



STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSE SERVICES

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 2 – June 27, 2016



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-Eighth Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON HOUSE SERVICES

Hon. Corey Tochor, Chair
Saskatoon Eastview

Mr. Warren McCall, Deputy Chair
Regina Elphinstone-Centre

Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff
Saskatoon Willowgrove

Mr. David Forbes
Saskatoon Centre

Hon. Jeremy Harrison
Meadow Lake

Mr. Paul Merriman
Saskatoon Silverspring-Sutherland

Mr. Kevin Phillips
Melfort

Mr. Doyle Vermette
Cumberland

[The committee met at 14:59.]

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much, folks. Welcome to the House Services Committee, consideration of estimates. We're joined today by the Speaker with the Legislative Assembly and certain of the officers from the Legislative Assembly. Pursuant to rule 139(5), the estimates for the legislative branch of government were deemed referred. Those are to the Standing Committee on House Services on June 9th 2016 and June 1st 2016 respectively.

The following estimates are under consideration: vote 76, Advocate for Children and Youth; vote 34, Chief Electoral Officer; vote 57, Conflict of Interest Commissioner; vote 55, Information and Privacy Commissioner; vote 21, Legislative Assembly; vote 56, Ombudsman; vote 28, Provincial Auditor; and supplementary estimates for vote 57, Conflict of Interest Commissioner; and vote 55, Information and Privacy Commissioner.

For the purposes of today's meeting, we've got a greatest hits selection from the independent officers, starting with the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, estimates from the Chief Electoral Officer, the Information and Privacy Commissioner. Then we'll get into voting the committee resolutions for the committee.

We're joined today by government members, Mr. Merriman, Mr. Phillips, and Mr. Cheveldayoff, and from the opposition, Mr. Vermette and Mr. Forbes. And with that I turn things over to you, Mr. Speaker, to introduce officials and to take it away.

The Speaker: — Thank you, Chair. First up, we'll have Conflict of Interest Commissioner Ron Barclay to answer any questions that the committee might have.

**General Revenue Fund
Conflict of Interest Commissioner
Vote 57**

Subvote (CC01)

Mr. Barclay: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And before I start my submissions, I wanted to congratulate Mr. Tochor on his election as Speaker. We're all looking forward to working with you.

Members of the Standing Committee on House Services, I have with me Sandra Arberry, who is my deputy registrar, and she's appeared quite a number of times. I'm pleased to have her with me, and I think most of you have met her.

Our budget, which was approved by the Board of Internal Economy in January of 2016, in my respectful view, recognized the fiscal climate of the province. And really, the heart of the budget in January when we presented it was the lobbyist budget. As all of you were aware, when the lobbyist legislation was passed, it was put under the umbrella of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner. So it's been a new challenge for me.

And I'm very, very pleased to advise that we're going to launch the registry on August the 23rd. I understand that if the bill

hasn't been proclaimed, it's going to be in the next few days for August the 23rd, so it will be law at that time.

The company we hired to build the system, Engineered Code consulting provided a price quote for registry development of \$156,095 which was at the lower end of all the 16 submissions we received in response to the RFP [request for proposal] we issued. It is also considerably lower than other jurisdictions who have recently implemented a lobbyist system. I think we're very pleased, and I think we're able to have saved the province quite a considerable sum of money.

Out of the \$191,095 total project cost, we had to appear before the board. It was . . . What was the month that we appeared? It was December, and we had a special warrant for work that was to be completed by March the 31st. That was \$141,659, and this year's budget includes the cost of \$50,252 to complete the project.

Our website was launched on June the 1st, 2016, and we have received very positive feedback from various stakeholders and our colleagues across Canada. The registry itself is in the final stages of development. We are currently in the initial testing phase and expect this to continue into the next month. While the database is not terribly large, there are a number of interrelated components to it that make the design and development of it somewhat complex. And we're going to be undertaking rigorous testing to ensure that the registration, search, and administrative functions work smoothly and run effectively together once the database is launched.

So that's where we're at. Our budget has already been approved, and we were very pleased that we're able to save, we think, the government a considerable amount of money. Sandra and I are prepared to answer any questions in respect to the budget which has been approved.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Commissioner, Ms. Arberry. Certainly the commissioner rightly points out that the matters under consideration here today have already gone under a significant amount of discussion with the Board of Internal Economy. And again, we're here for a bit of a greatest hits selection from the commissioners, and certainly with the lobbyist registry and the progress. Therefore it was thought that it would be good to have yourself and Ms. Arberry here to discuss that.

Mr. Barclay: — We appreciate that, Mr. Deputy Chair.

The Deputy Chair: — So at that, Mr. Speaker, and officials, I'd open the floor to questions or comments for the folks here today. Mr. Forbes.

Mr. Forbes: — Well I think you've done a very thorough job . . .

Mr. Barclay: — Thank you very much.

Mr. Forbes: — . . . and every time you present you come forward, and over the past few years as we've tried to get this going, and you've worked diligently as well.

Mr. Barclay: — Well this is the lady that deserves all the credit.

Mr. Forbes: — Yes, very much and congratulations to you. And I feel we've got a pretty good understanding of it. It is interesting though, you were saying that you had 16 bids, and towards the bottom end was the one you took. What was the range? That must have been fascinating.

Mr. Barclay: — 305,000.

Mr. Forbes: — 305,000, yes. And you've also worked with other provinces in taking learning from them, their best practices. And so can you tell us a bit about . . .

Mr. Barclay: — Yes, we've worked with several provinces, particularly Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia. And we also got a lot of help from the feds, that one of their consultants, we were able to have him work with us for two weeks at no cost except his traveling expenses. The registrar in Ottawa made him available to us.

Particularly we have a very close relationship with Alberta because the legislation is somewhat the same, and they're going through the same process that we're going through. They're going to have a new . . . They're building a new registry, and they sat through our whole process. And so we've been working back and forth with them, and they've been very helpful. Sometimes several days a week we're talking to Alberta colleagues and they've been very helpful.

Mr. Forbes: — And one last question. You know, one of the things with IT [information technology] and software and that type of thing is that once you think you've got it all organized, then somebody sells the licence or somebody buys it or all of a sudden it opens the can of worms up again. Is yours, is it ours and we won't be seeing that kind of thing where there's a licence that can be sold . . .

Mr. Barclay: — It's ours.

Mr. Forbes: — All right.

Mr. Barclay: — One time we were looking at perhaps getting licences from other jurisdictions, and that was one of the factors that was a deterrent.

Mr. Forbes: — All right. Well good. I have no further questions.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much, Mr. Forbes. Anyone else? Seeing none, I think we'll get to the resolutions at the conclusion of committee. But certainly thank you very much for appearing today, and we'll move on to the next round of witnesses.

Mr. Barclay: — Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy, and members of the committee.

The Deputy Chair: — While we're being joined by another witness, I'd like to also welcome Mr. Steinley on the government side, Mr. Olauson, and Mr. Buckingham here to observe the proceedings.

**General Revenue Fund
Chief Electoral Officer
Vote 34**

Subvote (CE01)

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you again. Mr. Speaker, if you'd introduce your officials and we'll get under way.

The Speaker: — Yes, thank you, Chair. The Chief Electoral Officer, Dr. Boda, couldn't make it today, and I informed both sides of the Assembly of his replacement. With us together to consider the estimates is Jennifer Colin, and I'll let her introduce her officials as well and thank her for the good work that her office does.

Ms. Colin: — Thank you. So I am Jennifer Colin. I'm the deputy chief electoral officer for corporate services and electoral finance, and with me today I have Richard Hall, our office's research and policy assistant.

I'm very sure that each of you in this room is aware that the 28th provincial general election was held on April 4th. And this general election event spanned two fiscal years, which as I'm sure you can appreciate caused some additional challenges for our organization with respect to financial reporting and budgeting for our organization.

Our budget document does though, however, lay out eight priorities for our organization for the coming fiscal year. First and foremost was to administer voting for the 28th general election. Our second priority is to perform post-election closure activities and revisit and rebase our election readiness plans. We will then begin to process by reviewing and processing reimbursement for candidates and parties who are eligible for reimbursement.

We will then be establishing baseline measurements and engaging stakeholders in a performance evaluation, which will allow us to engage our stakeholders to determine their level of satisfaction with Elections Saskatchewan services and identify any processes which are urgently in need of redesign.

We will then begin to prepare and deliver our election reports. We plan on delivering four volumes. One will be a detailed voting results overview, an administrative overview, an accounting of all election costs including those incurred by parties, candidates, and our own organization. And we'll also prepare some recommendations for legislative change.

We are also going to begin to assess options for administrative modernization for our event delivery. It's something that election management bodies across the country are increasingly focused on. We are going to continue the process of developing and implementing our permanent register of voters. And we will also be developing a new strategic plan for the organization.

We've been before this committee a number of times, but I would like to just take a minute to speak about our budget in particular. We're a little bit different than other organizations in that our budget really is made up of two components. We have ongoing administrative costs which are relatively constant from

year to year, and then we have event costs which fluctuate quite significantly from year to year, depending on where we're at in our four-year cycle. And our budget document does go into considerable detail with all of these costs.

Our administrative costs are relatively constant from last year, coming in at approximately \$2.68 million. Our event budget is forecasted to be \$12.39 million. And this budget is split into thirds: one-third approximately for expenses incurred by returning officers in the field; one-third of that is related to election expense reimbursements for political parties and candidates; and the final third is associated with head office expenditures such as payroll processing and other activities that are not associated with any particular constituency.

So while we are aware of the difficult economic times this province is facing, we are also aware of our responsibility to ensure that the electoral process is available and accessible equally to all citizens of our province. We also need to concern ourselves with the integrity of the electoral process, and this is something that has garnered a great deal of concern at all three levels — provincially, nationally, and internationally — since the last general election this province has seen in 2011.

So we are committed to maintaining public trust in the legitimacy of the process used to elect those by maintaining integrity in all aspects of voter registration, checking voter qualifications before issuing ballots, maintaining the secrecy of the ballot, and the transparent counting and tabulating of voting results. And our budget request for the coming fiscal year reflects our commitment to provide a high integrity, widely accessible, democratic electoral process at the most reasonable cost possible.

At this point I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

[15:15]

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much, Ms. Colin. I'd open the floor to questions from committee members. Mr. Forbes, you're looking inquisitive.

Mr. Forbes: — Yes, I have one. No, I appreciate all the work and I appreciate the good work during the election, and your comments. I do have one, and I think I'm just going to . . . I don't know the proper way of doing it, but your comments about making sure people have the right to vote.

And there were a couple of polls in my riding where the turnout was 6 per cent and 9 per cent, which is just alarming. I mean that is shocking, actually. You normally think of 72 or 80 per cent. And so I think I heard you say you're going to be taking a look at how things went from the elections internally to see how things went. But to me, that was . . . I hope and I would even almost think, it should be a legislative change that when polls hit below 20 per cent there needs to be an investigation, because something drastically went wrong when you have six people out of 100 people voting. You know, something went . . . There was some really wrong choices. And I know that often . . . And people say it's up to the parties to get people to the ballot box, and I get that. I think that's true. But sometimes there's just systemic barriers that stop people from even, you know, getting

out to the vote.

So I don't know how prevalent that kind of turnout is. Have you heard of many polls where the turnout was below 10 per cent?

Ms. Colin: — We are just in the process of gathering all of the voter registrations that were taken in conjunction with voting. So that would be voters who had to register either at advance polls or on election day. Once we have all of that information entered into our system, then we can start to do that poll-by-poll analysis to determine whether perhaps the initial number that we had for that poll was incorrect, and people had moved out and the number of voters at that poll was actually a lot lower than we had initially estimated, or if there was something else going on. And that will be released in *The Statement of Votes, volume I*, that's scheduled to be published sometime this fall.

Mr. Forbes: — Yes, I'll be watching because I think . . . That is to me shocking, when we have the low . . . I can understand 50 because it was a low-turnout election actually. It was not unusual to have 40 per cent or 50 per cent. But 6 per cent is, you know . . . So I'll follow up with that. I just want to flag that. Thanks.

Ms. Colin: — We appreciate your comment because we share your concerns.

The Deputy Chair: — Thanks very much, Mr. Forbes. Any other committee members with questions, comments? Seeing none and again the action-packed agenda that we've got in front of us, thank you very much, Ms. Colin, Mr. Hall. And certainly thank you for the work you do with Elections Saskatchewan of which we all certainly are impacted. So thank you for that.

And we'll welcome the Information and Privacy Commissioner and officials for the next and final round of estimates under consideration here this afternoon.

General Revenue Fund Information and Privacy Commissioner Vote 55

Subvote (IP01)

The Deputy Chair: — We'll come back into order and resume session and turn things over to the Speaker once again to introduce the officer and officials that have joined us here at present.

The Speaker: — Thank you very much. It's my honour to introduce the Information and Privacy Commissioner that most of us have known, Ron Kruzeniski, I turn it over to you to answer any questions and to introduce your staff.

Mr. Kruzeniski: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With me today to my left is Pam Scott, the director of operations, and further to the right is Diane Aldridge, director of compliance. And we're pleased to be here and present to the committee.

If I can just take a few minutes to briefly present to you today, this appearance gives us an opportunity to talk very briefly about our accomplishments last year and our hopes and wishes and goals for the future.

In terms of our accomplishments last year, in the House this afternoon our annual report for the last fiscal year was tabled and certainly if members have not got their copy yet, I hope you get it soon. It certainly is excellent midnight reading. And just a few highlights coming out of last year.

And I think the major one was that we made proposals in our annual report about amendments to the freedom of information Act and the local authorities Act. And those Acts had not been significantly looked at for 23 and 24 years. As all of you will know, this spring session Bill 30 and 31 have been tabled in the House, received first reading, that deal with amendments to those two statutes. I am pleased, first of all, that the bills are there because it's taken 23 and 24 years to get us to this point to take a look at it. I'm pleased with many of the amendments that are in the bill, and I look forward to some debate now, during the summer and into the fall, as members look at the proposed amendments.

Some of the key amendments in the bill itself: it proposes a duty to assist, that a public body would have to assist a citizen who asks for information. Another duty is a duty to protect. Once you collect my personal information, then, as a public body, you have an obligation to protect it and safeguard it, either from outside hackers or inside snoopers. And the third one is a duty to report a breach. If there has been a break-in from the outside, so to speak, or if someone has been snooping, then the obligation to report that to the individuals that have been affected by it. My personal information is my information, and it's very helpful if I know it's been snooped into that I may take some protective action. And there's always a constant concern about identity theft along this line.

Another significant one is the definition of "employee" has been expanded to include those who are under contract, and there's proposals to include police forces. Saskatchewan and PEI [Prince Edward Island] are the last provinces to include police forces under the freedom of information umbrella.

So I'm very hopeful that the House will give it due consideration, and hopefully the amendments are of the type that all or almost all members of the House can support it.

Other highlights involve . . . We've set a goal that we try to get back to citizens, on average, 35 days 80 per cent of the time. And last year we basically met that. I do emphasize that's an average and there are cases that just take longer, as one can expect, and there others that we are able to resolve in a relatively quick fashion.

If you look at our annual report, there's numerous situations where we've worked collaboratively with various public bodies to educate their employees, and really I think there's two themes that go through this. We're very supportive of new employees in their orientation program have a unit or a section on access and privacy. And secondly, because some employees won't have to deal with access and privacy issues very often, it's really important that they're required to take a brief annual refresher so that they're just up on the rules.

We also made a presentation to the workers' compensation review committee. We're awaiting their report and we were proposing that the Workers' Compensation Board be fully

covered by the freedom of information Act and they not be covered by *The Health Information Protection Act*. We await their report and we'll look towards their recommendations.

For the coming year, we have a goal of reporting back to our citizens, on average, 33 days, 80 per cent of the time, and we just really believe that citizens are entitled to a fairly quick response to their concerns if they're asked for information or if they feel that their information has been breached. We'll continue collaborative efforts with many public bodies to get education programs out there, and we are embarking upon providing webinars. And I find webinars one of the most effective ways of being able to reach any person in the province whether they're east, west, north, or south. I guess the requirement is that they have access to the Internet and a computer, but a very effective way of getting the information out to them.

Finally, in our annual report, we've proposed some amendments to *The Health Information Protection Act*. There's a summarized version of those proposals in our annual report and we've labelled it, "Striking a Balance." And what we're trying to do is propose amendments that strike a balance between access and protection. If you collect my information, it's clear, my health information has to be used by doctors, nurses, and others. They need access. On the other hand, if you collect my personal information, then you really are obligated to protect it. And with our significant rate of moving to electronic systems and the ability of hackers throughout the world to get into those systems, we need to take strong efforts to protect it.

In our report we have proposals that go from A to Z, so there's 26 proposals, but just to highlight three of them. One we've suggested, as we have in the freedom of information Act, that there's a duty to report a breach, and if a breach of my personal information occurs, a duty to tell me that it's occurred if there's a risk of significant real harm. Also part of that would be reporting it to our office and reporting it to the professional body if the person is of a particular profession.

We also proposed expanding the definition of a trustee so that it covers the many various ways that health professionals organize themselves today. And if you operate a clinic, then you are going to be considered a trustee even though you may have unique arrangements. And you know, it's hard to get into the details there, but there are more unique arrangements as how professionals organize themselves out in the world.

And finally we proposed increasing the scope of what an employee is. An employee can be a person that is under contract to an organization or is an agent or in fact can be a volunteer. And I think of some health organizations who depend on volunteers. In that process of volunteering, they certainly become exposed to my personal health information and we want to impose obligations on them to protect it and keep it to themselves.

So those are just some of the highlights that are in the annual report. There also will be . . . Tomorrow we'll post on our website a detailed document outlining those proposals. It's about 77 pages long and certainly is even better midnight reading, as it goes into greater detail.

So thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving me this time to give a brief update of what we accomplished last year and what we'd like to accomplish this year. And I'd certainly be most pleased to answer questions of you or any members of the committee.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. And certainly Ms. Scott, Ms. Aldridge, welcome to committee. Any questions or comments for the officials at hand? Mr. Forbes.

Mr. Forbes: — Just a comment and just a thank you in the office on the good work, and I appreciated seeing the new legislation come forward, and it seems to be thorough. We'll take a look at it over the summer, of course. But the one that caught my eye was bringing the municipal police forces into the legislation as an important part. So thank you for your good work.

[15:30]

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much for that, Mr. Forbes. And any response to that, Commissioner Kruzeniski?

Mr. Kruzeniski: — Well I am, you know, pleased that that particular proposal was in there, and I know that when you sort of add scope to a particular statute that there can be some apprehension. But it strikes me in this case, we have about eight jurisdictions across the country to refer to, where police forces have been under the umbrella of access information for some time and certainly this will allow access to things like policies, budgets, procedures.

There's a series of exemptions centering around investigations or where, you know, if information will harm the life of a peace officer or somebody else, then it's exempt from disclosure. So the proposal comes along with a sense of balance in terms of what won't be disclosed and what can be disclosed.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you for that, Mr. Commissioner. Seeing no further questions or comments at this time, I'd just say thank you very much, Mr. Commissioner and officials, certainly for the good and diligent work, and as well for the great summer reading, midnight reading list suggestions. We'll see what we can do to take you up on that.

But with that, again thank you very much, and you're able to leave now as we begin consideration of the resolutions attached to this particular committee.

Mr. Kruzeniski: — Thank you.

The Deputy Chair: — Again thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and committee members. We'll now proceed to consideration of the individual resolutions attached to each of the estimates and the votes contained therein, and then we'll be moving to consideration of a report that will hit the House tomorrow.

**General Revenue Fund
Advocate for Children and Youth
Vote 76**

The Deputy Chair: — But first off, we've got vote 76, Advocate for Children and Youth, found on page 119 in your

Estimates book. Advocate for Children and Youth, subvote (CA01) in the amount of \$2,378,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — We've got a non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$180,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted, just so you know.

Then for the overall vote, I would now ask a member of the committee to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2017, the following sums for the Advocate for Children and Youth, in the amount of \$2,378,000.

Mr. Phillips: — So move.

The Deputy Chair: — Mr. Phillips. Thank you very much. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Resolution is carried. Thank you very much, Mr. Park.

**General Revenue Fund
Chief Electoral Officer
Vote 34**

The Deputy Chair: — We now move on to vote 34, the Chief Electoral Officer, vote found on page 121 of your Estimates book. Chief Electoral Officer, subvote (CE01) in the amount of \$15,068,000. There is no vote as this is statutory. As well, there is a further non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$101,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for informational purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

**General Revenue Fund
Conflict of Interest Commissioner
Vote 57**

The Deputy Chair: — Moving right along, vote 57, Conflict of Interest Commissioner, page 123 in the Estimates book. Conflict of Interest Commissioner, subvote (CC01) in the amount of \$702,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Carried. Conflict of Interest Commissioner, vote 57, \$702,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2017, the following sums for Conflict of Interest Commissioner in the amount of \$702,000.

Mr. Merriman.

The Deputy Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — March
Conflict of Interest Commissioner
Vote 57**

The Deputy Chair: — Now for consideration of supplementary estimates from March 2016, vote 57, Conflict of Interest Commissioner found on page 10 in the Supplementary Estimates book. Conflict of Interest Commissioner, subvote (CC01) in the amount of \$142,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Carried. Conflict of Interest Commissioner, vote 57, \$142,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2016, the following sums for Conflict of Interest Commissioner in the amount of \$142,000.

Mr. Merriman.

The Deputy Chair: — Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Information and Privacy Commissioner
Vote 55**

The Deputy Chair: — Whipping right along, vote 55, Information and Privacy Commissioner, page 125. Information and Privacy Commissioner, subvote (IP01) in the amount of \$133,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — That's carried. Pardon me, 1,333,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you, committee members. Rob's just putting me through the paces here, so I'm just keeping up best I can. There's also a non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$22,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

So Information and Privacy Commissioner, vote 55, \$1,333,000. There we go. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2017, the following sums for Information and Privacy Commissioner in the amount of \$1,333,000.

Mr. Cheveldayoff. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — The motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — March
Information and Privacy Commissioner
Vote 55**

The Deputy Chair: — There is also a supplementary estimate for the Information and Privacy Commissioner, vote 55, found on page 10 in the Supplementary Estimates. Information and Privacy Commissioner, subvote (IP01) in the amount of \$45,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2016, the following sums for Information and Privacy Commissioner in the amount of \$45,000.

Mr. Phillips. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Legislative Assembly
Vote 21**

The Deputy Chair: — Vote 21, Legislative Assembly, page 127 of your Estimates book, central management and services, subvote (LG01) in the amount of \$3,383,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Carried. Office of the Speaker and Board of Internal Economy, subvote (LG07) in the amount of \$444,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried. Legislative Assembly Services, subvote (LG03) in the amount of \$5,579,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Payments and allowances to individual members, subvote (LG05) in the amount of \$16,257,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

Committees of the Legislative Assembly, subvote (LG04) in the amount of \$349,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Caucus operations, subvote (LG06) in the amount of \$2,178,000. There is no vote as this is statutory.

And a non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of \$68,000. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

The overall vote for the Legislative Assembly, vote 21, \$9,755,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2017, the following sums for the Legislative Assembly, in the amount of \$9,755,000.

Mr. Merriman. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — The motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Provincial Auditor
Vote 28**

The Deputy Chair: — We'll move on to vote 28, Provincial Auditor, page 133 in the Estimates book. Provincial Auditor, subvote (PA01) in the amount of \$7,980,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Unforeseen expenses, subvote (PA02) in the amount of \$545,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Provincial Auditor, vote 28, \$8,525,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2017, the following sums for the Provincial Auditor in the amount of \$8,525,000.

Mr. Merriman. All right, there we go. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — The motion is carried.

**General Revenue Fund
Ombudsman
Vote 56**

The Deputy Chair: — Carrying on, vote 56, Ombudsman, page 131 in the Estimates book, Ombudsman, subvote (OM01) in the amount of \$3,686,000, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Motion is carried. There is also a non-appropriated expense adjustment in the amount of zero dollars. Non-appropriated expense adjustments are non-cash adjustments presented for information purposes only. No amount is to be voted.

So Ombudsman, vote 56, \$3,686,000. I'll now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31st, 2017, the following sums for the Ombudsman in the amount of \$3,686,000.

[15:45]

Hon. Mr. Cheveldayoff: — I so shall move.

The Deputy Chair: — Mr. Cheveldayoff. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — The motion is carried. All right, committee members, I believe you have before you a draft of the second report of the Standing Committee on House Services. We require a member to move the following motion:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on House Services be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

Mr. Merriman: — Mr. Chair, I move:

That the second report of the Standing Committee on House Services be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Merriman. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — The motion is carried. All right. Any closing remarks from committee members? Seeing none, let the music do the talking. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Vermette: — I'll move.

The Deputy Chair: — So moved, Mr. Vermette. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Deputy Chair: — Thank you very much, committee members.

[The committee adjourned at 15:47.]