. Could you tell me exactly what the financial arrangements are between the Moser corporation and the executive director and why it was necessary for this foundation to in a sense have allowed the executive director to privatize some of the functions and participate at the same time?

9:02

MR. NOWICKI: When the RPW Foundation was set up in 1976, services originally were provided by the department at the time, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Then when the foundation became operational – I think it was 1979 or somewhere in that vicinity – they chose to hire a private individual, Chuck Moser, and he set up a private company to run the affairs of the foundation. So they contracted with him to provide the administrative services to the foundation. That was in place until the foundation was amalgamated with the Alberta Sport Council, and that contract has been terminated.

DR. PERCY: The voluntary separation payments to employees of Moser Management of \$97,377: does that include a payment to the executive director as well?

MR. NOWICKI: No. This was a payment to the staff as part of the termination of this contract that occurred in '93-94 as the Alberta Sport Council and the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation were being amalgamated.

DR. PERCY: Why did the government pay that instead of the corporation itself? I would have thought one of the purposes of contracting out would have been for the private company to assume some of the risk and not off-load it on the government.

MR. NOWICKI: The contract with Moser Management was of such a nature that in instances like this it was covered by the foundation. It was part of the agreement with Moser Management.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Carol Haley.

MS HALEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I take my glasses off and then I can't see anything.

With regard to public accounts, volume 2, page 58, it shows that the revenues from the Jubilee auditoriums for 1994 were \$999,000 lower than the revenues in 1993. Could you please explain the reason behind the 37 percent decrease?

MR. MAR: The main reason, as I indicated in my opening comments, is that there weren't any blockbuster shows like *Les Misérables* and *Phantom of the Opera* in that year, and the result was a dramatic decrease in revenue at both facilities, the Calgary and Edmonton Jubilee auditoria, compared to the previous year.

MS HALEY: Mr. Minister, there was an increase in the "other" category of revenue, from \$8,000 to \$963,000. Could you explain that?

MR. BATRA: Nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars of this amount represents payment for '92-93 and '93-94, representing for two years the cost of collection and administration of the fund. These moneys are to be returned to the general revenue fund legally, and therefore their return sets a pass-through or flow-through type of situation.

MS HALEY: The final supplementary is with regard to transfers from the government of Canada, that they've declined between 1993 and 1994. Could you explain the reason for the decrease and whether or not indications are that the trend would continue that way?

MR. MAR: There hasn't been a decline in transfers from the federal government to the province respecting the national museum's core funding. Under the heading "other," the \$20,000 decrease relates to an agreement with the Muttart Foundation. Muttart contracted the department to develop and deliver a program for training of directors, a board development program in rural Alberta. We don't expect any changes in the national museum's core funding transfers that come from the federal government at this time.

MS HALEY: Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Terry Kirkland.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thanks, and good morning, Mr. Minister. A follow-up to Mike Percy's questions on page 72 of public accounts in the provincial agencies, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation statement. I'm trying to arrive at an understanding in my own mind in light of the comments made in regard to note 10 and going back up to note 8, members' fees and expenses. The way that's written in the directory here, it's an ultra vires payment, which leads me to believe it was made outside legislation. I wonder if in fact the minister could provide an explanation as to why there was another \$21,930 that had to be paid. What were those fees exactly for?

MR. DAVEY: My understanding of the situation there was that these fees were paid on a regular basis and that this issue had come up before. There was, I believe, an intent to change the legislation. That in fact was not necessary when they amalgamated the two agencies.

MR. MAR: Just to supplement that. I recall that this question came up in last year's review of public accounts, and the new legislation which governs the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation has corrected this problem.

MR. KIRKLAND: Just one supplementary here this morning. In reviewing the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation expenditures in their annual report and also knowing that we're looking for some efficiencies, I compared them to the Wild Rose Foundation. I found very many similarities. Is there a reason why the minister didn't amalgamate the Wild Rose Foundation with Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife?

MR. MAR: The Wild Rose Foundation reports to the Minister of Health and does not fall within the responsibilities set out in this

portfolio, so at this time that amalgamation has not been contemplated.

MR. KIRKLAND: Even though the expenditures are somewhat similar? In my view it could be accommodated quite nicely with the mandate of what we're dealing with here.

MR. MAR: Many people have expressed that opinion as well.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You didn't have a third supplementary? Okay.

Lorne Taylor.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Yeah. Sorry; I missed your initial comments on the Human Rights Commission and its overexpenditure. Could you just tell me again why it was overexpended by over \$140,000, and how does that budget relate - I don't know if I can ask this. I'm wondering how much greater the '93-94 budget is than the '95 budget?

MR. MAR: Well, the budget in the current year remains level. It's not an increase. With respect to the overexpenditure that's outlined in 4.0.3: of the \$142,000, about \$100,000 of that related to the settlement of a case which is referred to as Watters versus Co-operators Insurance, and about \$42,000 was in reference to severance payouts in the downsizing in that area.

9:12

DR. L. TAYLOR: When we are cutting back in programs like Education and Health, how do you rationalize the fact that the budget for '94 is the same as '93?

MR. MAR: We've looked at all areas of our department - the Human Rights Commission and, of course, all the agencies, boards, and commissions - and we can say that in examining our priorities, we've delivered a significant reduction in the overall budget of the department. With the Human Rights Commission, examining that particular commission, because of the backlog it currently has, I can rationalize it by saying that it is running at a very, very streamlined level as it is now.

DR. L. TAYLOR: You conducted a review of the Human Rights Commission in this past year. What was the funding? What did that cost us, and what was the budget for it?

MR. MAR: The budget for the review was \$120,000, and the actual cost of the review came in at about \$102,000.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Peter Sekulic.

MR. SEKULIC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Finally the opposition outnumbers the government at a committee. I'm quite happy.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Let's take a quick vote.

MR. SEKULIC: Let's take a vote.

Mr. Chairman, my questions are to the minister, and I'll pursue what my colleague from Edmonton-Whitemud initiated in volume 3, page 72, the nature of the contract the government had with Moser Management Limited. I'm wondering, Mr. Minister: are there other similar contracts that your department entered into in this fiscal period '93-94? I'm referring to the terms of the contract. This was unique?

MR. NOWICKI: This was unique.

MR. SEKULIC: Okay. Following up on that, I see in note 11 that the executive director received a salary of \$84,156 and benefits and allowances of \$45,000 for a total of \$130,000. Now, I'm curious. Did the executive director also receive payment – perhaps the correct question is: didn't he also receive payment through Moser Management Limited, so that we're paying him through the government account as well as through the contractual agreement that we have listed in note 10? I guess what I'm asking is: was he paid double or receiving payment from two different sources?

MR. MAR: In examining that situation, I would come to the same conclusion as you. The answer is yes, and that's the reason why we've amalgamated.

MR. SEKULIC: Okay.

Now, what elements in note 11 also fall into note 10? We have a listing there of \$365,845 as a total payment in '94, and we also have Moser Management being paid \$415,000. Is that for the same service? We're listing a number of employees here as being paid by government and then also falling under contract of Moser Management. Once again, it seems like we're duplicating funding, and the total amount of the contract with Moser Management comes out to, in effect, \$700,000. We're paying Moser Management's employees.

MR. NOWICKI: When the minister was referring to "yes," he was referring to the fact that in Moser Management's contract he was paid a salary within the contract and then administrative fees, but it's not in terms of the \$700,000. The actual amount that was paid to Moser Management is as outlined in note 10, \$317,798.

MR. BATRA: I wish to assure the committee, sir, that there is no indication of any profit from the remainder of the services to the contractor. They are technically at cost.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Jocelyn, you were next on the list.

MRS. BURGNER: No, I'm not on the list.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Were you on, Dave?

MR. COUTTS: Sure will. I have a question.

On page 56 of volume 2, Mr. Minister, reference 4 shows the expenditure of the individual rights and citizenship services programs. Reference 4.0.6 in particular shows that \$735,000 was budgeted for advice on seniors' issues, yet over \$1 million was expended. That's an overexpenditure of nearly 40 percent. I'm wondering if you could explain the reason for that overexpenditure.

MR. MAR: There was an overexpenditure of \$287,000, which was required to pay for the expenses of a provincewide consultation with seniors during the development of the Alberta seniors' benefit program. The department estimates for 1993-94 did not provide for that expenditure, because it was not known at that time that this department would be accepting responsibility for that consultation.

MR. COUTTS: Could the minister then give us some examples of issues that the seniors' advisory committee has brought

forward? What benefit have Alberta seniors received from this committee?

MR. MAR: The Seniors Advisory Council brings forward policy recommendations in a number of areas, which include health, housing, recreation, and income support programs. Perhaps most notably, in August of 1994 the Seniors Advisory Council developed guidelines that related to private home care both for operators and for clients. They also run seniors' information workshops each year that are quite popular. Statistics on older Albertans have also been produced by the council and have been useful in helping develop policy for the department and in developing programs as well.

MR. COUTTS: Are there any plans to expand the role of that committee in the near future?

MR. MAR: I can't really speak to that issue, because as many members are aware, the Seniors Advisory Council now falls within the portfolio responsibilities of the Minister of Health.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sine Chadi.

MR. CHADI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I as well want to follow up on something that I find very interesting in volume 3, page 72, relating to note 10, Moser Management. Again, the foundation paid that \$415,000 to or on behalf of the corporation Moser Management, which was owned by the executive director of the foundation. Now, there was \$317,000 that was paid to the corporation for providing management, and as well the executive director, who owned the corporation, received a total of \$129,000. So he was paid as a salaried employee, it appears, at the same time as his corporation received \$317,000 for providing management. I want to know: did the management company provide anything more to the foundation than the executive director would have provided as an employee here, as he received the \$129,000?

MR. MAR: The \$129,000 is part of the \$317,000. It is not a separate and discrete expenditure.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Supplementary?

MR. CHADI: Yeah. Again, was the \$68,000 for the assistant to the director part of that \$317,000 as well?

MR. MAR: Yes.

MR. CHADI: So it's all included in there. That's how you calculated that. Okay.

My supplementary question is going to take us to page 55 of volume 2. I'm again going to refer us to overexpenditures and some efficiencies that were found with respect to vote 3, cultural facilities and historical resources. When we look at that – and I know in your opening comments you made some reference to the underexpenditures and overexpenditures in this vote – with respect to the Jubilee auditoria, it appears we've found some efficiencies in this expenditure. I note that back in 1992-93 our expenditures were in the range of \$1.8 million. We budgeted last in 1993-94, \$1.336 million, but then we found some efficiencies. Can you explain the difference between 1992-93 and where we're at today? I'm quite pleased to see that we've found those efficiencies, but can you give me an indication as to what it was?

9:22

MR. NOWICKI: Basically the difference between the two years is in the productions that were staged at the Jubilee auditoria. In the previous year there were major productions staged, so there were more costs required to stage the productions. In the '93-94 year there were no big productions, so the costs were lower.

MR. CHADI: I'm going to take us to page 58, then, under revenue. You explained to one colleague earlier that the decrease in revenues from 1993 to 1994 with respect to the auditoriums was the production of shows, et cetera. Again, I am puzzled when I look at the revenues with respect to fees, permits, and licences and also the revenue under the "other" category, again a major turnaround in the revenues. Is there something we could do maybe to enhance this, to encourage more revenue or continue getting more revenue as we have been?

MR. BATRA: Fees, permits, and licences. The decrease from \$254,000 to \$94,000 is basically due to the discontinuation of the Blue Lake Centre. The Blue Lake Centre was an institution operated by the department that offered courses in the recreation field for leadership development and lifestyle sorts of things, and we discontinued that.

Other fees basically relate to the film censorship fees we charge to the film distributor for classification purposes, and they vary up and down a little bit. There's only a reduction of \$5,000 there. As the minister explained, the reduction of the Jubilee auditoria revenue is primarily because in '93-94 we did not have the blockbuster performances such as the *Phantom of the Opera* that occurred in previous years. One cannot really gauge much in advance whether we are going to be able to book such kinds of performances.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Julius.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have some questions on page 55 of public accounts, volume 2. This page deals with community development expenditures. Under 2.1.1 we see an overexpenditure of \$70,000. My question is: what caused this overexpenditure?

MR. MAR: All of that overexpenditure was as a result of severance allowances.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you for that short and sweet answer. My first supplemental is found under reference 3.0.6. Here we see that the Remington-Alberta Carriage Centre had an overexpenditure of \$44,000. Could the minister please explain why this occurred?

MR. MAR: That \$44,000 was related entirely to the grand opening of the centre, and the moneys provided for it were transferred from other programs.

MR. YANKOWSKY: Thank you.

My final supplemental. Here we see a switch, where instead of an overexpenditure we see an underexpenditure. That is found under 2.2.3. Community recreation development grants are detailed here. Here we expended less than half the amount budgeted. Now, why were such funds budgeted if they were not required?

MR. MAR: Well, budgeting from time to time is a difficult exercise to go through, but the reason there was an underexpenditure was that the number of special grant applications was lower

than expected and, as a result, less money than budgeted was spent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Nick Taylor.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Thank you. I'm back again to program 4.0.3 and that measly 6 and a half cents per capita in human rights. I notice you had a backlog in the 1994 report of 280 cases. I gather there's still a backlog. Maybe we could go up to 10 percent of what the rest of Canada is doing, which would still be double what we're doing, and get rid of some of this backlog. Is there any reason why we're still running that big a backlog on so low a budget?

MR. MAR: Well, in order to deal with the backlog, rather than increase the budget for the department, we've seconded five staff from other areas of the department and trained them in the areas of dealing with human rights cases. It's those five staff that are dealing primarily with the backlog to reduce it over the 18-month period that's been set out in Mr. Mackintosh's plan.

MR. N. TAYLOR: Secondly, 4.0.6. We're wearing the other hat this time, saving money. You have a Seniors Advisory Council, a senior issues unit - this is in the government, in Health and Municipal Affairs. Why aren't all these groups coalesced into one? You know, there are only two types of seniors, male and female, and yet you've got three organizations there.

MR. MAR: Sorry; which three organizations are you referring to?

MR. N. TAYLOR: Well, you've got in the government the Seniors Advisory Council, seniors' issues for the departments of Health and Municipal Affairs, and you're responsible for seniors. Why the three groups all looking after seniors? Why not have them all merged into one under your capable management? Let's put it that way. I'll tell the Minister of Health hers when she comes.

MR. MAR: Well, although it's easy to categorize seniors in a single category, the issues they deal with frankly are far more complex than simply saying all seniors have the same concerns. We do work very hard in trying to get a single-window approach in terms of seniors' access to programs. That, of course, was one of the compelling reasons to amalgamate programs as we did when we put together the Alberta seniors' benefit program. But many of the issues that deal with seniors in terms of policy in the areas of health or municipal affairs or income support can be very different policy considerations. Because there's a quarter of a million seniors in this province, one cannot say there's a typical, severely normal sort of senior. All their situations can vary dramatically and are very individual. So the result is that we do have policies that come from a number of different departments or agencies.

MR. N. TAYLOR: I'll admit we're a complex lot, but I still think we'd like to deal all in one place.

I'm not so sure, Mr. Chairman, how this comes up. There were proposed agencies 1 and proposed agencies 2. You were going to put the foundation arts, historical resources, sports, recreation, and wildlife all into agency 2, yet you mentioned earlier, I think in answer to a question from the hon. Member for Leduc, that Wild Rose is not in your department either. Wouldn't it be better, for instance, that instead of putting sports, recreation, and wildlife in

with the arts and historical resources – although the Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat I think would agree that wildlife and art should be together, nevertheless I think arts and historical resources should be by themselves. Then why not have Wild Rose and sports and recreation together under one minister or the other?

9:32

MR. MAR: In looking at the amalgamations of agencies, boards, and commissions under my responsibility, there are two common themes which have emerged with the agencies. One theme is in relation to fair treatment of people, and that is the reason we've proposed an amalgamation of the Multiculturalism Commission, the Advisory Council on Women's Issues, and the Human Rights Commission. Many of the issues of racism and discrimination that are dealt with by the Multiculturalism Commission, for example, are also common issues that are dealt with by the Human Rights Commission. Issues dealt with by the Advisory Council on Women's Issues such as sexual discrimination are also dealt with by the Human Rights Commission. So there's not only a dollar saving, an administrative saving, by merging these agencies together but also a philosophical reason for doing so.

In looking at the agencies that you referred to – the Alberta Sport, Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, the Historical Resources Foundation, and the Alberta Foundation for the Arts – in my observation those agencies deal broadly with what I call quality of life issues for Albertans. They are things that make Alberta an interesting place to live. It's often said that quality of life issues are somehow soft issues, but really if you ask a person, "Why do you live where you live?" and you ask a corporation, "Why do you choose to locate in the province of Alberta as opposed to somewhere else?" the answer to the first question will frequently be answered by the individual, by someone who will say, "I live here because the quality of life is good." Ultimately for a corporation, that is often the question which is asked as well, because a decision to locate in this province will relate in part to a favourable tax regime, natural resources, a skilled workforce, and infrastructure, but at the end of the day there are many places with those elements and it will boil down to "Where will our employees be happy?" That is a quality of life issue. If you look at, for example, the Canada Winter Games, you would find a very strong connection between the sport and recreation elements of the Canada Winter Games and the cultural and historic components of the games. So there is also a great deal of interconnection between those things.

With respect to the Wild Rose Foundation, as the Member for Leduc suggested, many people have made the comment that there are some commonalties that deal with issues respecting quality of life that the Wild Rose Foundation deals with, perhaps most notably the whole area of volunteer board development and that sort of activity which the Wild Rose Foundation does a very good job of doing.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Barry McFarland.

MR. McFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Using the Member for Redwater's arguments about 6 cents per capita for human rights commissions, I'd like to argue for more money for the Alberta Sport Council and the number of young people and people in general that would benefit from a very worthwhile program. I want to compliment your staff that are with Alberta Sport Council on the work they are doing, Mr. Minister.

Back to the question I have, it deals partially with one the Member for Edmonton-Beverly-Belmont asked on page 55 of volume 2. You answered the overexpenditure on the Remington-

Alberta Carriage Centre, but could you explain the overexpenditures on the Provincial Museum, 3.0.2; Head-Smashed-In, 3.0.4; and the Ukrainian Cultural Heritage Village, 3.0.7.

MR. MAR: I'm not quite at that point yet in my paper, but many of those overexpenditures were a result of having to hire staff for the summer season when STEP students were not available.

In 1992-93 there were 78 STEP positions available for a total budget of \$312,000. In 1993-94 there were only 21 STEP positions available for \$84,000. In order to meet the obviously increased demand during the summer tourist season, we had to absorb some of those costs ourselves.

MR. McFARLAND: I noticed also on the statement of revenue, expenditure, and fund balance for these historic resources that it appears there's been an increase in either numbers of people using them or the revenue from the admission fees. If that trend doesn't continue, is there provision that the funds would be reduced for the expenditures in those areas, or will they have to draw in the reins somewhere else so they don't run into an overexpenditure again?

DR. BYRNE: Basically, in all the sites we run with a combination of the general revenue funding plus earned revenues from a variety of sources, including admissions and other special entrepreneurial activities. The overexpenditures/underexpenditures kind of scenario you're seeing right now is a result of the shakedown of this system. The province brought a number of these facilities onstream in a relatively short period of time, and quite frankly they're unique in the country in the way they operate with this heavy reliance on earned income. We are grossly in excess of the national average in terms of the amount of earned revenue that is devoted then to the operations in comparison to other sites across the country. As we get more experience in how to balance these responsibilities out from one institution to another and through the course of the season, we don't expect to see these kinds of variations happening again.

What we're trying to do is build into the system those areas of the operation being funded by demand so there is a balance of revenue and expenditures at each facility in each fiscal year. This will then give you the ability to rapidly adjust your expenditure pattern. If you are getting more revenue because you are getting more people, you thus require more guides, more attendants, and things of that sort. I don't expect to see this kind of fluctuation continuing in the future as we get this system refined. It's coming along very well at this point.

MR. MAR: In terms of the overall revenue which is raised through sources other than the admission fees themselves, in 1993-94 we took in about \$1.4 million in auxiliary revenues from our facilities. This year we expect \$2.3 million in auxiliary revenues. Those auxiliary revenues include private and corporate donations, grants from various sources. Perhaps most importantly they relate to things like sales in our gift shops and special promotions that we have. For example, last summer at the Royal Tyrrell Museum we started selling Tilley hats, and astonishingly just that one item produced about \$40,000 in revenue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Final supplementary.

MR. McFARLAND: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The historical sites and the museum aspect I think is one that's really worth while, especially for our younger children in getting an appreciation for Alberta's heritage. I don't know if in this past year or years before there has been a differential in fees for children or school

groups versus seniors coming in. Maybe you could explain to me if in fact seniors do get a discount for admission to places like the Ukrainian Village centre, or if we're looking at something where all seniors, regardless of what province, state, or country they come from, pay the same fee as everyone else so that maybe we could afford a discounted fee for a school group that's coming in as part of a social studies program and some of those very worthwhile things that I think young kids need to appreciate.

MR. MAR: Well, we don't have a discount fee for seniors. With respect to school groups, they come in for free.

One of the things we have for young people as well is one of our very, very popular programs, our sleepovers at the museums. Those are booked up months and months in advance, particularly at places like the Tyrrell museum and the Provincial Museum of Alberta. There is a charge for that, and we recover the cost of providing those services. They are certainly very, very popular with school groups, Girl Guide groups, Boy Scouts, and so on.

9:42

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mike Percy.

DR. PERCY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, I'm pursuing pages 72 and 73, the reason being that since the government is intent on moving to DAOs or whatever the current acronym is, I want to get a handle on what type of contracts work, which send out the right incentives, and which really are in the best interests of the province in providing a particular service. I look at note 9:

Accommodation, basic office furnishings and certain other administrative costs and salaries . . . have not been included in the Foundation's expenses. These costs are recorded by the General Revenue Fund of the Province.

I then look at schedule 1 on page 73 which shows the administrative expenses. I'll just look at the budget as \$661,000, because the actual includes the severance package which would be a one-off. Can you tell me what the true administrative expenses are inclusive of the material that is highlighted in note 9 but which is in the general revenue fund, that portion that comes directly from your budget that is not included in the administrative expenses set out in schedule 1?

MR. BATRA: I cannot pinpoint exactly, sir, the expenditures for such overhead costs as accommodation, lighting, heating, et cetera. They are paid by Public Works, Supply and Services. But their building happened to be in the downtown area. At that time, in the '90s, perhaps it was about \$7, \$8 a square foot at max. I do not recall how much space they occupied. The Auditor General now has requested that beginning this year we provide these overhead costs as notes to the financial statements, and perhaps they will be included as expense in future years.

DR. PERCY: Can you tell me exactly what the Moser corporation then did and what risks they assumed in return for this contract?

MR. DAVEY: There was a Moser Management contract. The obligation of that contract was to provide staff and services in order to administer the programs of the foundation. If there was confusion as to note 12, what used to happen prior to salary disclosure was that that note would reveal the total fees paid to Moser Management for the provision of staff and services in administering programs. In the year under review, the question arose as to whether there should be a salary disclosure common with all other agencies and departments. So what note 11 does in

detail give you the salary breakdown of that item under note 10. Note 11 is in fact an analysis of the costs of that Moser contract.

DR. PERCY: I look at schedule 1, \$661,000 or \$718,000 including the severance package. I see an array of expenses there. There's an array of expenses then under note 11. Now, some of the expenses under note 11 are part of the \$317,000; some are not. Could you tell me, just looking at note 11, what elements of note 11 are included in the \$317,000 and what is left over? What's the residual that has then gone to Moser Management?

MR. NOWICKI: Under note 11 the chairman, \$4,552, would not be part of Moser's management contract. Members of the foundation - those are board members - \$17,378, would not be part of the contract. Executive director, assistant to the director, secretary, secretary, other full-time staff would be part of the contract. In the part-time and casual wage staff, some of that would be under the contract and some would not; \$26,117 would not be part of the contract. There were some other contract staff that were hired between the foundation and the department, and that was covered by the \$26,000.

DR. L. TAYLOR: I'm on page 36 of volume 3, Alberta Foundation for the Arts. Once again I notice that their budget has gone up. From '93 to '94 is shown. I'm wondering how you can rationalize that when we're cutting back in Health and Education: Health, 17 percent; Education, approximately 12 percent. How do you rationalize increasing their budget?

MR. MAR: Sorry. What page are you on?

DR. L. TAYLOR: Volume 3, page 36, Alberta Foundation for the Arts, contribution from the lottery fund.

MR. MAR: There was an increase in the budget, but it really was just a transfer from the Multiculturalism Commission. There was also some interest revenue that came in. There was an increase in total revenue of \$180,000. Three hundred and eighteen thousand dollars related to lottery funding and was grants that were transferred from the Multiculturalism Commission; \$125,000 was a decrease in interest, matured investments that were not reinvested but used in operations; and \$11,000 approximately was a decrease in miscellaneous revenues. The transfer that took place was a result of a policy decision that arts funding would not be funded out of the Multiculturalism Commission, so that portion of their budget which related to the funding of artistic groups was transferred to the Alberta Foundation for the Arts.

DR. L. TAYLOR: Thank you.

In spite of that increase in budget, it appears to me they overspent their budget. I'm wondering if you can tell me why they overspent their budget if you look at page 37, top line, "deficiency of revenue over expenditure."

MR. MAR: That again relates to the same as the increase in revenue. The expenditure that was spent was expenditures that were from the moneys transferred from the Multiculturalism Commission.

DR. L. TAYLOR: There's a relatively low administration rate. There are dollars yet. Under note 3 on page 38, it says that certain salary, accommodation and other overhead costs incurred in the administration of the Foundation have not been included in the Foundation's expenses.

Can you tell me why they would not be included in the foundation's expenses and, secondly, what those costs would be so that we can have an accurate cost of the administration of the Alberta foundation?

MR. BATRA: Again, sir, the overhead costs related to accommodation – heating, lighting, electricity – are provided by the Department of Public Works, Supply and Services. The executive director of the foundation is an employee of the department. He has dual duties; he is the director of the arts branch as well. So there are some common expenses, and as I mentioned, at the beginning of this fiscal year we will be providing some estimate of those overhead costs as notes to the financial statements. You'll find this across the board in the government, that these overhead costs are absorbed by some central agencies.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kirkland.

MR. KIRKLAND: Thanks. The astute Member for Cypress-Medicine Hat just asked one of my questions, but I'll ask the supplementary on that. What is the salary of the executive director of the Alberta Foundation for the Arts?

MR. BATRA: I do not have the exact figure, sir. He's a senior manager 3. The top level on that today goes up to only about \$71,000.

9:52

MR. KIRKLAND: Okay. Just a supplementary to that particular question. I'm looking at management fees associated with the many different bodies, be it the Alberta Foundation for the Arts, the Glenbow-Alberta Institute, the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, or the Alberta Historical Resources Foundation, and I find there's quite a variance in the management fees. Yet when I look at the balance sheets – for example, the Alberta Foundation for the Arts, about \$12.1 million, or the Glenbow-Alberta Institute, \$18.2 million. I see that executive director's salary is \$121,000. We go over to Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and there's a balance sheet there of about \$5.2 million. Now, I know there are assets included in some of these and it's not simply a money flow as such. Why is such tremendous inconsistency apparent, when I go through the document here, in some of those management salaries when it seems they're dealing in essence with very similar amounts of dollars in their subdepartments, if I could call them that?

MR. NOWICKI: The only private management contract that was in place for these foundations was for the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation. All the other foundations come under the government schedule of salaries pursuant to their classification within the management scales. So depending on years of experience a manager has or whatever, the scale would vary, but it's within the management scale of the Alberta government.

MR. KIRKLAND: Okay. I guess this is a third supplemental. I lost track. When we are looking at some of the other items in those same organizations I spoke of, we look at honoraria. If I sit on the Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Foundation, is the honorarium paid to board members and board chairman the same as if I sit on the Glenbow-Alberta Institute or on the Alberta Foundation for the Arts?

MR. MAR: There is no honorarium at this time other than for the chairman.

MR. KIRKLAND: That was eliminated in '93; was it?

MR. BATRA: It was eliminated last year, I guess.

MR. KIRKLAND: Okay. Thanks.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Peter, you get the privilege of a clean-up question.

MR. SEKULIC: Thanks, Gary. That's a surprise. The other chairman wouldn't have permitted that.

I'll refer to volume 2, page 58. What I'm curious about is in terms of the revenue – and I'll just ask one question, so I'll wrap it all together – we have three different statements for "other revenue." I'm referring to 1994. We have \$110,000 in the first "other" category, \$364,000 in the second, and \$963,000 in the third. Incidentally, the third "other" category which has the \$963,000 revenue is an increase over the previous year by some \$955,000. I'm curious. What specifically is entailed in those "other revenue" categories?

MR. MAR: Well, in the \$8,000 to \$963,000 row that you referred to, ordinarily the revenue would be dealt with under the regulated fund, and ordinarily it would be about \$475,000 per year. Because we ended up transferring for two years, that's the reason why in 1993 it's only \$8,000 and in '94 it's \$963,000. Ordinarily it would be \$475,000 for each of two years.

I'll ask Mr. Batra to identify the sources of other revenues in the other two areas.

MR. BATRA: Perhaps I can add to the minister's comments regarding the \$950,000, \$8,000 and \$963,000. The background on this one is as follows. The department is provided with a budgetary offset in our estimates of \$475,000 for the management of the regulated fund. The regulated fund takes in all the revenues and, in turn, is required to pay back that money, the \$475,000, to the general revenue fund. So it's really basically a flow-through situation. The \$950,000 does represent two years of payments, because we were late one year in paying the money back to the general revenue fund.

Under fees and permits, I believe I explained earlier, sir, that that relates to the film censorship board fees. These are fees that we charge for classification of the films to the distributors. That's what the category represents. "Other" categories of \$110,000 and \$130,000 in my view are basically located in the wrong spot. It really is the revenue – we had a contract with the Muttart Foundation. We had a two-year contract with the Muttart Foundation to offer leadership as well as director training programs in rural Alberta. A private organization gave us that money. In '94 the revenue from that source was \$20,000 lower.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think we're running out of time, so I'm going to have to do you out of your two final supplementaries.

I'd like to thank the minister and his staff and the Auditor General and Assistant Auditor General for attending with us this morning.

I look forward to seeing all of you next Wednesday, April 5, when we will have on the hot seat the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Hon. Tom Thurber.

[The committee adjourned at 9:59 a.m.]