



Legislative Assembly of Alberta

The 30th Legislature
Second Session

Standing Committee
on
Public Accounts

Tuesday, January 26, 2021
8 a.m.

Transcript No. 30-2-17

8 a.m.

Tuesday, January 26, 2021

[Ms Phillips in the chair]

The Chair: Well, good morning, everyone. It's 8 a.m., so I will call this meeting to order. Welcome, everyone. I'd just like to welcome everyone in attendance.

My name is Shannon Phillips. I am the MLA for Lethbridge-West. I am the chair of this committee. Ordinarily I would suggest that we go around the table for all participants to introduce themselves; however, we have a number of people participating remotely today. We have a number of members, in fact, all except Member Schmidt, I believe, participating remotely. I'll just read into the record the others that I see at the bottom of my screen. I have Member Renaud. I have Member Toor. I have Member Guthrie, Member Gotfried, Member Reid, Member Rowswell. Sorry. I'm just going to see if I'm missing any. I have, I believe, Member Schmidt in the room.

For the Auditor General's staff I have Auditor General Wylie and Karen Zoltenko, who's the business leader for financial statements audit practice in the Auditor General's office.

We also have two substitutions. We have Mr. Hanson for Mr. Stephan and Ms Ganley for Mr. Dach.

From the Legislative Assembly we have Dr. Philip Massolin, who is the Clerk assistant, director of House services, and Aaron Roth, who is the committee clerk.

We also have members Hanson and Rosin in the room and, I believe, Member Ganley in the room.

I'm just going to ask the clerk to clean up any of those folks that I have missed and see if we can move on with this part of the agenda.

Mr. Roth: Sorry, Chair. Member Barnes, I believe, is joining by phone as well.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Folks participating remotely, please ensure that your microphones are muted unless you are recognized to speak and wait a second or two before speaking to ensure that the audio fully captures what you are saying. If you wish to abstain from a recorded vote, please send the committee clerk a private instant message, e-mail, or text. Committee proceedings are of course live streamed on the Internet, broadcast on Alberta Assembly TV, and all of these streams and transcripts can be accessed via the Legislative Assembly website.

Now I'm going to look to members for the approval of the agenda. The first question I will ask is: are there any changes or additions to the agenda? If there are any matters members would wish to raise under other business, members can advise the committee at this time.

Okay. Would a member like to move that the agenda for the January 26, 2021, meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be approved as distributed?

Mr. Gotfried: So moved.

The Chair: Okay. I have a mover, I believe. Member Gotfried. Any discussion on this motion? Hearing none, I will ask all members to unmute their microphones. All in favour? Any opposed? Thank you. That motion is carried. Please remember to remute.

We will now move on to the approval of minutes. Hon. members, we have minutes from our last meeting. Do members have any errors or omissions to note in regard to this meeting that was held on December 8? If not, then would a member move that the minutes of the December 8, 2020, meeting of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be approved as distributed?

Mr. Toor: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. I have that moved by Member Toor. Any discussion on this motion? All in favour? Any against? Very good. A bit of a delay there. The motion is carried.

Now we'll move on to the 2021 winter and spring schedule of committee meetings. Hon. members, the subcommittee on committee business met on January 21 to discuss the scheduling of meetings for us for the winter and spring sitting of this Legislature. We had two possible schedules. The subcommittee has not at this time recommended a schedule. At this time I would like to open the floor to discussion about the schedule. What I'm going to do is make sure I've got the chat open. At this time I will open the floor to discussion about this schedule and invite any comments or motions in relation to this matter of business.

Mr. Schmidt: Chair?

The Chair: Okay. Very good. I recognize Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you. I have a motion that I'd like to put forward regarding the schedule of this committee. I believe that it was submitted to the committee clerk, if he could put that up on the screen for all of us to view.

The Chair: Okay. I'm just wondering how we're going to handle this matter of being able to see the motion for the members participating remotely.

Mr. Roth: Chair, I'll put it in the chat screen, but it's also available on the committee's internal website under meeting motions.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Clerk.

As it is being reviewed, I will give it another few seconds. I will now open the floor to discussion on this motion.

Mr. Schmidt: I haven't quite moved the motion yet, Chair. That would be really fantastic, if I could do that before we discuss it.

The Chair: Yes. You can move this motion.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you. I move that

the Standing Committee on Public Accounts adopt the winter and spring 2021 meeting schedule proposed by us, the Official Opposition caucus, as circulated to members and also authorize the subcommittee on committee business to propose alternative dates for any meetings scheduled during a period in which Standing Order 59.01(11) is effective.

I have a proposed schedule here, Mr. Clerk. Should I read that out as well? There we go. It is on the screen. Our proposal includes inviting the Ministry of Community and Social Services on February 8, the Ministry of Energy on February 15, 2021, the Ministry of Environment and Parks on February 22, 2021, the Ministry of Justice and Solicitor General on March 2 and in the alternative on April 6, the Ministry of Health on March 9 and in the alternative on April 13, the Ministry of Treasury Board and Finance on March 16 and in the alternative April 20, the Ministry of Education on March 23 and in the alternative April 27, the Ministry of Advanced Education on April 6 and in the alternative May 4, the Ministry of Jobs, Economy and Innovation on April 13 and in the alternative on May 11, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs on April 20 and in the alternative on May 18, the Ministry of Labour and Immigration on May 4, and Children's Services on May 11. If those dates don't work, then alternative dates should be sought by the committee as soon as possible.

We've put considerable time into our proposal. In our view, the Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature plays an essential role in our system of government, and we were thoughtful and deliberate in what we put forward. Before I outline our proposal, I'd like to thank Member Gotfried, the deputy chair of the committee, who commissioned some research from the LAO in order to help this committee do its scheduling work effectively. The deputy chair asked two important questions. First, which ministries did the committee not meet with last year? Second, which ministries have the most outstanding recommendations from the office of the Auditor General? I want to give credit to Member Gotfried because this is the obvious way to prioritize the work of this committee. We built our proposed meeting schedule off of his work.

8:10

That's why we propose first to meet with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, then Energy, then Environment and Parks, then Justice and Solicitor General. To be clear, these are four ministries that did not appear before the committee in 2020 and so must be the highest priority. We have an obligation to the public to review these annual reports as well as the Auditor General's recommendations and to question these ministries on their public accounts on behalf of Albertans. In our view, the first four proposed ministries are obvious selections.

The second group of ministries includes Health, Treasury Board and Finance, Education, Advanced Education, jobs, Municipal Affairs, labour, and Children's Services. These were selected because these ministries have the most outstanding recommendations from the Auditor General, and it's the mandate of this committee to review those recommendations and ensure they are followed up in a timely manner. These ministries were also selected because they are the big spenders, and it's our job as the Public Accounts Committee to review government expenditures.

Indeed, as we have discussed before in this committee, it's common for large ministries to appear more frequently than smaller ministries simply because they spend more money. For example, the Ministry of Health appears before us more frequently than the ministry of culture if only because the Health ministry represents 40 per cent of government operating expenses. It's our job to review those expenses.

I want to close by thanking Member Gotfried for asking the LAO to do this research that led to this proposal. We fully agree with his instincts, and I certainly hope that all members of the committee find that this proposed schedule is agreeable and will vote in favour of it.

The Chair: Thank you, Member Schmidt.

I believe I have Member Rowswell, who has put his name on the list.

Mr. Rowswell: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I'd like to propose an amendment. What I would like to do is – I will just read it out here. It's saying that Public Accounts adopt the winter and spring 2021 meeting schedule proposed by the government caucus as circulated to members and authorize the subcommittee on committee business to propose alternative dates for any meeting scheduled during the period in which Standing Order 59.01(11) is effective, so striking out "the Official Opposition caucus" and changing to "government caucus."

There has been a lot of thought put into this. We're probably going to be going into estimates and of course we can't have meetings during that time, and there's a constituency break in there as well, so that's just trying to reflect those. The one as circulated is Tuesday, April 6, Justice and Solicitor General; April 13, Advanced Education; April 20, Jobs, Economy and Innovation;

May 4, Labour and Immigration; May 11, Children's Services; and May 18, Agriculture and Forestry.

The Chair: I have an amendment on the floor that has been moved, but I want to seek direction of the clerk here because, as I understand it, an amendment is not necessarily to completely change the entirety of a motion.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Chair. Yes. You wouldn't want an amendment changing the original intent of the motion or to be directly contrary to the motion.

The Chair: Yeah. This is a bit of a tough one. Given that it is an entirely substantive change to the original motion, Member Rowswell, I'm going to ask us to deliberate on this original motion. You know, the member and his caucus are free to vote that down and propose a new motion. That is certainly something that is an option open to them if that's, upon deliberation, what they elect to do, but a complete overhaul is not in keeping with how amendments generally work in these meeting proceedings. I'm going to revert back to the original motion, and I used the discretion of the chair to do that.

I'm recognizing Member Renaud at this time.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Chair. It's my pleasure to be here today. I just wanted to say a couple of things, so I'm going to focus my comments on one particular ministry that I am the critic for. One of the things that I am very alarmed by is that, you know, I hear the talk very frequently from members from the government side about the importance of nonpartisan work. We had the deputy chair ask for research to complete a list of which ministries hadn't appeared before us – and, obviously, Community and Social Services is one of them – but instead they're voting this down, and once again they're putting this particular ministry at the end of the line.

Now, there are a lot of things that have gone on in 2020. We've seen millions of dollars directed to a new Premier's civil society committee. We've got at least 160,000 Albertans that make use of disability supports. We have lived through some really unique times, and this is a ministry that is really important in terms of looking at the recommendations and ensuring we're doing the work. By continuously bumping it, we're just sort of throwing up our hands and saying: "Yeah, transparency doesn't matter. The rules don't matter." I'm incredibly disappointed that the government side would be more interested in politics, about looking less bad, and bumping this ministry to the end once again because they're uncomfortable about the questions that that ministry will receive. If this committee is truly nonpartisan, I would suggest that the government members listen to the researchers, who have said: "We have not looked at Community and Social Services in 2020. It is high time that we do that." I strongly encourage government members to really think about their list. Is it really vital that we look at Service Alberta again first as opposed to Community and Social Services?

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Member Renaud.

I am looking to any other speakers to this motion. I will note for the record that the LAO research that was commissioned, just for the members' awareness, indicated to us that we have 26 outstanding recommendations for Health from the Auditor General. We have 18 outstanding recommendations for the Ministry of Energy, we have Transportation with just one outstanding recommendation from the Auditor General, and Agriculture and Forestry has two.

We have also been in receipt of the briefing from LAO research to the subcommittee in preparation for the subcommittee's meeting.

The ministries of Energy, Environment and Parks, and Justice and Solicitor General last appeared before this committee in 2020, and the Ministry of Community and Social Services last appeared in front of this committee in 2017. I just wanted to make sure that those pieces were noted for our members' awareness.

Any other speakers to this motion?

Seeing none, I will now call the question on this motion. All in favour of the motion?

Given that we have people from so many different places, I'm wondering, Mr. Clerk, if you could read back into the record the ayes and the nays as people speak up just so we can know who's voted.

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Chair. If someone were to call for a recorded vote, certainly I'd be able to do that.

Mr. Schmidt: I would like to call for a recorded vote.

Mr. Roth: Yeah. If you do the voice vote first, and then if someone wished to call for a recorded vote after that.

The Chair: Okay. I'm getting a lot of feedback, so I just wanted to make sure that people weren't hearing themselves.

I will now call for all in favour of this motion? All opposed?

Mr. Schmidt: Can I call for a recorded vote, Madam Chair, on this motion?

The Chair: Yes, please.

So I will now look to a recorded vote, and I'm wondering if I can defer this to the clerk given the mixture of people in the room and not in the room. I will now call for all those in favour of the motion.

8:20

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley, Member Schmidt.

The Chair: Any on the line who are in favour of this motion?

Ms Renaud: Sorry, Madam Chair. I am getting so much feedback, I'm not really able to follow this. I'm sorry. I'm losing – I can't understand what's being said.

The Chair: Member Renaud, I'm asking for a recorded vote. Are you in favour of this motion? I will invite Member Renaud to, if you like, mute and stop your video and just simply record your vote in the chat, perhaps, if you're having some difficulty otherwise communicating with us. That might help.

Okay. Mr. Clerk, I'm just looking to you for a little bit of guidance on the procedure.

Mr. Roth: Sorry, Chair. Yeah. It looks as though the member may need to rejoin the meeting. Can I suggest perhaps a five-minute recess so that everybody, if they got kicked out, can rejoin the meeting?

The Chair: Okay. What we're going to do, then, members, is that we're going to do a five-minute recess. We're going to rejoin the meeting, if we need to, for those of us who have been getting some feedback and other things, and we'll go back into the recorded vote. I just want to make sure that everyone is properly recorded on this. We have now, I believe, 8:22, so we will reconvene at 8:27, please, members.

Thank you.

[The committee adjourned from 8:22 a.m. to 8:27 a.m.]

The Chair: All right. I will call this meeting back to order, friends. Thank you for that quick indulgence of getting our information technology all sorted out. The clerk has proposed a good idea, which is that we do this as a roll call vote, which makes it a lot easier for us to know who has voted and who has not.

Mr. Clerk, if you wouldn't mind undertaking that now.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Chair.
Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Barnes.

Mr. Barnes: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: Aye.

Mr. Roth: Member Guthrie.

Mr. Guthrie: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Reid.

Mr. Reid: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Toor.

Mr. Toor: No.

Mr. Roth: Chair, total for the motion, three; total against, eight.

The Chair: All right.

That motion has been defeated.

I will now open up the floor to other motions to be moved.

Mr. Rowswell: I will have a motion.

The Chair: Okay. Member Rowswell, I will assume that that motion has been forwarded to the clerk for distribution. I will give Mr. Clerk a moment to put it up on the screen for folks who are in the room and in the chat for folks who are not in the room and also advise members – and the clerk can confirm this – that it has also been posted to the committee's internal website.

Mr. Roth: Mr. Rowswell, the motion I have is: moved by Mr. Rowswell that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts adopt

the winter and spring '20-21 meeting schedule proposed by the government caucus. Does that meet your intent?

Mr. Rowsell: Yeah.

Mr. Roth: I'll just send that through the chat.

The Chair: Thank you.

Member Rowsell, if you'd like to move that motion, I believe that most of the members have it in front of them. I recognize you now.

Mr. Rowsell: Okay. Just state that same thing again? Okay. I'll move that

the Standing Committee on Public Accounts adopt the winter and spring '20-21 meeting schedule as tabled by the government caucus.

Did you want me to read it out as well, or is that circulated?

Mr. Roth: Perhaps. It's on the screen, and it's been delivered to members, but you may perhaps want to read it out for the record.

Mr. Rowsell: Okay.

Tuesday, April 6, Justice and Solicitor General; Tuesday, April 13, Advanced Education; Tuesday, April 20, Jobs, Economy and Innovation; Tuesday, May 4, Labour and Immigration; Tuesday, May 11, Children's Services; and Tuesday, May 18, Agriculture and Forestry.

The Chair: Thank you, Member Rowsell.

I'm advised that my video was freezing, so I'll leave my video off for a moment here.

Opening it up to the floor for discussion on this motion, I see Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I'm just bringing this up here on my screen because as it turns out, I can't see quite that far. I'm a little curious. I'm looking at this particular proposed schedule, which appears to begin in April. Since we have the remainder of February, I'm a little bit confused about why exactly that would be the case.

I think also, looking to this schedule, we're seeing that Jobs, Economy and Innovation is third up on the line. I think they have one outstanding recommendation continuing to sort of be there. I mean, my take is that the point of this committee is to sort of look at those reports. Sorry; they have two. That's my bad. The point of this committee is to sort of take a look at those recommendations, so I'm a little curious why they would be up so early.

I also note that Community and Social Services, which got bumped at the most recent meeting, doesn't appear on this list. It's one of the largest spending ministries in the government. It has many, many outstanding recommendations. I mean, it seems pretty clear to me that if we had to cancel a meeting and something got bumped, that thing should be the first up.

I feel like this particular schedule appears to be sort of a transparent attempt to avoid accountability for a number of ministries. We have ministries with few recommendations coming forward as opposed to ministries with more recommendations, so I would urge members to vote against this particular meeting schedule, I would say, in part because, you know, this committee has time in February to do its work – I don't understand why we would avoid doing that – and in part because, I mean, it was a member of the government caucus that commissioned the work to say which ministries had the most outstanding recommendations and which ministries hadn't been here in a long time. I'm a little

confused as to why this list, which clearly doesn't reflect that work, would be proposed.

Thank you.

The Chair: Recognizing any other members to speak to this motion?

Mr. Gotfried: Madam Chair.

The Chair: I have Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to note that, you know, all the ministries are important, and most of the ones that we have on here have outstanding recommendations that have not been addressed for some time and that have not been brought in front of this committee for some time. As was noted, I think, in 2020, I think that the work of this committee was very ambitious, and we saw all but four ministries if I'm not mistaken. Our intent, of course, is to continue on that pace to do so, and we fully expect that to take place. I think that this is a very good and sound schedule for us to take. It takes into account the likelihood of us being postponed due to budget estimates, and then we will get on to the nonpartisan and very focused work of this committee once this is approved.

Thank you.

8:35

The Chair: I have Member Renaud on the speakers list.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Chair. With all due respect to the deputy chair, you know, this action seems very much the opposite of nonpartisan to me. Let's be clear about this. Community and Social Services has not appeared since the UCP formed government. I don't really know what the problem is as our job is to work with the Auditor General to ensure that we're monitoring the recommendations and the work of each ministry. Now, it seems to me that if that ministry hasn't shown up in this long, it is high time that they do. So I'd be pleased to hear from the Auditor General his thoughts on this schedule, seeing as there are some very large-spending ministries that have not appeared before this committee for some time.

Thank you.

The Chair: I am recognizing Mr. Wylie.

Mr. Wylie: Good morning, Chair. I'm getting a lot of feedback. Can you hear me?

The Chair: Much better, Mr. Wylie. It was getting feedback for me, too, but now we're fine.

Mr. Wylie: Okay. Thank you, Chair. You know, quite frankly, I think that the committee has the information. The committee is aware of the outstanding recommendations, when those recommendations were made, and the committee is also aware of when the ministries were last before the committee. The Legislative Assembly Office research has provided that information to the committee. Quite frankly, with respect to the question of the member, I think, from my view, the committee has all the information it needs to make a decision, so I have nothing further to offer.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Wylie.

I have Member Schmidt on the list according to the chat.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you. I would like to propose an amendment, then, to the government caucus's proposed meeting schedule if I could.

The Chair: Yes. Please proceed.

Mr. Schmidt: You know, taking into account some of the urgency of the business that this committee is faced with, I would like to propose that because we have a lot of work to get through now – and members need to keep in mind that sometime in June, if the government doesn't play the silly games that they played last year with annual reports, the annual reports of the 2020 fiscal year will be made available as well. Then the committee has to start its work all over again, and we won't, according to the schedule that the government caucus has put forward, get through all of the work that was given to the committee last year.

Keeping that in mind, I would like to propose that we amend the schedule significantly, that

we have a full-day meeting on February 9, at which we would consider Justice and Solicitor General, Advanced Education, and Jobs, Economy and Innovation, giving each of them a two-hour block.

Mr. Roth: Sorry.

Mr. Schmidt: Yeah?

Mr. Roth: Justice and Solicitor General?

Mr. Schmidt: Yeah. Justice and Solicitor General, Advanced Education, and Jobs, Economy and Innovation.

I'm just taking into account the government caucus's priorities here and moving them up the calendar significantly. Then I would propose that

we schedule on February 16, 2021, Labour and Immigration, Children's Services, and Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. Roth: Labour and Immigration . . .

Mr. Schmidt: Labour and Immigration, Children's Services, and Agriculture and Forestry. That would be an all-day meeting again.

Mr. Roth: On? Sorry, Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: February 16, 2021.

Then on February 23 the Ministry of Community and Social Services. April 6 would be Energy; April 13, Ministry of Environment and Parks; April 20, Ministry of Health. May 4 would be Treasury Board and Finance; May 11 would be Ministry of Education; and then Ministry of Municipal Affairs on May 18.

Mr. Gotfried: Madam Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Gotfried. Please proceed.

Mr. Gotfried: In reference to this proposed amendment I just remind you of your prior ruling with respect to amendments that substantively change this. I just would seek your ruling on that.

The Chair: Sure. Thank you.

I guess my question to the members is: is this the same order of ministries?

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Chair, if I could respond to Member Gotfried's question. Of course, this is the same order of ministries that the government caucus has put forward. We have additional ministries that are available simply because there are extra slots that

are opened up. The only amendment that I'm proposing is a date change for several of the ministries, moving them from April to February, so that the committee can deal with these urgently. In my view, this isn't an amendment so substantive that it should be ruled out of order. This is simply taking the government caucus's proposal and moving it up a couple of weeks.

The Chair: Yeah. I think that given that it's not too confusing for members to follow what is actually being proposed here and it's not a complete re-jumbling of the entire puzzle of dates and departments, I will allow the member to move this amendment.

We have an amendment on the floor for our discussion. Do I have any folks who would like to speak to this amendment?

Ms Renaud: Madam Chair, if I could just weigh in really quickly.

The Chair: Sure. Yes, please. I recognize Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am very much in support of this amendment. I would just like to remind members that were perhaps on Public Accounts before 2019 – and it was a fairly regular practice – that we would have all-day meetings to catch up, to make sure that we were diligent in having every ministry appear before us. I am very much in support of this amendment, and I encourage others to support it.

Thank you.

Ms Ganley: There it goes, but I'll wait for the chair to recognize me.

The Chair: I'm recognizing Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: Excellent. Sorry. A little microphone challenge there. I just want to say that, I mean, I think this amendment appears to be fairly co-operative despite the fact that I think it's been made clear that it's our view on this side that it's a little bit – this isn't our preferred order. We think that we should go in an order as suggested by the research that was done by the LAO, but in the spirit of co-operation we have put forward an amendment which takes into account the government's priorities. The reason for those priorities is somewhat curious.

Nonetheless, what it does do is move the work forward, because the current schedule literally has the committee performing no work in February. I mean, given basically the incredible importance of the work that this committee does in terms of looking at the recommendations of the Auditor General, I just think that it doesn't fulfill our responsibility as legislators to put this work off until April. I think that there is lots of time in February. I think that, you know, you can get through a lot of meetings. In fact, it's a time before the Legislature is sitting, so it allows the meetings to be longer. It allows more work to be done.

I think there's a lot of work that needs to be done. As Member Schmidt has pointed out, you know, there's another whole set of recommendations coming in June, and in previous years we have met with ministries on multiple days to get through a backlog, which is what was occurring, and we have a backlog right now.

8:45

I think we need to get through the high-priority ministries that the LAO has identified based on the research commissioned by Member Gotfried, so we're proposing a strategy with a few multiday meetings to accomplish both objectives, both the government's desire to do these ministries first and the opposition's desire to ensure that we fulfill our responsibility as legislators and get through the necessary work. I think, you know, we're all here to serve Albertans. I don't think it's unreasonable to suggest that we should have some

meetings in February, so I would urge all members to vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. Gotfried: Madam Chair, just a comment, please.

The Chair: Yes, please.

Mr. Gotfried: Actually, I just wanted to point out again that there were only four ministries that we did not see in 2020, so there is really not a backlog, thanks to the very good and hard work of the committee and the agreement of those ministries to come forward. We also would be running into a situation – it is fairly traditional for us to give ministries about a month's notice in respect of their very busy schedules as well as to ensure that they're prepared to come forward and answer the questions. So I would suggest and request that members vote against this amendment and move back to the original motion, please.

Thank you.

The Chair: All right. I am looking to the floor and the chat for any other speakers to this amendment.

Mr. Schmidt: Well, Madam Chair, it's Marlin here. Of course, I feel the need to push back on some of the desperate justifications that the deputy chair is trying to make for not seriously considering this amendment. You know, I'll just remind all members that these annual reports were completed more than six months ago. The ministry should be ready to present them almost any time. We're giving them two months' notice if we adopt this amendment, so I think it's perfectly reasonable.

You know, also, the deputy chair says that we invited almost all but four. Of course, we didn't get through many of the 2019-2020 annual reports. That was the backlog that I was referring to. I think it's incumbent upon this Public Accounts Committee to look at the annual reports every year of every ministry just to give Albertans the opportunity to examine the expenditures of every ministry, and of course we haven't had the opportunity to do that. This amended schedule would give the opportunity to do that.

I would urge the government members to fulfill their role in holding the government cabinet to account through their roles here on Public Accounts and vote in favour of this amendment.

The Chair: I am now looking to the floor and to the chat for any additional speakers to this amendment.

Ms Renaud: Yes, Madam Chair. If I could just add a brief comment . . .

The Chair: Sure.

Ms Renaud: . . . just to support my colleague Member Schmidt. Absolutely, I believe that these ministries should be – at least, if they're not, I am quite sure they are – ready to respond to the questions of members of Public Accounts and to talk about the work they're doing around the recommendation. To suggest that we can't do that because they're not ready just seems really hollow to me. It seems like there are far more motivated reasons, politically motivated reasons, for not supporting this. Once again I urge my colleagues to put your partisan politics aside and look at what's right for the people of Alberta.

Thank you.

The Chair: All right. Now looking to the floor and the chat for any additional speakers to this amendment.

If not, then I will call the question. Once again we'll do the voice vote, but because of our IT situation, then I'll also call for a roll-

call vote from the clerk so that we can make sure that this is – or someone from the floor will call for that. I just want to make sure that everyone gets the chance to vote. I'll start with the voice vote. All in favour of this amendment? Any opposed?

I'm recognizing Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Yeah. I'd like a recorded vote on the amendment, please.

The Chair: Okay. So, Mr. Clerk, if you might do this as a roll call given the realities of our IT situation right now. I turn it over to you.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Chair.
Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: I vote no.

Mr. Roth: Member Barnes.

Mr. Barnes: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Guthrie.

Mr. Guthrie: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Reid.

Mr. Reid: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Toor.

Mr. Toor: No.

Mr. Roth: Chair, total for the amendment, three; total against, eight.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

That amendment has not passed.

We will now move back to the main motion, and I will look to the room and to the chat for any speakers to the original motion as moved by Member Rowswell, I believe? As moved by the government caucus: I'll put it that way.

Seeing none, then I will call for a vote on the motion as proposed by, I believe, Member Rowswell. I will now call for a voice vote. All in favour? Any opposed?

Mr. Schmidt: Can we call a recorded vote, Madam Chair, on that motion?

The Chair: Yes. Yes, you may. I'm certainly getting some feedback.

I will now hand things over to the clerk for the recorded vote. If you could do it by roll call, please, that would be appreciated.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Chair.

Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Aye.

Mr. Roth: Member Barnes.

Mr. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Guthrie.

Mr. Guthrie: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Reid.

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Toor.

Mr. Toor: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Chair, total for the motion, eight; total against, three.

The Chair: Thank you, Clerk.

That motion has passed.

We'll now move on to the next agenda item, which is our overview of crossjurisdictional research concerning report writing and follow-up on implementation of the Auditor General's outstanding recommendations. I turn this over now to, I think, Mr. Clerk as there has been crossjurisdictional research prepared related to how various public accounts committees engage in report writing and follow-up of the implementations by ministries and associated entities relating to outstanding Auditor General recommendations. That research document has been posted to the committee's internal website for all of our review.

I'd like to turn things over to Mr. Roth to provide an overview of that document, and then we'll have some questions from committee members. Mr. Roth.

8:55

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Chair. I just want to give a brief overview here of the document. To begin, I guess, the subcommittee on committee business had asked for some crossjurisdictional research to be put together in regard to how public accounts committees from across the country work with their respective auditors to follow up on audit recommendation implementation and also how they do report writing and if they make any recommendations with regard to follow-up and implementation from those audits.

Responses were received from five jurisdictions, they being Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia, and P.E.I. In all cases these jurisdictions reported that they had a good working relationship with their respective auditor. Different committees had different ways of executing that relationship, if you will. Most issue a standing invitation to their respective auditor to attend committee meetings, for instance. In another instance, in Saskatchewan's case, the Public Accounts Committee works with the auditor, but they also have responsibility for budget estimates approval, appointment roles within the Auditor General's office. Any legislation that has to do with the Auditor General's office: my understanding is that it is referred to the Public Accounts Committee automatically for a review.

The process that's followed in reviewing various auditors' reports is also different in many jurisdictions. In Ontario and Saskatchewan public accounts committees take chapters from their auditors' reports and review them. In P.E.I. my understanding is that their committee takes one to five meetings to review the individual reports. Most committees have the ability to issue reports to their respective Assemblies making recommendations. Nova Scotia was one of the five that responded who reported that they did not have the ability to do so. Alberta, of course, is one that does have the ability to do so.

Each jurisdiction has a slightly different mechanism by which their procedural rules require a response from the government to any report or recommendations that are issued. As is the case in Alberta, Saskatchewan and P.E.I. do have response requirements from the government. In Alberta, you know, our response requirement pursuant to the standing orders is 150 days. In Saskatchewan it's 120 days. In Nova Scotia they have to reply within the subsequent session of their Assembly. Ontario's situation: they can request that the government respond, but it's not an automatic thing unless the request is triggered. B.C. and Nova Scotia have no response requirement from the government to reports. While Saskatchewan and British Columbia do issue annual or sessional reports, Ontario is actually the only jurisdiction that responded that actually routinely issues separate substantive reports from the committee, usually on particular matters that they've had under consideration. The makeup of these reports can vary pretty significantly.

In terms of follow-up activities with regard to various ministries' and entities' implementation of auditor recommendations B.C., Saskatchewan, and P.E.I. have an action plan process that they follow for following up on the implementation of recommendations. Each jurisdiction has their own way of doing that. The report talks a little bit about that. In Ontario when responses from the government to recommendations come in, the committee decides whether further follow-up is needed and whether or not to invite a ministry back to the committee to follow up with them.

In each jurisdiction the provincial auditor's report is relied on heavily for their support in terms of follow-up to assess whether entities would be called back or not or if the implementation of recommendations is proceeding appropriately. In B.C. their process

actually has their subcommittee review the responses, and then they issue recommendations back to the main committee.

That's really the substantive element of the report. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Looking to the room and to the chat for any speakers to this matter of business that is before the committee. I believe I see the deputy chair opening up his screen. Please, Mr. Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a comment. I wanted to thank our research team and the clerk, specifically, for his work on this cross-jurisdictional study and report to us. I just might suggest – I don't think we need a motion – in that we have members of the Auditor General's office and the Clerk's office and research services and our legal counsel at the subcommittee, we review the outcome and some of the recommendations and findings from the other jurisdictions to see if we would perhaps like to make some recommendations back to the committee for any amendments on our procedures.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. I would like for this report to be posted on our external website if at all possible.

Mr. Clerk, do we require a motion for that, or is that something that can just be done as a matter of course?

Mr. Roth: Thank you, Chair. I think the general practice is that if there is general agreement amongst members of the committee, we can certainly arrange that.

The Chair: Yeah. I see no reason why this ought not be public information, so I'm looking to the chat and to the room for any objections to that, I suppose. All righty. Seeing none, then we will move on from item 5.

If I see no other speakers to this matter, I will now move on to item 6 on our agenda, which is other business. First of all, hon. members, I would like to note for the record that the committee has received the written responses to questions asked by us during Public Accounts meetings in 2020. We have Transportation at June 9, 2020, Treasury Board and Finance of June 23, Labour and Immigration at July 14, Executive Council at November 17, the Auditor General at November 24, Indigenous Relations at December 1, and Culture, Multiculturalism and Status of Women at December 8. As per the usual practices these responses will be posted to the committee's public website.

Is there any other business that members wish to move forward? I am seeing Member Ganley in the room. I recognize the member.

Ms Ganley: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to move a motion on behalf of Mr. Schmidt. I believe that we have given advanced notice of this motion, so the language should be available, but I will read it into the record. I am moving on behalf of Mr. Schmidt that

the Standing Committee on Public Accounts (a) request that the Ministry of Executive Council appear before the committee at a date to be determined by the subcommittee on committee business and provide all documents and records in its possession related to the government of Alberta's investment in the Keystone XL pipeline project undertaken by TC Energy Corporation and (b) direct the chair to send a letter to the Premier of Alberta and inform him of the request described in clause (a), request that any necessary steps be taken to release the document and records, including any steps related to cabinet confidences, and ask for a response to the committee's request within 30 days.

I do have an argument, but I will wait till – I see it is up on the screen, so I will proceed. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to

this important motion. In March of last year, just by way of background, the Premier announced that the government was investing up to \$7.5 billion in the Keystone XL pipeline. The decision came despite significant ongoing political and legal risks to the project. The project was facing a court challenge in Montana at the time, and just two weeks after the deal was announced by the Premier, the Montana court halted the project after cancelling an environmental permit. The decision was later upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in July.

9:05

But the risk to the project at the time went beyond the U.S. courts. Early in March Joe Biden had just won Super Tuesday and had momentum in the Democratic nomination campaign. Mr. Biden had been a long-time opponent of the KXL. He stood next to President Obama when KXL was cancelled in 2015. In May of last year Mr. Biden repeated his opposition to the project by promising to cancel KXL if elected President.

So despite all of the known political and legal risks, the Premier still went ahead with the KXL deal. Its path forward depended heavily on the re-election of Donald Trump. It was a risky bet to place money on Donald Trump's re-election, but the Premier still made that bet, and he made a big wager. In fact, he bet \$7.5 billion on Donald Trump winning that election. But the problem is that the money doesn't belong to the Premier; the money belongs to Albertans.

Unfortunately for Albertans, the Premier lost that bet. Last Wednesday President Biden rescinded the construction permit for the Keystone XL. As a result, TC Energy announced it was halting work on the project and cutting a thousand jobs. This news is a devastating blow to our province, especially to the Albertans working on the project and to the towns benefiting from the economic activity like Hardisty and Oyen.

Of particular concern for Albertans is that the government's economic recovery plan relied heavily on KXL proceeding. But even after the President cancelled the project, we still don't have clarity about how much of Albertans' money the Premier lost on that risky bet. He said it's in the ballpark of \$1.5 billion due to the equity investment and loan guarantees. We don't know how much more Albertans could be on the hook for in the future.

Since the deal was signed, our caucus has asked for the deal to be made public, and we've asked for any risks or legal analysis to be released with it. However, these requests have been refused every time. At the Public Accounts Committee meeting on November 17 the Member for Edmonton-Gold Bar asked, through a written question to the Executive Council, whether it would consider waiving cabinet privilege to release the documents relating to the KXL deal so that this committee could engage in its essential function and review the public accounts and government expenditures. All members of the committee received the response, and the response we received was that the committee had not made a formal request to cabinet on this matter.

Today we are putting forward a motion to make a formal request to cabinet to waive privilege and release the documents related to the Keystone XL deal. We believe this matter is of the utmost importance to Albertans. We know the deal has cost us \$1.5 billion so far, but there could be more costs, including reclamation and legal fees associated with the deal. In the end up to \$7.5 billion of Albertans' money is at stake, and they deserve to know exactly how much was lost on this risky bet by the Premier. Just as importantly, we need to understand how it happened, what the risk analysis was, and whether we need to improve our system of adjudicating risk.

In the interest of transparency I hope all committee members will support this motion so that Albertans can get some answers.

The Chair: Okay. I am now looking to the room and to the chat for any speakers to this motion. I have it in front of you on the screen, and I also asked for the clerk to put it into the chat as well for members.

Ms Rosin: Madam Chair, I'd like to propose an amendment to the motion.

The Chair: Sure, Member Rosin. Floor is yours.

Ms Rosin: Okay. I will propose the amendment first and then go to rationale after, if that's okay.

The Chair: Yes.

Ms Rosin: Okay. Perfect. I would like to propose that in subsection (a) we strike out "Executive Council appear before the committee at a date to be determined by the subcommittee on committee business and provide all documents and records in its possession related to" and substitute in "Energy provide the committee with the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission's current expected cost exposure for", and then in subsection (b) I would like to strike out "Premier of Alberta to inform him of the request described in clause (a), request any necessary steps be taken to release the documents and records, including any steps related to cabinet confidences, and ask for a response to the committee's request within 30 days" and instead substitute in "Minister of Energy to inform her of the request described in clause (a), request that any necessary steps be taken to release current estimated costs without breaching any contractual confidentiality, and ask for a response to the committee's request within 45 days."

Ms Ganley: Point of order.

The Chair: Very good. Please proceed.

Ms Ganley: Sorry. I called a point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Oh. Yes.

Ms Ganley: Pursuant to your previous ruling regarding subamendments that basically restate the motion on the floor, I believe that the intent of this is basically to remove the intent of the motion. This motion came forward because Member Schmidt had requested a waiver of privilege from cabinet. Cabinet's response to that request for a waiver of privilege was that the committee needed to make a formal request, so the purpose of this motion is for the committee to make a formal request to seek information in the possession of Executive Council. This amendment sort of alters the original motion in such a way that that intent is not met. There is no request for waiver of privilege left as I read it.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you. I'll now respond to this point of order. My previous ruling had to do with amending the department's – okay. I'm going to stop my video here. I'm being advised that it's frozen. I'll just go with audio for now. The departments were the object of the motion, the original motion. That was the reason why I ruled in the first instance, earlier in this meeting, that the amendment was out of order in that the reason for the motion was ministries, related to individual departments, and substantively altering that was, in fact, a change to the overall substance.

We have a similar situation happening here. The original motion has as its object a response from Executive Council, and the motion is directed toward the request that Executive Council, not any other associated entity or any other ministry indicated, would be required

of this committee. This amendment is, in fact, out of order, and we will go back to the original motion.

Are there any other speakers to this motion at this time? Looking to the floor and to the chat.

Seeing none, I will now call the question, and as per our practice before we'll start with the voice vote, please. All in favour of this motion? Are there any opposed? I am seeing from the room that Member Ganley has requested a recorded vote.

Ms Ganley: I would like to request a recorded vote, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, per our procedure for all of this meeting if you would not mind doing a roll-call recorded vote given the mixture of IT that we're using today.

Mr. Roth: Certainly, Chair.
Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Barnes.

Mr. Barnes: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Guthrie.

Mr. Guthrie: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Reid.
Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Toor.

Mr. Toor: No.

9:15

Mr. Roth: Have all members voted that wish to vote?

Mr. Reid: It's MLA Reid. No.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, did you get that last vote? I know I had a little bit of feedback. I just want to make sure that that happened.

Mr. Roth: Chair, I believe I did.

The total for the motion, three; the total against, eight.

The Chair: Okay.

That motion has not passed. That motion has failed.

So we'll now move to the next item on our agenda, which is the date for our next meeting.

Ms Rosin: Madam Chair.

The Chair: I'm sorry. Yes. Please go ahead.

Ms Rosin: Sorry to interrupt. I would just like to propose a motion before we move on. Is that all right?

The Chair: Yes, it is. Sorry. Now I'm getting a lot of feedback.

Okay. Yes, please go ahead. I'm sorry. I moved too quickly off other business. Go ahead.

Ms Rosin: That's okay. Thank you so much. I would like to move a motion to

(a) request that the Ministry of Energy provide the committee with the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission's current expected cost exposure for the government of Alberta's investment in the Keystone XL pipeline project undertaken by TC Energy Corporation and (b) direct the chair to send a letter to the Minister of Energy to inform her of the request described in clause (a), request that any necessary steps be taken to release the current estimated costs without breaching any contractual confidentiality, and ask for a response to this committee's request within 45 days.

The Chair: Very good. Thank you, Member Rosin.

We'll just have that motion in some way, shape, or form circulated to the members. If it hasn't gone to the clerk beforehand, that is okay. Given that the member has read it into the record, we can maybe just cut and paste it into the meeting chat. I'll just give it a moment.

Friends, we have a motion before us. I am looking to the floor and to the chat for any speakers to this motion.

Ms Rosin: Madam Chair, I'll just speak to my own motion briefly. Thanks so much for letting me put this up here. I appreciate our opposition's request to release the financials on this Keystone XL deal between TC Energy Corporation and us. As many Albertans know, it's been a big investment and a very important one for our province. The Keystone XL pipeline was going to increase our export capacities by over 830,000 barrels of crude every day, create 7,000 jobs for Albertans, and it was going to help all of North America, the Americans and us, achieve energy independence. So this is a very important investment that our government chose to make.

I would also like to note that on April 2 of last year Motion 18 was passed in the House, which supported a \$1.5 billion investment with the initial \$6 billion of potential loan guarantees to get this pipeline started. I would also like to note that that motion passed unanimously, with support from both sides of the House.

We know this investment was very important for Albertans, for our economy, and for the future of Alberta's oil and gas industry. As we obviously know, the new President, Joe Biden, has revoked the presidential permit on this pipeline. Because we have such a large investment in this project, Albertans do deserve to know where their money is spent, how much of it has been spent. I believe it's important as members of this committee and just, frankly, as ethical legislators to ensure that we have transparency in our governments and when we spend money that belongs to Albertans.

This motion will call on the Ministry of Energy, who obviously, of course, is responsible for this Keystone XL file, to release those financials to Albertans and make them public while also making sure that we don't breach any of the commercial contract sensitivities. Obviously, when we make contracts with private companies, there

are always some sensitivities that are involved because they have major implications on the market at times. This is the same as with the former crude-by-rail deal that was signed by the previous government. That was a \$3.7 billion deal, the full details of which were also never released, presumably for the same reason, in that some of those contracts included some commercial sensitivities that would have had large implications on the free market.

This motion will ensure that the financials and the cost exposure to Albertans and to taxpayers are released and made public and made fully transparent while also ensuring we don't breach any confidentiality between TC Energy Corporation and us.

The Chair: Thank you, Member Rosin.

I have Member Reid to speak to this.

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate it. I just need to concur with the comments of my colleague Member Rosin. You know, it's a balance between the interests of the private sector as well as transparency for Albertans, and I'm speaking in support of this motion because I believe it does accomplish both of those things, accountability and transparency on behalf of Albertans for the motions and the movements of this government as well as protecting the interests of our private sector. So I'm just speaking in favour of my colleague's motion.

Thank you.

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Chair, if I may.

The Chair: Please.

Mr. Schmidt: What the government caucus is trying to do here is some performance art, I guess, with the intent of appearing to be transparent while not actually providing any transparency to the people of Alberta. You know, if they want to conduct themselves that way, I guess that's fine, but of course I think that they should give the people of Alberta . . .

Mr. Gotfried: Madam Chair, a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order. Yes, please.

Mr. Gotfried: The member is trying to impugn members of the government caucus here, and I would ask that you perhaps make some comment on that.

The Chair: I do not have any comment on that at this time. I do not find a point of order.

Please proceed, Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: Thank you, Madam Chair. As I was saying, this motion is just intended to provide the appearance of transparency when, in fact, the government is covering up the details of the KXL deal that we were trying to get when we were examining members of Executive Council on November 17. I just want to refer people to the written questions that we were asking Executive Council at the time. We were asking Executive Council about briefings that were prepared, any analysis of risks and liabilities that cabinet was presented with. We wanted to get at what advice was given and how much the Premier and cabinet knew about the risks entailed with spending up to \$7.5 billion on the KXL deal.

The information that the members opposite are trying to present from the motion that they're presenting will be fully available in the budget, we expect, and that's not what we're trying to get at here. We're trying to get at what Executive Council knew, when they knew it, and look at all of the information that they had in front of them before they made this very expensive bet on Keystone XL.

The Chair: Thank you.

To the room and to the chat for any further speakers.

Ms Ganley: Madam Chair.

The Chair: Yes, please.

Ms Ganley: Thank you very much. I would just like to add a few comments here. Obviously, this motion is, you know, intended to appear or appears to be intended to appear like it's a response to what was asked. Again, what was asked was for a waiver of cabinet privilege so that members of the public could see the full information. What's being proposed in this motion is essentially to make publicly available information which will be made publicly available in any event. Frankly, we talk about this commercial sensitivity, but that doesn't have anything to do with this. The issue here is one of political sensitivity and the Premier not wanting us to see what the details are. Now, I won't speculate on the reasons that the Premier doesn't want us to see what the details are, but whatever those reasons are, they are certainly not the mandate of this committee. The mandate of this committee is to review government expenditures in the public interest. It is not the problem of any member of this committee – UCP, NDP, or otherwise – to be concerned about ensuring that the Premier can continue to hide.

9:25

You know, the members of this committee should be transparent with the public, should be fulfilling the mandate of this committee, which is, again, to oversee public expenditures. Executive Council has made it clear that the committee needs to make a request for waiver of privilege before such a request will be considered. We had made a request that the committee do that. Obviously, the UCP members of the committee have voted against that. Again, I won't speculate on their reasons.

The public is demanding a serious look at this deal, and this motion that is being proposed is not a serious look at this deal. It is a motion to give a veneer of transparency, and that veneer of transparency is itself incredibly transparent because it makes publicly available information publicly available. I mean, what is the point of that?

I would urge members to vote against this motion because it doesn't achieve anything at all. Those are my submissions.

The Chair: Thank you, Member.

I am now looking both to the room and to the chat for any other speakers to this motion.

Seeing none, I will now move on to calling the question on this motion. All in favour of this motion, please say. Any opposed?

Ms Ganley: I would request a recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay. As per previous practice, Mr. Clerk, if you could do a recorded vote by roll call, please.

Mr. Roth: Member Gotfried.

Mr. Gotfried: Aye.

Mr. Roth: Member Barnes.

Mr. Barnes: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Ganley.

Ms Ganley: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Guthrie.

Mr. Guthrie: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Reid.

Mr. Reid: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Renaud.

Ms Renaud: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Rosin.

Ms Rosin: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Rowswell.

Mr. Rowswell: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Schmidt.

Mr. Schmidt: No.

Mr. Roth: Member Hanson.

Mr. Hanson: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Member Toor.

Mr. Toor: Yes.

Mr. Roth: Chair, total for the motion, eight; total against, three.

The Chair: All right.

That motion has now passed.

Thank you, members. I will now move on to the final item on our agenda, which is the next meeting. The next meeting will follow the approved current meeting schedule of the committee or be at the call of the chair of Public Accounts.

With that, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Reid: So moved.

The Chair: Thank you, MLA Reid. This meeting is now adjourned at 9:28 a.m. Thank you, everyone.

[The committee adjourned at 9:28 a.m.]

