



STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 37 – October 31, 2006



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-fifth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
2006**

Mr. Elwin Hermanson, Chair
Rosetown-Elrose

Ms. Joanne Crofford, Deputy Chair
Regina Rosemont

Mr. Lon Borgerson
Saskatchewan Rivers

Mr. Ken Cheveldayoff
Saskatoon Silver Springs

Mr. Michael Chisholm
Cut Knife-Turtleford

Mr. Andy Iwanchuk
Saskatoon Fairview

Mr. Kim Trew
Regina Coronation Park

[The committee met at 10:30.]

The Chair: — Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. We'll commence with our Public Accounts Committee meeting. I'd like to welcome each one of you here. This is the first session that we will have during . . . our first meeting, I should say, during the fall session. As you know the legislature has now put together a calendar, and hopefully that will also help us to plan our affairs a little better. We have one item on the agenda because we only have a short period of time, sort of a little bit after the official opposition caucus starts and a little bit before the NDP [New Democratic Party] caucus starts. But perhaps we'll be more focused and stay on topic and accomplish much during the time that we do have.

Public Hearing: Liquor and Gaming Authority

The Chair: — The one item on our agenda this morning is Liquor and Gaming Authority. As some of you may recall, we dealt with this chapter in the 2005 report volume 3 quite some time ago. The auditor tells me it might have been last May. We will be dealing only with part B of chapter 7 in that volume. And I've asked the auditor's office if they would just quickly remind us of the subject matter that we were dealing with, and then we'll go on to chapter 7 as well but in the latest volume from the Provincial Auditor. That's volume 1 of the 2006 report.

We have also the acting president and chief executive officer of Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming, Mr. Barry Lacey, and several officials from his office with us. We welcome you here, as we do all of our regulars at Public Accounts. The procedure will be that we will ask the deputy provincial auditor, Mr. Bashar Ahmad, if he will refresh our memory on the old chapter and review the second chapter with us. And then, Mr. Lacey, we would be pleased to have you introduce your colleagues and respond. We'll keep it as tight as we can so that members will have opportunity to ask questions. Mr. Ahmad.

Mr. Ahmad: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning. Chapter 7, B, begins on page 186. We note in this chapter that SIGA [Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority] has made good progress to address all of our past recommendations, but some work remains. We continue to encourage SIGA to provide effective guidance to employees and to ensure employees comply with established policies.

The exhibit on page 202 to 205 shows the status of our past recommendations as at March 31, 2005. There are 27 recommendations. Of those, 13 are fully implemented; 13 are partially implemented; and 1 recommendation was not evaluated as part of our work during the year. This recommendation is being followed up in our current audit. That is for the year end March 2006.

On page 195, we make two new recommendations to include SIGA's information technology area. We recommend that management review and the board approve an IT [information technology] strategic plan for SIGA. Also we recommend the SIGA's board approve SIGA's IT policies and procedures. Doing so will help SIGA address society threats and risks. We know that SIGA's employees have prepared a draft IT strategic

plan and draft IT policies and procedures. Senior management and board however do not review and approve the drafts to the plan of the draft IT policies and procedure. That concludes my review of this chapter. Thank you.

The Chair: — Just carry on with the second chapter as well.

Mr. Ahmad: — Chapter 8 . . . wrong chapter. Chapter 7 of 2006 report volume 1 begins on page 87. In this chapter, we assess the adequacy of Liquor and Gaming Authority's processes to promote responsible use of beverage alcohol. Liquor and Gaming regulates and controls beverage alcohol in Saskatchewan. The Alcohol and Gaming Regulation Act, 1997 authorizes Liquor and Gaming to develop or promote programs to encourage responsible use of beverage alcohol.

Liquor and Gaming faces a challenge to promote this possible use of liquor while generating revenue from the sale of liquor. We looked at how Liquor and Gaming was meeting this challenge. We found that at December 31, 2005, Liquor and Gaming had many good practices, but it need needed to improve its practices in some areas as well. We make three recommendations in this chapter.

Our first recommendation on page 94 requires Liquor and Gaming to formally assign responsibility for encouraging responsible use of liquor. Currently Liquor and Gaming relies on an informal committee to consider social responsibility issues and has not formally assigned responsibility to anyone from managing activities that promote responsible use of alcohol.

Our second recommendation on page 94 requires Liquor and Gaming to prepare a complete plan by encouraging a responsible use of alcohol. Liquor and Gaming carries out a number of activities that directly or indirectly promote responsible use. For example Liquor and Gaming provides the public and permit holders with education and training about the responsible sale, use of alcohol, and provide funding to other agencies to carry out activities relating to responsible use of alcohol. However it should analyze different methods of encouraging responsible use and . . . [inaudible] . . . how it will proceed based on those analyses.

Liquor and Gaming should establish an implement plan to carry out its activities. It should set out how and who will carry out this plan and set milestone dates.

Our third recommendation requires Liquor and Gaming to continue its research and development of performance measures and targets to evaluate its performance in encouraging responsible use. To ensure its plans are achieving the desired results, Liquor and Gaming needs to set out performance measures and targets. It is a challenging task for Liquor and Gaming because initiatives to promote socially responsible use of liquor are aimed at modifying human behaviour. Liquor and Gaming told us management continues to work on developing performance measures and targets.

That concludes my overview of this chapter. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Ahmad, for that report. Again

welcome, Mr. Lacey, and if you'd introduce your colleagues and respond, then we'll get on with questions.

Mr. Lacey: — Yes thank you. I'd like to introduce, to my left here, Jim Engel, our executive director of our policy and planning; to my right, Jolene Tytlandsvik, vice-president of gaming operations. And behind me — working from my right to my left — Paul Weber, vice-president of retail liquor operations; Lisa Ann Wood, executive director of human relations; and Dale Markewich, vice-president of regulatory compliance.

I just have a few brief opening comments in regards to the SIGA chapter in the Provincial Auditor's fall 2005 report. We're pleased that, for the first time since 2000, the Provincial Auditor has concluded that SIGA has adequate rules and procedures to safeguard public resources, except for the matters described in that chapter. And that's in contrast to previous reports where the Provincial Auditor's opinion was that SIGA did not have adequate rules and procedures.

SIGA has accomplished much since 2000 in terms of correcting past practices. It has developed and implemented a comprehensive set of policies and has a business and strategic plan in place. These developments have significantly improved SIGA's financial accountability, and we continue to work with SIGA to further strengthen and develop its processes. SIGA's net income continues to grow, and it remains a major employer of First Nations people in the province.

With respect to the Provincial Auditor's spring 2006 report, I would like to thank the Provincial Auditor's office for reviewing SLGA's processes and encouraging the responsible use of beverage alcohol. As you know, the responsible use of beverage alcohol is an important part of SLGA's mandate statement. We're pleased the Provincial Auditor found that SLGA has adequate processes in place to encourage the responsible use of beverage alcohol, and we accept the auditor's recommendations for further improvements. SLGA is committed to ensuring that beverage alcohol continues to be distributed in a socially responsible manner. My colleagues and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. We'll open the floor for questions. The Liquor and Gaming critic, Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to welcome the temporary deputy minister, I gather, and your officials here today. We're talking about the SIGA report today by the Provincial Auditor. And I would certainly agree that SIGA has made huge steps forward in their accountability and their procedures by which they account for their operations and the rules that they are putting place.

They did have a number of difficulties, and the management changes that took place there made a huge difference. And I think the new management that they have in place continues to make a huge difference. Even though they, at the present time, don't have a new president in place, it's my understanding that the process is ongoing and to replace the president, to find a full-time head there.

It's an interesting relationship between SLGA and SIGA. In

some contexts SLGA is the regulator for SIGA. And yet in other areas the government, not specifically SLGA but Saskatchewan Gaming is a competitor to SIGA. So government, while not SLGA, government plays the role of both regulator and competitor. And I know that causes some difficulties at times in how things are done and how things are evaluated, even if not in actual practice at least in perceptions at times.

So when SLGA is looking at the operations of SIGA and has certain expectations of them, I wonder how SLGA goes about presenting those expectations and how do they go about assisting SIGA in meeting those expectations?

Mr. Lacey: — There's a number of, I guess, documents that set out the expectations with respect to SIGA and SIGA's relationship with SLGA. And then there would be a number of, I would call, informal practices as well that are in place with respect to moving that forward.

I guess I would start off with the broader arrangement being the gaming framework agreement between the province and the FSIN [Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations] that really establishes and puts the framework around First Nation gaming in Saskatchewan and First Nation gaming casinos here in Saskatchewan.

A subsidiary to that agreement is the casino operating agreement, which is really where the relationship between SLGA and SIGA is spelt out with respect to how the two parties will interact and what are the various responsibilities of the two parties in that relationship. So that would speak to, you know, the setting of the budget and how that process works with respect to SIGA and SLGA's involvement in there. It would speak to SLGA's role over conduct and management of the electronic gaming machines in the SIGA casinos and how those policies and procedures are established.

So from a broad piece, I would say that would be the framework that sets up that relationship and the expectations that fall out of that piece. On a more of a dialogue basis, and how do we interact with SIGA, I would say that almost on a daily basis our staff are in contact with SIGA officials on a variety of issues — whether that's establishment of policies and procedures, discussion of their year-to-date operating results, explanation of their variances. And I would consider that to be at the kind of the policy analyst level.

As we move up through the organization we have, I guess between the two presidents' offices of SLGA and SIGA, we have established regular monthly meetings where obviously that unfolds. And as well we do attend the SIGA monthly board meetings as well where there's an opportunity to engage in dialogue with the SIGA board, talk about issues of the day that either we might have or they might have, discussion of expectations where SIGA's at, etc.

Mr. D'Autremont: — How would you describe your relationship — SLGA and SIGA? Is it co-operational or is it confrontational?

Mr. Lacey: — I would characterize it as very co-operative. I think we have a very good relationship in place with the SIGA

management team and SIGA officials over at SIGA and the SIGA board. That's not to say at times that we might disagree on a particular issue or a particular item that's under discussion, but my view is, is that we can have frank and straightforward debates and discussions on those matters. And so from that perspective I would characterize it as a healthy relationship.

Mr. D'Autremont: — When SLGA has expectations or requirements of a certain reporting method, accountability, do you sit down with SIGA and say, here is what we want? Or is it, here is what we need, but here is how you can go about in complying with that? And what impact, what influence does their desires have on that type of requirement?

Mr. Lacey: — If you go back to the events of 2000, there were a number of directives where I would say where we issued specific policies and procedures that we had indicated to SIGA, you must follow.

I would say though, more recently most of the policies and procedures and direction that's being provided is in conversations with SIGA with respect to areas where SIGA needs to develop policy. The relationship really has been for SIGA to develop those policies in discussions with us with respect to what our expectations are, to bring those forward to SLGA then for review and approval. So I would characterize the process more of being SIGA developing the policies and then bringing them forward to SLGA for approval.

And then through that process, before they reach SLGA, having the conversations about their issues, our issues with respect to perhaps a particular control issue and into the approval process, if there's some issues with respect to the final policy that's been brought forward, obviously we would engage in that conversation with them to try, to try and reach a policy that both of us have a comfort level with and believe it's achieving both of our objectives.

Mr. D'Autremont: — When you're in negotiations or discussions, does SLGA have discussions with FSIN and what their expectations are for SIGA?

Mr. Lacey: — I would say largely, with respect to the operations of SIGA, a conversation does not occur with the FSIN with respect to the daily operations of SIGA. SIGA, very much from that perspective, operates independently from the FSIN, and so our conversation is limited to SIGA.

With respect to some of the broader issues like the expansion of gaming to new casino sites that have been announced in Swift Current and on the White Cap Reserve, in broader issues of that nature, that kind of touch on the gaming framework agreement, certainly there, we would be engaging the FSIN in conversations with respect to those broader policy pieces on First Nations gaming that obviously would impact SIGA.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Because I know, in some discussions with the First Nations community regarding gaming, they have a concern that, as was expressed to me, casinos — just a Crown corporation. They view it more as an arm of government rather than as an arm of FSIN. And they have concerns about the role that SLGA plays as a competitor rather than as, well as a competitor and as a regulator, and have a great deal of concern

that one organization plays both roles. And their concern is that perhaps there needs to be a different way to do either one or the other — the gaming side of it or the regulatory side. Now I understand the gaming side through the Saskatchewan government is done through Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation, but they don't seem to differentiate between SLGA and SGC [Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation], and so that's an area of conflict for them. Has that been raised with SLGA?

Mr. Lacey: — I would say on occasions that broader issue has been raised with respect to, I guess as you framed it, the more broader government and government's broader involvement in gaming operations and gaming regulation.

I think often in the conversations that we have is really government's involvement in gaming really revolves around the province's responsibility under the Criminal Code of Canada. Only the province can conduct electronic gaming as the Criminal Code lays out. So with respect to, I guess, SLGA's involvement with SIGA, the machines in SIGA are SLGA's machines. We run and operate them, so to speak, to ensure that the requirements of the Criminal Code are met. With respect to SGC, we have a separate Crown corporation so obviously a government corporation that also is running electronic gaming machines pursuant to the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. In the auditor's report, talks about ancillary operations, perhaps the auditor can answer this, or perhaps you can answer this, Mr. Lacey. What is included in ancillary operations on page 191 . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Sorry.

Mr. Lacey: — Maybe I can just touch on it briefly, and then the Provincial Auditor's office or perhaps Ms. Tytlandsvik might be able to expand on that.

Typically when we're talking about ancillary operations, we are referring to the restaurant that might exist in a casino. If they have a gift shop, we'd be referring to the gift shop in that casino. And I believe if they have a lounge or bar that's associated with that casino as well, that would fall under the heading of ancillary operations. So basically any type of business activity that's not directly related to the gaming floor.

Mr. D'Autremont: — When there's a loss reported in those operations, is it differentiated as to where that loss occurs — gift shop, liquor sales, restaurant? Is it broke down at all?

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — It's not broke down in the public report, but SIGA definitely has records of that detail, yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — I know in a number of retail operations at times they use what are called loss leaders — operations where they know and understand that they are not going to make a profit in that area, but it's used as an enticement to bring customers in to make a profit in some other area. Is this possibly what is happening within the SIGA operations in those areas, that they are not making a profit?

Mr. Lacey: — Yes, in SIGA's case, SIGA very much would view this as a, I guess you could call it, a loss leader. I understand that with many other casino operations, that is not

necessarily atypical for casinos to have some of these areas be loss leaders to basically complement their main line of business and enhance their customers' experience at the casino.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Is the problem here then not so much that these are not making a profit but rather that SIGA does not have clearly defined policies and goals for those areas that explain what their operation is?

Mr. Lacey: — That would be certainly our view with respect to the ancillary operations at SIGA. I mean at the beginning of the year, obviously they'll establish a budget for SIGA, and that budget very well may see a loss. So they're expecting a loss for the reasons that you've articulated.

I think the issues that the Provincial Auditor has raised in his report really go to strengthening some of the control framework with respect to the operation of ancillary operations at SIGA, which is a piece that SIGA recognizes and is continuing to work on improving that control framework with respect to ancillary operations.

Mr. D'Autremont: — In some of the areas of operation within SIGA, that they have a fairly intensive training program. In discussions with them, that they run more people than a comparable casino operation someplace else would be doing so because they're using it as a training program for First Nations people working in that area. Would that also be happening within these other operations?

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — I'm sorry. Do you mean more globally on their slot operations?

Mr. D'Autremont: — Yes. In general they tend to run a higher percentage of employees than say a comparable casino operation someplace else would run.

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — Our experience has been because they are spread out; they have four locations. And when you compare that to SGC for example, it's a much less segregated organization. So I wouldn't say that they have a significant number of staff that are training positions. I think it's more a factor of their geographic location.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well SGC operates two locations — Regina and Moose Jaw — so they are somewhat diversified in that sense. And I don't know how casinos go about measuring this. Is it dollars of return or the amount of floor space that they have per the number of employees? How does SIGA compare then with SGC or with operations in other jurisdictions?

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — Our experience they're comparable to SGC with the exception of them having two extra locations. So we certainly do, do comparisons that way to ensure that SIGA isn't way overstaffed or vice versa, way understaffed.

Mr. D'Autremont: — I know in my discussions with them, they told me that they run more staff than, say, a comparable operation in the US [United States] would do because they're using it as an opportunity to train the people from First Nations in that environment and to prepare them for employment opportunities outside of the casino operation.

Mr. Lacey: — I'd just like to make one comment there with respect to the fact there is recognition under the Gaming Framework Agreement that one of the purposes and intent of First Nation casinos here in the province is to provide opportunities for First Nation peoples and learning and training experiences you articulate. I know in conversations that we've had with SIGA for example, introduction of TITO or ticket in, ticket out where there is less of a staffing requirement with respect to changing the change at slot machines, that SIGA certainly is interested in retaining those individuals and moving them to other functions.

I think the point that Ms. Tytlandsvik's making is that yes, I think I would agree with the statement that more generally SIGA is a training ground for First Nations people. They do undertake quite a bit of training. When you look at I guess from a broad perspective their staffing levels compared to other casinos, I wouldn't say that they're way outside the range. But there's definitely a recognition that yes, that is part of the role and function of the SIGA casinos is to provide those opportunities and those training opportunities in particular.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. I think that's a very important role for SIGA to play, is that training avenue and providing opportunities and experience for First Nations people. And that's why in some of the commentary of the losses in the ancillary areas that perhaps part of that lack of profit is the fact that it's being used as a training ground as well, and maybe it needs to be differentiated that part of this money is actually for training rather than simply being an operational loss within that operation.

The report recommends some changes or the approvals of the information technology strategies within SIGA. What has happened since this report was written? Has there been any significant changes in that area?

Mr. Lacey: — SIGA's continuing work in this area. One of the unfortunate events that have occurred, I believe subsequent to the issuance of this report, is that SIGA has lost their vice-president of IT, so the vice-president of that area. So while SIGA's continuing to work on that area, one of their objectives here in the short and near term is to fill that senior position in this area such that they can move forward with respect to these two recommendations. In our conversations with SIGA, they're targeting to have achieved and addressed the Provincial Auditor's recommendations by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What areas of failure were there within their IT component that required some reconsiderations in that area?

Mr. Lacey: — I'll let Ms. Tytlandsvik talk about this in further detail. It's my understanding that this is in part that they don't have formal policies and procedures in place that have been approved or a formal IT plan. That's not to say that they don't have processes in place that they're actually undertaking from a day-to-day perspective, but my understanding is, is what the Provincial Auditor's raising here is the need to formalize some of the things that are being done there and then secondly that there needs to be approval of that piece.

So I don't know if that answers your question. If you want to

get into specifics but more broadly, I understand. Really it's the nature of needing to formalize many of the things that are currently occurring.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well I know from touring some of the casinos that they seem to have a fairly strong IT component there in both surveillance and recording their day-to-day operations. So I'm not 100 per cent sure as to what the problem is here, if it's just simply having the same procedures in place at all locations. Is that what the problem is, that perhaps one casino is doing things slightly different than the other? So I'm not exactly sure what the day-to-day problem with their IT sector is.

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — I think the auditor is referring to a very wide array of information technology items, for example, access to your financial system. Again it's a computer system, so there's password requirements, for example, how often you would change your password, the length of the password.

So there's a very wide array — everything all the way up to something as high level as a disaster recovery plan. For example if head office burned down, do you have systems in place that you could recover your data and continue operating?

So I think . . . In my opinion the auditor is expressing a number of areas. And as Barry mentioned, the fact . . . We're not aware of any failures per se, but just the documentation of those policies and procedures.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Has SLGA taken a look to ensure then that SIGA understands what the need is and that there is a need for redundancy of their systems, off-site storage of not just headquarters but obviously the casino operations themselves, for their backup systems and recovery? Is SIGA following through on these?

You mentioned that the vice president of their IT operation has left and I am assuming that they are looking for someone new. But they are moving ahead on this, are they?

Ms. Tytlandsvik: — Yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Some of the issues in question within the auditor's report deals with public relations, events, sponsorships, and those kind of issues. And I know this has been an issue not just with SIGA but with some of the Crown corporations as well, that they have failed in the past to provide the proper documentation as to who were the beneficiaries of sponsorships — particularly tickets and those kind of things — and what the benefit to the corporation or in this case to SIGA was involved in offering those sponsorships or event tickets.

Has SIGA made the necessary changes to be able to document those types of sponsorships and tickets, and the reasons for them, since this report was written?

Mr. Lacey: — I think the report identifies two things. Firstly, SIGA previous to this year had done a significant amount of work with respect to putting policies and procedures in place around marketing, promotions, and sponsorships. The Provincial Auditor's report, I believe, in here flags a few instances where those existing policies, where there were some

transactions where those policies were not followed. With respect to that item in the last year and our own audit over 2006, we've seen significant improvement by SIGA in that area. And in our view SIGA is in compliance with those policies that they've put in place.

The second piece that the Provincial Auditor has flagged here is where . . . And I should mention that those policies that SIGA put in place a number of years ago probably cover the vast majority of SIGA's marketing, promotion, and sponsorship activity.

In this report, the Provincial Auditor as a second piece has flagged some other areas where policies were not in place at that point in time, that perhaps SIGA needs to develop policies for those other areas as well. And I believe that for a number of those items, SIGA has now developed policy and put policies in place with respect to those other areas and are continuing to work on the remainder.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Has SLGA been in discussions with SIGA and perhaps FSIN as to some of the issues that they see as cultural necessities, that they would, I think would come under in these categories as sponsorships? And if so, where are those talks at?

Mr. Lacey: — Certainly we've had conversations with SIGA with respect to the nature of their operations and the nature of some of their expenditures as it relates to cultural items. The gaming framework agreement in itself recognizes that — that by the nature of SIGA's operations, there is that cultural aspect to it.

So certainly we've had those conversations with SIGA. And in reviewing SIGA's policies and procedures and also reviewing SIGA's expenditures, we certainly take that into consideration. And through conversations with SIGA, obviously have a conversation around those items.

Mr. D'Autremont: — They still seem to be a bone of contention. I know in my discussions with SIGA, they raise it quite often, particularly the issues surrounding tobacco — not the smoking in casinos but the giving of tobacco as a token of recognition to elders at ceremonies and that kind of event. And there seems to be some difficulty within SLGA as to how to account for those kinds of gifts. And I'm just wondering, is that moving forward in a positive manner that is satisfactory to everyone involved?

Mr. Lacey: — I'd mentioned, I think, earlier in my remarks that I believe we do have a very good relationship with SIGA; although at times there's items where we may not necessarily always be in agreement. However, in my view there's always that opportunity to have that debate and discussion with SIGA.

I think you've raised a good example with respect to the smoking piece. I guess it would be our view and perspective that we do recognize that tobacco is a very important part of First Nations culture and some of the ceremonies associated with that. So we do support, I guess, from that perspective, SIGA's purchases of tobacco with respect to some of those ceremonies and activities that are undertaken — gifts to elders as an example.

Our conversations with SIGA have really centred around ensuring that there is accountability with respect to those purchases, that you're able to demonstrate the purpose of that purchase. And I think by and large most of the tobacco purchases of SIGA we have seen as appropriate. And in those few instances where it has been an issue has been in areas where SIGA has been unable to provide support with respect to what specific purpose that tobacco purchase was for, be it for an elder attending a prayer ceremony, be it for a SIGA powwow, etc.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay, thank you. A question for the auditor. In reviewing SIGA's operations and in discussions with SIGA, how closely does the Provincial Auditor work with SIGA to meet and understand the requirements that are being requested of them by the auditor's office and by SLGA?

The Chair: — Mr. Ahmad.

Mr. Ahmad: — Mr. Chairman, we meet with the senior management and board . . . [inaudible] . . . the audit committee quite often and we explain to them what the issues are and how those issues can be addressed. We don't give them the policies and procedures; we give them broader guidelines. And they do understand the issues and there's always co-operation and understanding on both sides.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Do you work with SIGA to help to develop means by which they can meet those requirements?

Mr. Ahmad: — Because of professional difficulties, we cannot give them policies and then go and audit them. But we do provide broader guidelines how they can achieve those objectives.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay, thank you. I think that's all the questions I have on this area.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. D'Autremont. I just have a couple of questions that I'd like to ask myself.

Mr. D'Autremont said that he wouldn't raise the issue of smoking, so I will. I know that's been a contentious issue. I'm just wondering if you can report on whether there's been any progress. I know that there's a jurisdictional issue that . . . you know, who has the jurisdiction over smoking regulations on-reserve. And that's a federal issue and the province's smoking legislation has been considered to be not in effect on reserves and therefore on casinos on-reserve. However I am wondering, can you report whether SIGA itself is looking out for the health and safety of workers and patrons, if they're looking at making their facilities non-smoking facilities, you know, regardless of whose jurisdiction and who might have the say in all of those issues?

Mr. Lacey: — I'm not aware of SIGA having taken any action in that area or in the near- to short-term planning any action in that area to my knowledge.

The Chair: — Okay. Does SLGA take any position on it? Are you trying to negotiate anything?

Mr. Lacey: — The smoking issue from SLGA's perspective we

really see that as a ministry of Health issue. It's my understanding the ministry of Health recognizes the rights of First Nations to set their own laws within their First Nation or reserves. So I guess we very much take Health's lead on that piece and we would not have a direct and active involvement in that piece.

The Chair: — Okay. The other issue, as was mentioned, there is not a full-time appointed president to SIGA because the past president stepped down. In the auditor's report there is some concern over the fact that the president did authorize travel expenses for himself without going to the board and also some expenses for board members, individual board members, without going to the board. Can you first of all tell me if that matter is now corrected and that no longer happens?

Mr. Lacey: — Yes. Subsequent to the year under which this report was under the review, which is the year ended March 2005, we have conducted further audits ourselves of SIGA. And from our perspective this issue really resides around delegation of authority and appropriate people approving these invoices. And from our perspective SIGA is in compliance with its policies and procedures in that area.

The Chair: — So that you're saying that they are now complying with the procedures as recommended by the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Lacey: — That's what our findings are indicating as of March 2006.

The Chair: — Can you tell me whether the outgoing president . . . Was there any resistance on his part to accepting these changes?

Mr. Lacey: — No. From my perspective SIGA has always been very supportive of policies and procedures around this area. In fact the policies and procedures that govern these particular items are policies and procedures that have been approved by SIGA's board and the senior management team there. I think the ones that have been identified in this report are really items, for the lack of a better word, I guess I'd say it slipped through the crack, that there was an individual . . . [inaudible] . . . that wasn't following appropriate policies and procedures.

SIGA recognized that and worked hard through 2006 to rectify some of the areas where they could improve in that area to ensure they were complying with their own policy. So that hasn't been an issue with respect to acceptability at SIGA.

The Chair: — Can you then assure the committee that the president's departure had no . . . was not in any way regarding any disagreement over these procedures or maybe misconduct on his part as concerns were brought forward by the auditor?

Mr. Lacey: — The former CEO's [chief executive officer] departure was not related to financial matters or matters raised in the Provincial Auditor's report.

The Chair: — Okay. Very good.

Mr. Lacey: — I can confirm that.

The Chair: — Are there other questions on chapter 3 of the 2005 report before we go on? We have a couple of minutes to . . . we'll need a couple of minutes to do the other chapter — I would think — unless there are no questions, and then we do have a few recommendations to deal with before the end of our time. Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'll be brief. In the series of recommendations that were still on the books at March 31, 2005, a number of these have been answered this morning. I would just question on no. 4, "SIGA's Board should ensure all board members and senior management comply with the established conflict-of-interest policy." I'm wondering if you could . . . That was partially implemented as at March 31, 2005. What has happened on that particular issue since?

Mr. Lacey: — Part of the issue SIGA was having was tracking all of the paper coming in with respect to new employees, new hires, ensuring that a conflict-of-interest form was signed. There's a fair amount of significant turnover at SIGA.

Subsequent to this report, they implemented a computerized system to help them assist in ensuring that employees did declare, did fill out conflict-of-interest forms, declared conflict of interest. Our subsequent work in this area, subsequent to March 2005, has shown that SIGA has made tremendous progress in this area. And once again we believe SIGA has achieved its goal of addressing this issue and from our perspective is now in compliance with this outstanding recommendation.

Mr. Chisholm: — Thank you.

The Chair: — Mr. Cheveldayoff.

Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. To the acting president, sir, are you aware of any fraud, alleged fraud, or implied fraud or investigations currently under way within your department with either your management, employees, or contractors at the present time?

Mr. Lacey: — I'm not aware of any.

Mr. Cheveldayoff: — Thank you, sir. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: — Are there any other questions on chapter 7, volume 3 of 2005 report? Seeing none, we will go to the recommendations. There are two, I believe. I'll just double check my notes. Yes, there are two, and they are both on page 195. The first recommendation reads:

We recommend that the management review and the Board approve an information technology strategic plan for the Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.

Is there a motion? Ms. Crofford.

Ms. Crofford: — Yes, I'll move that we concur and note progress.

The Chair: — Motion to concur and note progress. Is there any discussion of the motion? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All in favour? Carried unanimously, I believe.

The second recommendation by the Provincial Auditor:

We recommend that the Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority Inc.'s Board of Directors approve the information technology policies and procedures.

Is there a motion? Ms. Crofford.

Ms. Crofford: — Again I'll recommend that we concur and note progress.

The Chair: — You'll move?

Ms. Crofford: — Yes.

The Chair: — Okay. A motion to concur and note progress. Is there any discussion of the motion? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All in favour? Again that's carried.

That takes us to chapter 7 of 2006 volume 1. Are there any questions in regard to this chapter? Excuse me. Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you again. This chapter of the auditor's report deals in large part with the responsibilities of SLGA and concerns with social responsibility. What does SLGA see as its social responsibility in dealing with the sale and consumption of alcohol?

In some ways SLGA is in a bit of a conflict of interest here as both the retailer of alcohol for consumption and as being the regulator of that distribution and sale, as well as being a government agency needs to recognize that there is a need for social responsibility in how alcohol is consumed and the actions of individuals after that consumption. So what does SLGA see as its role in this area?

Mr. Engel: — Mr. Chair, through you to the member, thank you for the question. I think SLGA, the mandate that we have and the statute that governs the authority speaks to our obligation to attempt to ensure to the degree possible that our products that we offer are used in a socially responsible manner. We go further in our strategic plan to talk about a number of actions and activities that we take. And our vision, if you will, would be of a situation where all of the products that we offered are used only in a responsible manner; that there is no, I guess the counterpoint, irresponsible use of those products.

So our, I guess, our corporate mandate and what we're trying to achieve to the degree possible is to encourage through a number of activities — including regulatory means as well as direct initiatives and program interventions — encouraging the responsible use of liquor products in the province.

Mr. D'Autremont: — And does that run in parallel with the need for SLGA to promote the sale of its products that it retails through the Liquor Board stores, or does that run counter to the desire of the Liquor Board to sell its items?

Mr. Engel: — Generally, generally speaking internally there, we don't see there as being a conflict between those two mandates, that the socially responsible use and sale of our products is paramount and takes precedence over financial

returns related to our activities. So I think from, speaking from a corporate mandate point of view and if I would also speak on behalf of my colleagues in the senior management throughout the organization, I think to a person, everyone of us would be of a view that encouraging socially responsible use of our products is paramount and takes precedence over generating revenue from the sale of those products.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So would you say that responsibility would extend so far as then to discourage the sale of alcohol for consumption?

Mr. Engel: — I wouldn't normally characterize the discouraging alcohol consumption because — again I appreciate there are different views on this — but generally our society takes a view that alcohol is a product that when used in moderation and used responsibly is an acceptable product. So there is by definition a responsible way to use beverage alcohol.

And since the ending of prohibition across North America back in the 1920s, the general flavour of society has been to allow the consumption of beverage alcohol, to discourage its irresponsible or non-responsible use and consumption but certainly not to generally discourage consumption.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well I think ... You mentioned prohibition. I think prohibition was the best advertising for consumption of alcohol that ever happened. If you tell people you can't have it, it's bad for you, they obviously want it then to find out why it's so bad for you.

But I still see a bit of a conflict here between the desire to maximize the return for liquor boards and for the government and the need to regulate and promote responsible use of alcohol. That is obviously one of the mandates for — or should be one of the mandates if it's isn't and I believe it is — for SLGA.

So I'm wondering how the balancing act occurs here between the need to sell liquor, to have a profitable system that provides strong dividend returns to the province versus the need for responsible consumption. And it's been suggested to me that that's a conflict at times within SLGA, that the promotion of safety and responsible use of alcohol versus the need for sales within SLGA.

Does SLGA view this as the opportunity to concentrate the sales through a smaller number of outlets, or is it more responsible to allow the sales out of a larger number of outlets, as in the franchisees and the hotels across the province because there are restrictions in place as to the size of communities, what kind of outlets they can have, the distance between them, and those kind of issues.

Mr. Engel: — You covered a lot of ground there, so if I can maybe I'll start with your last comment and work back from that.

Generally the literature around responsible use of alcohol suggests that there is a role to play ... or the number of outlets or access points that you have for beverage alcohol does have an influence on the harms that are caused by alcohol.

The challenge I think for us and for any organization that's in

the business of retailing a product, where if that product is not used properly there is an opportunity for people to cause harm to themselves or to others, the challenge is to find the right balance between providing service to people who are using the product responsibly versus containing or restraining the distribution of that product in a way that minimizes the harm than can come to people.

If I can perhaps just use one situation as an example, in Saskatchewan through regulatory process, we put restrictions on the time through which alcohol can be legally purchased. If the only driving factor for an organization were to make money, you would likely not do that. You would have beverage alcohol being available for sale 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Through a regulatory regime that applies not specifically to our stores at retail level but to the other access points for beverage alcohol which are businesses that have licences to distribute alcohol, we place restrictions on the hours when those products are available for purchase.

So that's, I guess, one example of a way where you try to find the balance between meeting the public's interests around service and access, while at the same time trying to put in place a regime that mitigates harm.

One other comment, if I could follow up on something you said earlier in your question. Certainly the relationship of an organization that again is selling a product that can cause harm to someone ... this is a challenge that faces any organization that has a product, whether it's alcohol or any other product that again can be used in an inappropriate way and cause harm to people. I guess I wouldn't see ourselves as being necessarily unique or alone on an island here in what we're trying to accomplish of providing customer service to a product at the same time that we're trying to mitigate the harms associated with that product. And again the challenge for us as a public body is to find that appropriate balance between those two objectives.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. Oh you talked about the time limits as being part of the social responsibility. And yet I note here not that long ago that even though we have a certain time limit for closing access to purchase alcohol, the Rolling Stones weekend, that time was changed to allow further access for social reasons, not necessarily for socially responsible reasons. And you know so it seems that is flexible as well, depending on the demands of the particular circumstances as well. And so there may be circumstances where the social requirement has its ability to extend itself to perhaps extend or shift the social responsibility. And I guess that's where I question the role between SLGA as the regulator and SLGA as the retailer. And I think that's an area that needs to be watched very carefully so that one doesn't over weigh the other and that sometimes we need to think out of the box as to just exactly how to achieve social responsibility in these areas.

One of the areas that the Provincial Auditor has outlined in determining the responsible use of alcohol is that SLGA has an informal committee, internal committee. If you have an informal committee to deal with this — and we were talking previously about SIGA and how they develop policies and implement them — what is SLGA doing to formalize the issues of social responsibility of alcohol within SLGA, and how is that

process moving ahead? Who will that process be responsible to? How will it fit into the whole organization of SLGA?

Mr. Engel: — You raised one of the notes that the auditor made in the report about the committee approach that we'd taken. And I think a related comment in the auditor's chapter revolved around the fact that, at the time of that review, there was not a formal assignment of responsibility for social responsibility within the organization.

What we had been working on at that time and have continued to work on since the report was issued, we are in the process of implementing a new out-of-scope class plan which required restating all of the job descriptions for all of the out-of-scope managers in the organization. So we will deal with . . . When that plan is in place — and it is very nearly in place at this point — we will have clearly identified two individuals in the organization that are directly responsible for social responsibility at the Liquor and Gaming Authority.

And as well, those two individuals co-chair what the Provincial Auditor noted was an informal committee that I think will become more formalized in that it will become part of our corporate operational structure in terms of having those two individuals co-chair that committee and reporting through that committee to the management committee of the organization.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay thank you. I'll look forward to seeing that and seeing where these two individuals fit into the flow chart of corporate responsibility and what their roles and what authorities they have at when that comes forward.

Some of the other areas that I'm interested in dealing with SLGA is SLGA's relationship with the gaming industry in some other areas such as bingo and what role does SLGA play in this.

Mr. Lacey: — Well with respect to the bingo industry, the role they play is primarily as regulator of that industry, so with respect to determining the terms and conditions with respect to the halls' operations, the calendar of events with respect to the halls, where are the locations of the halls, play their games at, of the licensing of those halls, etc. — so from more of a regulator perspective.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you very much. You mentioned locations of halls. What kind of determinations do you go through to determine the locations of the halls, and is there a formula for the hall in relationship to population or distance from another hall? What's the qualifications there?

Mr. Lacey: — I'll let Mr. Markewich answer that question. Thank you.

Mr. Markewich: — Thanks for the question. We let actually the market decide where a hall's located. A group of charities would come to us and apply for a hall. We assess the feasibility of the hall. We look at two aspects. One is charitable demand: are there enough charities to support a hall? And the other is a market demand: are there enough players in that market to support the hall? So we consider, is there another hall in the market? For example, another group of charities wants to come forward. We'll determine whether or not the market can support that hall and then make a decision. And all our decisions can be

appealed to a commission.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What kind of numbers are you looking at as far as the number of charities needed to support an additional hall? Can a charity operate through two halls, or are they limited to simply one hall?

Mr. Markewich: — They're limited to one hall.

Mr. D'Autremont: — And what is an appropriate number to operate a hall?

Mr. Markewich: — A commercial hall usually has about 30 charities in the hall at minimum because they operate pretty much every day of the week and they have a number of events every day. So you have to have a number of . . . enough charities to basically operate each of those events. Charities can get a . . . That's a commercial hall. Charities can work on what we call a class C hall. They can set up their own bingo hall and those are typically your legions, your church basement-type bingos. And they could operate up to three times a week on their own if they would so choose.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So you could have a commercial hall at one end of the block and you could have a church basement operating at the other end of the block. And your requirement for the church basement was simply that they're a charity of their own and they could operate up to three times a week.

Mr. Markewich: — That is correct.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Do both categories of halls have to meet the same requirements as far as payouts are concerned?

Mr. Markewich: — Payouts? Yes. Under our terms and conditions, charities are to receive 20 per cent of the gross vend in a hall. So if they make \$1,000, 200 of which has to go to charities.

Mr. D'Autremont: — And so what happens to the other 80 per cent of the . . .

Mr. Markewich: — That's for prizes and hall operating costs.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Is there a requirement as to the percentage of money that has to be given as prizes?

Mr. Markewich: — Yes, there is. A maximum of 70 per cent can be paid in prize value.

Mr. D'Autremont: — A maximum of 70 per cent.

Mr. Markewich: — A maximum of 70 per cent.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So they don't have to pay out . . . They could pay out 50 per cent if they wanted and the hall operator could keep 30 per cent if they . . .

Mr. Markewich: — Typically halls operate at about 63 per cent on prize value.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay. But there is no minimum prize payout. There's a maximum but no minimum.

Mr. Markewich: — Just a maximum. We have a maximum to protect the charities' share.

Mr. D'Autremont: — And how does SLGA ensure that the halls are not exceeding the 70 per cent payout ratio? How are they monitored?

Mr. Markewich: — They provide us monthly reports of their financial activities, and we monitor them on a regular basis. We get their financial information, yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So this financial information would come from their audited reports, would it? Or . . .

Mr. Markewich: — No. Well most of them get an annual audit. But this is a monthly information so they just submit the information to us. If we have questions in whether or not the numbers are right, we actually have our ability to go out there and audit the numbers. But we rely on the information the halls send us.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So how often would SLGA monitor, send someone out to actually monitor the numbers that are being provided to you?

Mr. Markewich: — Offhand I can't remember how many class A halls we actually audited last year, but we usually do on a cyclical basis. There are right now about 18 commercial halls out there. And so we go on a cyclical basis and rotationally go through them all. But we do respond to any complaints that we have from a charity or an individual and we will actually go out and look at every, each and every one of those.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Do you track the complaints or concerns that are raised with you about the various halls so that you could say, you know, hall no. 1 has 10 complaints and hall no. 2 we haven't had any complaints, so you have your eye on particular operations?

Mr. Markewich: — Absolutely, yes. We do keep track of all complaints. And we do follow up and file a report on every complaint that there is so there'll be follow-up on file as to a complaint . . . [inaudible] . . . outcome, sorry.

Mr. D'Autremont: — And what happens when you find someone who's not in compliance?

Mr. Markewich: — A hall or a charity? Well typically . . .

Mr. D'Autremont: — Anybody.

Mr. Markewich: — Well we have an ability to sanction. Our sanctioning ability is we can suspend a licence. Typically it follows a progressional approach where we would warn the charity first verbally, then if it continues we would . . . or hall. And then we'd . . . a formal written warning. And then we usually sanction to, you know, suspend their licence for a day or two. And then if it progresses even farther then we can go as far as actually cancel the licence. But in the five, six years that I've been there now I think we've only cancelled one licence.

Mr. D'Autremont: — From your experience in this, is it more apt to be the hall that would fail compliance or the charity that

would fail compliance?

Mr. Markewich: — It's the class A, the hall, yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — So the charity is simply operating based on the recommendation from that . . .

Mr. Markewich: — That is right.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Bingo hall operator as to the procedures that they should follow.

Mr. Markewich: — Yes. The halls are actually . . . most of them now are actually operated by the charities themselves. I think there's only one hall now that actually hires a contract manager. They're all operated by themselves, so . . .

Mr. D'Autremont: — So of the 18 commercial halls across the province, all but one is operated by the . . .

Mr. Markewich: — That I'm aware of, yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: — If the Chair could just interrupt for a second. We do have a commitment to be concluded by 11:45 which gives us about another seven minutes according to that clock. So, members, if you will prioritize your questions, we do have three recommendations to deal with. And as Chair I will be pretty firm on conclusion at 11:45. Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well the Chairman cut me off at the right time because I was done there.

The Chair: — We have the less than fortunate, depending on your perspective, fortunate or unfortunate reality that the Chair of the NDP caucus sits on our committee and he's a stickler for this. So, Mr. Borgerson, you have a question or two?

Mr. Borgerson: — Yes, I have a couple of questions.

The Chair: — I'll let you deal with your own caucus chairman if you run us over.

Mr. Borgerson: — Do you have a clear definition of what socially responsible drinking is? A clear, defined position or statement of what . . . or definition? And I should ask that question of the auditor as well.

Mr. Engel: — Yes. We can go first. I think the best way to define it would be to say that socially responsible drinking occurs when there is no irresponsible use. But again that is a very soft definition because that will vary depending upon the person that you ask the question to, frankly.

There are certainly some people in our society that would argue that no amount of beverage alcohol consumption is responsible. So clearly a person that had that perspective would have a very different definition of what social responsibility would mean compared to someone who had sort of a more typical mainstream view.

So I guess we have a working understanding internally about

what we're trying to accomplish, but I think it would be very difficult to find documented anywhere a clear, definitive statement about what is responsible or not responsible use of beverage alcohol.

Mr. Borgerson: — And so I'll ask the same question of the auditor. And I guess what I'm getting at . . . And I think in your presentation, at the beginning, you talked about the challenge within the third recommendation. And so my question then is, is it an attainable goal for SLGA? Is it an attainable goal to achieve let's say 100 per cent socially responsible drinking?

The Chair: — Mr. Wendel.

Mr. Wendel: — I would say what they are responsible for is to come up with their definition of what socially responsible is, and they should be held accountable for that. Because everybody else will have a view as to what social responsibility is, and they should speak to it and be held accountable for what they develop.

Mr. Borgerson: — And I raise this because as the official indicated, it can be very subjective. I'm sort of grasping with how you would define performance targets for this. I can think of a number of different agencies and associations and organizations that promote and work for socially responsible drinking, some of which have partnerships with SLGA, some of which don't. So how to separate out how SLGA is being successful in achieving their targets would be very difficult.

So with that third recommendation, I am kind of struggling with what kind of . . . how you would set targets, how then you would set indicators with such a fluid sort of — shouldn't use the word fluid — with such a fluid sort of definition. Anyway, I would appreciate a further comment from the officials.

Mr. Engel: — If we have further comment? I think I share, I think collectively we share the concern that the member notes that . . . particularly in trying to define the outcome of certain initiatives or certain practices and what the outcome of those initiatives might be is exceedingly difficult.

And it's difficult again . . . Not to pretend that we're on an island here and we're the only ones facing this difficulty, but I think any organization that is trying to measure the outcome of things that they are doing, when what they are fundamentally trying to do is modify human behaviour — they're trying to articulate outcomes in that field of endeavour — is very, very difficult. Some would argue it is impossible to actually define, particularly when we've got a multitude of players that are involved and you've got a number of other societal perspectives and issues that influence people's behaviour.

It is very difficult for an organization to say, this thing has happened and we're responsible for this piece of it; and we can clearly identify and say that these things that we did or these actions that we took, we can draw a direct line between what we did over here and this particular outcome. Again that is, from a social science point of view, that is a very, very difficult challenge to overcome.

Mr. Borgerson: — I would, and not to question the worthiness of the goal that's laid out in that particular recommendation, but

I find it difficult to see the day when this committee would receive a recommendation of this kind and concur with compliance. That would be a difficult goal to achieve. A worthy goal to work for though, so thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Borgerson. And perhaps just to the officials, if you have . . . I don't know if you have this information. But if you have information as to how Saskatchewan compares with other provinces when it comes to, you know, fetal alcohol syndrome, traffic accidents where alcohol is a factor, perhaps even alcohol-related illnesses — you know, are we above average or are we at the median or are we below average — that would, I think in some way, address or provide a partial answer to your question. Certainly doesn't take the subjectivity out of it, but at least it gives you something to measure. If you had that information and could forward it on to the committee, that would be appreciated.

Mr. Engel: — Yes, thank you. And we certainly can undertake to provide some comparative information. And I think just to restate, that the challenge for us is that, for example, if the rate of impaired driving in Saskatchewan or the rate of FASD [fetal alcohol spectrum disorder] occurrence is lower in Saskatchewan than compared to some other jurisdictions, the challenge for us is how, given the multitude of players that are involved in those areas trying to mitigate the social harm, it's very difficult for us to say that, sort of hold ourselves out and saying that we . . . that's because of us; we did that. It's very difficult for us to take the credit for doing those sorts of things because there are again so many players involved in trying to accomplish those same end goals. But we could certainly provide the committee with some literature that's out there in terms of comparing some key alcohol-related harm indicators.

The Chair: — Thank you. We have three recommendations to deal with. Two of them on page 94, one on page 95. The first recommendation by the Provincial Auditor reads:

We recommend the Liquor and Gaming Authority formally assign responsibility for encouraging responsible use of beverage alcohol.

Is there a motion? Mr. Borgerson.

Mr. Borgerson: — I'll move that we concur with this recommendation and note progress.

The Chair: — A motion to concur and note progress. Any discussion of the motion? Seeing none, call the question. All in favour. Carried unanimously.

Second recommendation:

We recommend the Liquor and Gaming Authority prepare a complete plan for encouraging responsible use of beverage alcohol.

Is there a motion? Again, Mr. Borgerson.

Mr. Borgerson: — I'll move that we concur and note progress.

The Chair: — Again a motion to concur and note progress. Again is there any discussion of the motion? Seeing none, the

question. All in favour. Again carried unanimously. The final recommendation on page 95:

We recommend the Liquor and Gaming Authority continue to research and develop performance measures and targets to evaluate its performance in encouraging responsible use of beverage alcohol.

Is there a motion? Mr. Borgerson.

Mr. Borgerson: — I'll move that we concur and note progress.

The Chair: — Again a motion to concur and note progress. Any discussion of the motion? Seeing none, we'll call the question. All in favour. Again it's carried unanimously.

And that concludes our discussion of the two chapter 7's this morning. I want to thank you, Mr. Lacey, and your officials for appearing before committee and providing the amount of information that you did in the short time that we had.

I just want to tell members of the committee that in the spirit of having some kind of a calendar, we hope next week to deal with the Community Resources and Employment special report of the Oyate Safe House. I understand that both the department and Ms. Young will be able to be with us on that particular date.

The following Tuesday — November 14, possibly, likely — managing for results, chapter 10 of the 2005 report and reporting on infrastructure follow-up, chapter 21 . . . That's not for sure yet, but likely.

Just a special reminder that Wednesday, November 22 — that's Wednesday, not Tuesday — that we'll be meeting with representatives of the CCAF, and then we have left open the last Tuesday of November to again deal with Community Resources and Employment, given the large number of recommendations and information that has been provided to the committee, if that time is needed.

Thank you for your time. I declare the meeting adjourned.

[The committee adjourned at 11:50.]