



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MINUTES AND VERBATIM REPORT

Published under the
authority of
The Honourable H.H. Rolfes
Speaker



No. 1 — JANUARY 5 & 6, 1995

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY
1995**

Hon. Herman Rolfes, Chairperson
Saskatoon Nutana

Hon. Carol Carson
Melfort

Glenn Hagel
Moose Jaw Palliser

Lynda Haverstock
Saskatoon Greystone

Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Prince Albert Northcote

Rick Swenson
Thunder Creek

Eric Upshall
Humboldt

MEETING #1 1995

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

**Room 10 Legislative Building
7:05 p.m. Thursday, January 5, 1995**

Present: Members of the Board of Internal Economy

Hon. Herman Rolfes, Chair
Hon. Carol Carson
Glenn Hagel, MLA
Lynda Haverstock, MLA
Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Rick Swenson, MLA
Eric Upshall, MLA

Staff to the Board

Marilyn Borowski, Director, Financial Services
Greg Putz, Deputy Clerk
Gwenn Ronyk, Clerk
Deborah Saum, Secretary

Officials in Attendance

Office of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan:

Judy Brennan, Assistant Legislative Librarian
Robert Cosman, Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk
Chris Hecht, Systems Analyst (Contract)
Linda Kaminski, Director of Personnel and Administrative Services
Marian Powell, Legislative Librarian
Meta Woods, Clerk Assistant

MINUTES Moved by Mr. Upshall, seconded by Mr. Lautermilch, ordered that the Minutes of Meeting #6/94 be adopted. Agreed.

AGENDA Moved by Mr. Hagel, seconded by Ms. Carson, that the proposed agenda be adopted. Agreed.

ITEM 1 Decision Item - Consider Personnel Classification Request

The Board met in Camera at 9:42 p.m.

At 10:50 p.m. moved by Ms. Haverstock, seconded by Mr. Upshall, that the meeting be adjourned until 9 a.m. January 6, 1995.

Herman H. Rolfes
Chair

Deborah Saum
Secretary

MEETING #1 1995 (continued)

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

**Room 10 Legislative Building
9:07 a.m. Friday, January 6, 1995**

Present: Members of the Board of Internal Economy

Hon. Herman Rolfes, Chair
Hon. Carol Carson
Lynda Haverstock, MLA
Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Rick Swenson, MLA
Eric Upshall, MLA

Staff to the Board

Marilyn Borowski, Director, Financial Services
Greg Putz, Deputy Clerk
Gwenn Ronyk, Clerk
Deborah Saum, Secretary

Officials in Attendance

Office of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan:

Judy Brennan, Assistant Legislative Librarian
Linda Kaminski, Director of Personnel and Administrative Services
Marian Powell, Legislative Librarian
Meta Woods, Clerk Assistant

Office of the Provincial Auditor

Wayne Strelloff, Provincial Auditor
Fred Wendel, Assistant Provincial Auditor
Kevin Taylor, Auditor
Bob Paisley, Auditor

ITEM 1 Decision Item - Review of the 1995-96 Budget for the Legislative Assembly (continued)

The Board agreed to the following reductions to the \$14,879,070 budget as presented:

Budgetary Estimates

- 1) Personnel reclassifications (Item #1(b)) for a total reduction of \$26,830
- 2) Delete the Australian Regulations Committee Conference for Committee Support Services - \$3,620
- 3) Delete the Visitor Services National Conference in Halifax - \$1,390
- 4) Delete the Clerks' Joint Canadian-American Conference in Tennessee - \$1,420

Statutory Estimates

- 1) Delete the Australian Regulations Committee Conference for Members' Committee Expenses - \$8,000
- 2) Do not apply the annual cost-of-living adjustments to members' allowance and grant payments for the 1995-96 fiscal year - \$52,910

ITEM 1(c) Decision Item - Directive Amendments Re: Indexing

Statutory Estimates

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Swenson:

That the Directives listed below not be increased April 1, 1995 by the annual cost-of-living adjustment:

Directive #1	Per Diem Sessional Expense Allowance
Directive #5	Constituency Office and Services
Directive #7	Caucus Grant - Sessional Research
Directive #8	Caucus Grant - Secretarial Expenses
Directive #10	Grants to Independent Members
Directive #11	Grant to the Office of the Leader of the Opposition
Directive #14	Per Diem Caucus Expense Allowance
Directive #15	Grant to the Office of the Leader of the Third Party
Directive #17	Committee Per Diem and Expense Allowance
Directive #18	Speaker's Per Diem and Expense Allowance

and that the section of each direction that contains the indexing provision be amended to read as follows:

"This adjustment will not be applied for the fiscal years beginning April 1, 1992, April 1, 1993, April 1, 1994 and April 1, 1995."

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1347

ITEM 1(d) Decision Item - Consider Caucus Fax Request

The Board tabled this item.

ITEM 1(f) Decision Item - Motion to Approve Budget and Statutory Estimates

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Ms. Carson:

That a budget of \$14,784,840 be approved for the Legislative Assembly, for 1995-96 fiscal year, as follows.

Budget to be Voted - \$4,611,660

Statutory Budget - \$10,173,180

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1348

ITEM 1 (c) Decision Item - Motion to Approve Revenue Estimates

Moved by Mr. Upshall, seconded by Mr. Lautermilch

That the Legislative Assembly Revenue Estimates of \$50,300 be approved for fiscal year 1995-96.

The question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1349

ITEM 2 Decision Item - Special Warrant Request for 1994-95 Fiscal Year

Moved by Ms. Carson, seconded by Mr. Upshall:

That a Special Warrant in the amount of \$200,000 be requested for the 1994-95 fiscal year.

A debate arising and the question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1350

ITEM 3 Decision Item - Review of the 1995-96 Budget for the Office of the Provincial Auditor

Moved by Mr. Swenson, seconded by Ms. Carson:

That the Board approve an allocation of \$4,377,000 for the Office of the Provincial Auditor for fiscal year 1995-96.

A debate arising and question being put, it was agreed to.

Minute #1351

The Board requested the Office of the Provincial Auditor to Look into charging a fee for auditing external agencies.

Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Swenson that the meeting be adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY
January 5, 1995

The Chairperson: — It now being 7 o'clock I will call this meeting to order. First of all, let me take this opportunity to welcome all of you back from your holidays and hope everybody has spent a good festive season and had a good Christmas with your family and friends and that we are now ready to, in a very generous, charitable mood this evening and tomorrow, see what we can do with the LAO (Legislative Assembly Office) and the Provincial Auditor's budget.

But before we get into those, ladies and gentlemen, we need to review the minutes of the last meeting. If you turn to your tabs, you will note that the minutes of the December 14 meeting . . . I don't know if you had an opportunity to peruse those. If you had, someone will move that we adopt those minutes. Moved by Mr. Upshall. Seconded by Mr. Lautermilch. Any questions? If not, all those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

The next item would be the adoption of the agenda, and you will note that we have on the agenda the review of the 1995-96 budget of the Legislative Assembly; that will be the first item on the agenda, review of budget document; (b) will be: consider personnel classification request and that will be an in camera meeting. As we have agreed to a year or two ago when we talk about personnel items that they would be in camera, and I'm suggesting that that, not only suggesting . . . well I guess I am suggesting; I am at the board's disposal.

Directive amendments to re: indexing, that comes up pretty well every year; (d) is the considering of caucus fax request; (e) is a motion to approve revenue estimates; and (f) is a motion to approve budget and statutory estimates; second last item would be special warrant request; and the last item, review of the 1995-96 budget for the Office of the Provincial Auditor. Hopefully we can accomplish all that tonight and tomorrow.

Are there any other items to be added to the budget . . . or pardon me, to the agenda? Any other items? If not, could I ask someone to move that we adopt this agenda? Mr. Hagel. Seconded by Mrs. Carson. All those in favour of approval of the agenda? Carried.

So the first item on the agenda then will be the review of the 1995-96 budget of the Legislative Assembly. If you look on your first page, ladies and gentlemen, you will note that in the requests for our budget there is an overall increase of 2.39 per cent. But if you remember, ladies and gentlemen, that this budget is made up of two components — one is the statutory budget, which is the vast majority of our budget of which we have very little control or change, unless you make fundamental changes. And the other of course is the day-to-day budget of administration and the workings of the Legislative Assembly. The two divide about 10 million to 4 million approximately and that will be . . . you will note that later on in your document.

If you want to turn to the second page, you have before you the general administration: Assembly administration and caucus administration. I don't know how you want me to proceed. Do you want to go line by line or do we simply want to say page 2

or page 3 or wherever we are at? And this is a . . . the first two pages will give you a summary and then we go to by item by item after that so . . . Mr. Lautermilch.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we could have Ms. Ronyk take us just through some of the changes, some of the major changes in the budget before we proceed on a page-by-page basis, and then we just go through it on a page by page if the committee's in agreement with that. I think it might speed the process up here a little bit.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Ms. Ronyk.

Ms. Ronyk: — Thank you very much. Our budget this year really isn't reflecting a great deal of change. We have been able to find some savings within the budgetary part of our budget. The main increases that we are looking for are small ones in ergonomic furniture. We're asking for some money for a second video. We'll get into the detail of that later. The main cost increase that we are going to be reviewing with you is our proposal for renewal of some of our computer equipment and systems.

We've seen some major decreases in personnel, mainly due to the fact that we've had a turnover in a number of positions with new people coming in at the bottom of the ranges. It means that we are saving substantially. We also are bringing forward with this budget a proposal for a number of personnel reclassifications that we would like to deal with at the end, after we've reviewed the budget. The personnel dollars in the budget document are as they would be if you do not approve any of the reclassifications.

We'll be coming after to ask you to review some of the classification requests that we're bringing forward. But because of the savings that we're seeing anyway in personnel, even the reclassifications that we're asking for, we're still going to be seeing a savings overall, if you approve the reclasses, of 21,000 in personnel over last year's budget.

I think that's the major items. In the statutory part there's very little change at all. It's pretty much stand pat. There is a decision we'll be asking you to take there on whether or not the few items that are affected by indexing should be . . . have the index applied or whether they should not. That's about the only change that you'll be asked to deal with in the statutory aspect.

The third item of the budget, that the Speaker didn't mention to you, is in the very back of your document, and it's the revenue budget. There's a couple of pages there that outline the income that the legislature will be receiving. And that's due to the sale of subscriptions to *Hansard* and legislative papers. It's a small item.

We are pleased to report, I think, some changes in our printing costs this year, and we foresee more of those over the next year. We've analysed some of our printing requirements. We're going to change the format of our legislative documents from the

seven by ten format that we've used for aeons, and converting them to eight and a half by eleven documents for the *Votes*, the *Orders*, the *Hansard*, and Bills. And that will save us substantial dollars because we pay for printing on a per-page basis, and we can get more on a page on the bigger format.

It's also time for the major tender for Bills to be let out again this year. And we expect to see a major savings in the Bill side of our printing. We will likely see a small increase in the other elements of our printing because the cost of newsprint and paper is sky-rocketing. If you noticed, the *Leader-Post* and the *Star-Phoenix* went to a smaller format just recently, partly because of the costs of paper. It is a problem out there on the market. But we still expect to see some overall savings.

We've also been negotiating with Queen's Printer, and we have reached a tentative agreement with them to take over the printing and publishing, the paying for the separate chapters entirely. We will just buy from them what we need for the legislature itself. And that will save us probably in the realm of about \$20,000 in our printing budget.

I probably missed some other points, but at this point I think that's the major issues here.

Now you're at the summary pages there. These two summary pages — or three, actually, summary 1, 2 and 3; they're identified as sum 1, sum 2 and sum 3 — does give you the overview of the subvote-by-subvote costs. And it shows you the increase or decrease in each of those items.

On summary 2, you'll see that Assembly administration is the one where we're asking for a substantial increase, the 30 per cent increase. And that is the computer, the computer costs there.

As far as personnel goes, the budget here shows no increase whatsoever in our permanent personnel and a very small half person-year in the non-permanent personnel, and that is a caucus position. When we had a third party caucus created, then that caucus became eligible for an extra half a person, and that accounts for the only personnel increase in the budget. And that was last year it happened, and is now reflected in this coming year's budget.

The budget for personnel in the document that you see there shows increases for increments wherever the incumbent in the position is eligible for them. There is no cost-of-living increase in the budget because we don't know of any. There's no contract with the SGEU (Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union) within government and our aligned people fall under that alignment. If SGEU agrees on an increase, then our non-management people get the same increase. We also align our management staff to the management and professional class plan within the Public Service Commission, and there is no projected cost-of-living increase in those positions either. Any questions, overall, before you want to proceed with the detail?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — In that cost of computers, you've included the furniture and the video as well? Is that where you have the cost for the video included in that total figure of two fifty-eight nine sixty?

Ms. Ronyk: — I think the video is . . . it's \$5,000 is what we're asking for again. We've had such a great experience with the video that we're currently . . . that you approved last year, the one for the Legislative Assembly itself, and it's nearly ready to be released. They expect to do a launch of that new video as soon as . . . after the session opens. I know various people in the caucuses have seen it, and some members have seen it, and we've seen it a number of times as it's been finalized. We're very pleased with it. We think it will be a very effective tool for reaching students and the general public with a better understanding of the role of a member and the role of the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Did you talk about a second video then?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. The second one that we proposing here is one again that we want to do in a similar fashion as this one, and that is in a partnership with other agencies and departments of government. And in this one, we would be a minor partner, and it would be a Heritage Days, video dealing with the heritage aspect of the Legislative Building. It would be part of a tourist attraction promotion that is particularly fitting in our 90th anniversary year and in Grey Cup year, if you like. And it's something that the tourism industry and Heritage Saskatchewan and various others — again Education — would like to be partners in. And we will be a minor partner in this one. And we're suggesting that we would like to contribute \$5,000 to that video. And that comes up in subvote 901 which in your summary there is under Clerk's office. Okay, I'm sorry, it is under Assembly administration. So it's in that first, it is in the 30 per cent.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — So the other video is finished? The cost is all wrapped up.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes it is. It's come in on budget, and we're very pleased. In fact some people in the industry feel that we've gotten about a \$100,000 video for our \$40,000 budget. So I think we've done very well. Our production company has been excellent to work with, and they've done a good job.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Are you planning a debut, a premiere showing?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, we are in fact. And we hope that you'll be getting an invitation once we know when the House is going to open, and then we will plan a couple weeks after that to debut the new video. We'll have a screening here in the Legislative Building. And we'd like to invite members and staff and the press and the various people that were involved in the production.

The next pages are basically again summary pages. If you recall the structure of the budget, we kind of start at the beginning

with overall summary and we progressively break it down into more detail. And we get into the actual questions. It's a little easier to look at it in the detailed section.

The page 2 is the personnel summary. That's also at the beginning. And it shows that our positions have not changed from last year in terms of permanent employees and the very small increase in the sessional employees.

If you'll then flip right through to page 5, that's where we begin the code-by-code detail of the Assembly administration. Now this section of the budget, this subvote, contains the expenses for the executive administration of the Assembly and the central services. And that's the Speaker's office, the Clerk only, the Clerk's salary only — not the rest of my office which appears later. It includes financial services and personnel and admin functions. This is where the central services in terms of computer costs also appear.

On page 5 then all the subvotes start with the same order of codes. Personal services is at the beginning. There's a detail of the permanent and temporary salaries on page 9, if you have any questions. And some of these are . . . in each subvote where there is a detail of staff, some of these are going to be the ones that we're requesting some reclassification changes in.

Mr. Hagel: — Just from the . . . the difference between the bracketed figure and the unbracketed figure above it . . .

The Chairperson: — On page 9?

Mr. Hagel: — Yes, sorry, page 9.

Ms. Ronyk: — The bracketed figure is the comparison with last year's budgeted figure.

Mr. Hagel: — With 1993-94 or '90 . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — No, it's '90 . . . You see at the top of that page, it says, requested '94-95; that should be '95-96. These darn computers don't do everything, do they?

So the unbracketed figure is what is in this budget, the '95-96 budget, and the one in brackets below is what was budgeted for that position in last year's budget.

Mr. Hagel: — By last year you mean the year that we're currently in at the moment, yes.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, the '94-95.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — And so when there's a change there it means that there's either been an increment or a cost of living or a reclass, but in this case there hasn't been any reclasses.

Mr. Hagel: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — And sometimes if there's a change in personnel, the new person will be coming in at a lower level.

I think that brings us to the computer section. So if you would like to have a look at page 6, that are the codes . . . maybe we should start at the beginning of that because the 200 codes also include telephone and long-distance charges at the top of that page. There we are actually seeing in the long-distance charges, we are seeing some decreases and that is mostly due to cheaper long distance, lower rates for long distance. And we'll notice that of more importance when we get into the caucus telephone costs.

The 270 codes are largely the computer codes. And I would like to give you an overall briefing on our request. And we did provide you right in the document attached to that page an explanation of the request, some rationale to support it, a little more detail on, you know, just what it will buy for us, these dollars that we're requesting.

But even in addition to what's there, I have a real pitch to make to you. Unless you're prepared to just ask me any questions that you have and vote, then I won't bother with the pitch, or if you've already decided what you're going to do, I'll still make the pitch anyway.

As far as computer goes, if you recall our last year's discussion on this issue, we at that time had come forward with a substantial request. Our five-year lease and contract with Digital Systems was up, the equipment that we'd had during that period had become largely obsolete, and it is still with us and it is still obsolete.

But you did give us last year about \$55,000 in new money for purchase of new equipment. And with that and with some of the savings that we were able to get by renewing some of the old equipment, then we saved on the maintenance cost on old equipment because new equipment is under warranty. We were able to do some changes in part of the hardware.

But we are still very badly behind. As the Deputy Clerk likes to put it, we're still using bearskins and bone knives in the Legislative Assembly when it comes to computer technology.

Why do we need computers? Well they are nice toys, but that isn't why we want them. We need better up-to-date computer technology so that we can do our jobs better. And our jobs are to provide members and the House and committees with services. And we can do that better, we can do it more efficiently, with the same staff if we have up-to-date technology.

What we now have is, last year when we got only a small portion of our request, we began to phase in changes. And that maybe makes each year's budget look a little better, but it means us working in a very difficult environment. We have a mishmash of old stuff and new stuff. We have new equipment that we can't use adequately because we don't have the software to utilize it. When we do utilize our new equipment and with

some of the new software we have, then we lose our functionality with the rest of the organization that has old equipment and we can no longer communicate and link between and share the information and documents between various branches in the organization.

We are getting very behind other legislatures. And that's an embarrassment to me because we've always been on the leading edge in Saskatchewan. And we were. At the beginning of technological development and automation 15, 12 years ago, we were on the leading edge. But we have fallen very badly behind. And this isn't a keep up with the Joneses sort of thing; it's a realization that we can't provide the services that members need.

If members' responsibilities are largely to keep abreast of what government is doing, to monitor government which is becoming more complex all the time, members need the most up-to-date services that they can to do that.

Now what we've asked for here is a budget of \$555,000. Now that compares with 305,000 that you gave us last year. So we're asking for 250,000 extra in this budget. That is going to enable us to do a lot of things. But we're not asking for a Cadillac. When the first cut at the budget was prepared for me by the automation committee that we have in our staff, their request was for a budget of \$700,000, because that would have given us what we would like to have. That was the ideal.

We didn't feel that that was an appropriate request to make at this juncture because we can phase into some of the services that we would like to be able to provide and we can do a lot with the requests that we are making, and that's \$150,000 less than that 700,000 that we would really have liked to have. So we're asking for a Chev, not a Cadillac.

We feel it's important, as I mentioned before, for the Assembly to keep pace with technological development in government. For example, now as a reality in government departments is interdepartmental e-mail or electronic messaging link between departments. And it would be so wonderful if we could tap into that. If we could link with the Department of Justice and the Department of Finance and SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation) and the various departments, it would make our lives much easier; we would save a lot of time and effort.

We know what e-mail is like. We have it within our own organization, within the various offices of the Assembly, and it's a wonderful tool, especially for management. And it's also for all of the staff because they have access to information that they never had before when they had to rely on somebody to pass it down to them from on high.

The information that we have is that information technology is not on hold in government proper; it is recognized that the information technology is essential to a modern organization, to doing the work that governments do for the public and for each other within government. We have to keep up. Particularly for

members, it's essential that you keep up with the information explosion that's out there. And you can't with bone knives and bearskins. But in government, for example, within government departments in the last fiscal year for which we have actual figures, 1993-94, approximately \$11 million was spent in straight computer hardware purchases. Now that's only the purchase of new hardware — not, you know, the operating, maintenance, software, and support of existing systems.

Mr. Swenson: — Does that include the Crowns, Gwenn?

Ms. Ronyk: — No, that's only the departments that are Treasury Board and within the *Estimates* that you receive in the House as far as the government goes.

Now in the upcoming fiscal year '95-96, Treasury Board officials have indicated that there have been no directives, no restrictions or freezes on departments with respect to information technology expenses. There will be no massive increase either. They expect that this \$11 million base budget that's there in departments for computer hardware will be roughly the same in this upcoming fiscal year as well, that there's not likely to be any great change in that either higher or lower.

Now as our background document there indicates, that what we are asking for is to bring our basic system up to kind of a standard that will give us the most functionality we can. We're finding that it's a very frustrating situation that we have now with a mishmash of old and new equipment, old and new software; we can't use the new equipment and software. If we want to communicate with somebody else in the organization, we have to go and use the old, and it's very frustrating. We will bring it up to standard and we will be able to do the things that we need to do and more things with greater efficiency.

But these funds that we're requesting, this 550,000, which is 250 new money, does not include some of the new functions that we would like to provide and that members have begun to be asking us about — things like Internet connections, a way to connect between members' offices here in the building, constituency links with the Legislative Building; on-line access to *Hansard*, to the *Journals*, to progress of Bills, to the things that are there on our systems but nobody can get at them because we just lack the power and the sophistication that we need in the systems to provide it.

There's one of the documents in the package here that deals with some of the services that other legislatures are starting to provide to members, and we would like to be able to do that. And if we get these funds that we're asking for here, it will give us kind of the basic system on which we can build these services. We can't even consider those services until we have the basic functionality on which to build them.

And if you look at page 2 of the background document there, you'll see at the bottom our projected expenditures over the next number of fiscal years. The '95-96 is the \$555,000 total that I mentioned earlier, is what we're requesting. In the future years

we'll see that number go down a little bit. It's not projected to go up. But even with that, with it going down a bit, we should be able to start providing some of these services that are more directly of value to members, that are more visibly of value to members.

If you recall, last year when we proposed this our projection showed a large blip in that year for the request of a total renewal of our equipment and then a very low projection over the next four years. We felt that that isn't really realistic because once we have this basic system, then we ought to start providing members and caucuses and committees with the enhanced services that are of more value to members. Certainly it's of value to you to have your claims processed more quickly and so on.

But in terms of your work as legislators, we would propose that our budget would look more like these figures now in the future years — 485, 445, 410. With that we will still have sufficient new money each of those years to provide you with some enhancements and bring the Legislative Assembly into the modern age — for a while. It's amazing how fast we get behind again with technology.

Are there any specific questions?

Mr. Swenson: — Last year, Gwenn, you gave us some numbers — and I should have brought this along — about the service costs with the Wang system that you were projecting, that they were going to be fairly high because of its obsolescence and the fact you couldn't get parts on everything. How close did we come? I notice in this year you've only got a \$2,000 maintenance and last year it seemed to me it was significantly higher than that.

Ms. Ronyk: — The *Hansard* maintenance costs are actually in *Hansard*. But we have . . . because last year you gave us enough money to replace the typesetter in *Hansard*, the big Linotron, that saved us all the maintenance that old beast used to cost us, which was about \$6,000. And we also were able to replace the Wang terminals in *Hansard* with more old Wang terminals, but a slightly newer version of them, by buying them from another agency of government that was getting rid of their old stuff and getting new. We picked up all their old Wang terminals for \$500 and we've put those into *Hansard* in the transcriber areas, because our system still is a Wang base there. And those terminals have not required a great deal of maintenance.

Okay, this year our maintenance estimate is only . . . where's this \$2,000?

Mr. Swenson: — I'm just looking on page 7, code 277. It says: Wang equipment eliminated during year. Expense \$2,000.

Ms. Ronyk: — We're proposing in this budget to get rid of the Wang this year and of course we won't need maintenance any longer. What we were worried about last year was the whole thing failing.

Mr. Swenson: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — And it did fail a couple of times, but it didn't . . . it slowed us down. We had a couple of delays early on in the session with the production of *Hansard*, but we did stumble through and it worked.

What you did provide us last year, the new money was used to replace the Linotron and replace the computers in *Hansard* that hold together all the pieces that each of the transcribers have transcribed, pulls them together into one document and then types that somewhere or does the desktop publishing. We were able to replace those. So that avoided some of the concerns that we had about the whole thing breaking down. Now the only old parts we have there is actually the transcribers which are still in the old Wang system.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay, when the system failed, what did it cost you? Was there a set-piece cost for bringing somebody in to bring it back up when it . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, there was. We do have to bring in repair, maintenance people. But it wasn't a great deal of cost. You know, it cost us to bring in somebody I think from Calgary or Edmonton in *Hansard*. It's part of the maintenance agreement which is what dollar figure . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh. So our maintenance here under 277, the 35,000 covers that as well.

The maintenance costs are in a general maintenance agreement that we have which shows up more under here than under *Hansard*. And in the actual budget document, if you look at line 277, you'll see that our estimate last year in '94-95 was 82,000. I can get the actual for you.

What we did find . . . that because we were able to replace . . . what we did last year was replace those two elements in *Hansard*, and we replaced the VAXmates, those kind of non-PCs (personal computer) that were part of our Digital system. And we got rid of a lot of the maintenance by putting in new PCs there.

The budget was 82,000, and we've spent 57,000 to date. We still have . . . What is that to? End of December? End of December. So considering that we have about two months of session coming up yet in this fiscal year, we'll likely be about on budget there for maintenance. But that is where, when you get new equipment, for a while you can save on maintenance because they have warranties, three-year warranties on them.

What's happened though with our replacement in *Hansard* of part of the system is that it is going to cause delays this year because we have to take the product that the transcribers put into the old Wang system, convert it into the new IBM system, and reformat it. And that's just going to cause some delays which means we'll be paying a little more overtime for the people that work in the production side — and a little more frustration. That's a concern of mine with the, you know, morale and so on.

Mr. Hagel: — I'm looking on page 4, item 270. And this would be the new equipment purchases. Are the items, the five items listed there, are they listed in order of priority? I guess what I'm wondering is if it's possible to . . . is this kind of an all or nothing sort of package? Is it possible to accomplish something significantly useful for less than the \$280,000 in equipment purchases, less than that total amount?

Ms. Ronyk: — The staff have been asking me that very same question, because you'll see if you look on page 7 there's an actual breakdown of that \$280,000.

Mr. Hagel: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — That shows you where the bulk of the expense will be, and it'll be for new PCs, replacing the dumb terminals, and replacing them in *Hansard*. And the terminal users are the dumb terminals or the non-intelligent terminals that we still have in the rest of the organization. That is the biggest expense.

Now you're asking, can we do part of this and not all? Yes we can. But we're going to have a real fight on our hands to see whether it goes to *Hansard* or it goes to the rest of the organization, and that's basically the breakdown that there would be.

Mr. Hagel: — And for the *Hansard* portion of it — of the total 280, 235 is *Hansard* — is there any sense in purchasing something less than the total 235 for *Hansard*? Or then are you into mixed systems that just don't function well?

Ms. Ronyk: — It's my understanding — and my people here can confirm that or correct me — that to do the upgrade that we need to *Hansard* is about \$100,000. So it's only \$100,000 of that total 280.

Mr. Hagel: — Oh, and terminal users.

Ms. Ronyk: — Sorry, excuse me, it's about 125,000. Yes the terminal users are not *Hansard*. That's in the rest of the organization.

Mr. Hagel: — Oh I see.

Ms. Ronyk: — 125 is roughly the *Hansard* portion of our increase.

Mr. Hagel: — And then the terminals is 110. So then I would ask, if we . . . I come back to my original question then. Is the listing in item 270, is this in order of priority or this is just . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — No, it's just a listing of the contents of it or the make-up of it.

Mr. Hagel: — Is it possible for you to go through and identify these in terms of priority, of value, to increase the efficiency or effectiveness of operation?

Ms. Ronyk: — I guess, you know, a judgement will have to be made whether it's more important to fix *Hansard* or is it more important to fix the rest of the organization.

In the rest of the organization, you know, we can continue to add bits and pieces and I mean we will spend whatever money you give us and we will try to do that dealing with the most urgent need.

I think probably the first thing that we do need to do, in order to get the functionality out of the expenditures we've already made, is to replace those non-intelligent terminals. But that would be something we would have to sit down internally and try to decide where would be the best place to put the money. Because until we replace them, we can't go into the new software and have a network that works with the new equipment and software.

Mr. Hagel: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — You know, they're not even PCs. All they are is terminals, word processing terminals, and they're pretty ancient stuff.

Mr. Hagel: — I see. And that figure attached to that move would be \$110,000?

Ms. Ronyk: — No. Because it would be the rest of the 280, I think. And then the other code of course are the software that needs to be done. If we're going to have new equipment, then it doesn't do any good unless we can have the software that goes with it and makes it work.

The Chairperson: — Excuse me just for a minute here.

Ms. Ronyk: — If our *Hansard* part of the increase is 125, that's about half of the 250 extra that we're asking for. Probably the most urgent need for the most number of users is on the other part of the organization. The Legislative Library has to have some equipment increases in order to keep up with the technology that's there.

They have an ancient CD ROM (compact disc ready-only-memory) that won't play the newest releases of things. They need updated, more powerful equipment for the Internet connections. They need a lot of things that Marian will be able to give you a little more detail on later. And the rest of that money would enable the rest of the organization to get up to speed and get on a standard sort of basis with the rest of the board. And we would likely do that and take the chance that *Hansard* will not fail.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay. Then looking at the other side of the coin, because I quite appreciate too that if you don't replace equipment with more effective equipment . . . And setting aside just for the moment, not because I consider it irrelevant, I don't, but setting aside for the moment the factors of frustration and efficiency, just pure dollars spent. If we weren't to spend that 280,000 in purchase of new equipment, then what is the

implications in terms of expected maintenance costs to continue to operate just what we've got with the same capacities and the same frustrations? Is it possible to . . .

Is that the difference between line 277, '94-95, and '95-96? In essence, I guess that leads me to believe that it costs \$50,000 maintenance to do nothing?

Ms. Ronyk: — If you look at the maintenance code 277, we have a significant reduction there in our request this year because of the replacement of the old VAXmates that were very costly to maintain. But we feel that if we did not get the rest of the items that we're requesting there and we were asked to make do with the same dollars as last year, this figure would have to go up to about 45,000 from 35; we'd need to add 10 to that for maintenance. And in our view, that's just money down the drain because it doesn't give us anything for the money. It's a waste of money. I mean \$10,000 that you're just throwing away and you're not getting anything for it, any functionality for it.

Mr. Hagel: — Finally one last question, and one can finish that off by saying, and then we come back to the same picture next year all over again. However, is there a cost efficiency in terms of postponing purchase which means that if you come back next year, it's reasonable to expect lower costs because of changing prices in the cost of the technologies, the hardwares?

Ms. Ronyk: — I guess I would need a bit of advice on that, but basically yes, I think technology is coming down. But as our needs expand and we're ready to use a more sophisticated equipment and technology, I don't think there'll be a significant difference there. Stuff that's cheap out there are the old 386s that nobody wants any more. You know, there's no point in buying anything less than a 486 . . . 66 because it's going to be obsolete tomorrow.

When you buy at what's current and what's currently the most useful, I don't think there'd be a great deal of difference between now and next year. There has been over the last five years. There could be, but on the other hand, there could be some increases too. We may have to go to a Pentium-based machine by next year and that probably will cost us more.

Mr. Upshall: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I assume there's very little value in the existing system once it's replaced. I didn't — maybe I missed it — I didn't see anywhere in the document where you would recoup any monies from the sale of existing equipment.

Ms. Ronyk: — That's right. It basically becomes salvage almost. I'll give you a couple of examples of that. We bought out . . .

Mr. Upshall: — Maybe the Chechen Republic would like some of them.

Ms. Ronyk: — Maybe my kid's school.

Last year when our five-year Digital lease was up, which was the bulk of our equipment and system, we were able to purchase the whole works for \$26,000. Admittedly we paid for it well over the five years. But I mean that's what it was worth. It wasn't worth just . . . you know, they didn't want it back in order to sell it and make some money on it because it was pretty well worthless.

Another example is that when Workers' Comp was getting rid of their old Wang terminals; we were able to buy — I don't know, was it 20 of them? 17? — 17 of them for \$500.

Mr. Hagel: — Total?

Ms. Ronyk: — Total. So they just aren't worth much once the . . . (inaudible) . . . runs the new software.

Mr. Upshall: — Now just in following up in terms of what Mr. Hagel was saying about the possibility of either going part way this year and the whole way next year. You have two items, 272 and 279, systems consulting and training. Can you give me an idea of what would happen if we went to terminal users only or *Hansard* only, if we could reduce the costs in those two departments by doing, first of all, a lesser amount and then doing the rest in-house as opposed to the total consulting for a complete operation, adding the training of \$20,000?

Ms. Ronyk: — We would likely save on training because there wouldn't be as much new equipment to train people for — a little bit there. We would have to probably spend more on consulting because we would still have a mixed bag of equipment that is problematical. It causes . . . it doesn't work properly; there's glitches all the time. And we don't have anybody on staff. We have no systems expertise position, no position in the Assembly where we have anybody with any systems expertise, and so we have to go out and contract that expertise, which we have done. And our systems consultant is right here, Chris Hecht. We, as you say, last year here we budgeted \$15,000. Well we've blown that budget in order to keep functioning. I think we spent probably about 45 in this year — isn't that what . . . 272, and the year isn't over yet . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . 35 so far.

Because we can't hold this together. It's being held together with haywire and binder twine, and if we don't have somebody that knows the complexities of this old stuff and can kind of keep it . . .

Mr. Upshall: — So you'd be duplicating, one old and one new . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. Well no, just parts. Some parts are old; some parts are new. It's not a duplicate. It's just that we don't have it all up to the same standard.

Mr. Upshall: — So then it's . . . So what you're saying then is it's possible to separate *Hansard* out for internal users, but we don't solve . . . you only half solve your problem then.

Ms. Ronyk: — Well *Hansard* would still have a problem. It doesn't affect . . . you know, the fact that *Hansard* has problems doesn't affect the rest of the organization as much as having weak spots in the rest of the systems.

Mr. Upshall: — Yes, what I was getting at is if we could segregate, get one up and running . . . I'm assuming your costs of consulting and probably training would drop because you're almost doing an experimental one. But what you're saying to me is that it won't help that much because you still have the problem of the old system, assuming you can segregate the two.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. Likely we could save a bit on the consulting because I think that code includes some application development. We want to renew our indexing system. We have a computer system, a software system, in *Hansard* to do the automated indexing. It's not really automated, but it's as automated as we get right now. And we need to renew it; it's ancient; it's failing. It's, you know, not working that well. We need to renew that. And we're only putting in \$5,000 to start on that project here, and another 5 in that 55,000 is to start on the development of a precedent database so that Speakers' rulings and precedents will be accessible on a database, and it won't be just up here.

When Gordon Barnhart left, he took 20 years of procedural experience with him, and it's lost to us. It's totally gone. And we need to get some of this down in . . . it's accessible to members, it's accessible to caucus staff, and it's accessible to the Clerks and the chairs and the Speaker. And we're way behind on that compared to other legislatures. And this is merely a drop in the bucket, but it would get us started this year. So I think about 10 of that was for application development.

Now they're telling me they took that out already, that 10,000. We had initially, I thought, 50,000 in there, and I thought we left . . . Oh, I thought we'd left 5 in each of those. They say it's gone altogether. What page is that? That's on page 8, yes. You'll see under code 272, that's the breakdown for systems consulting. And the *Hansard* indexing, the precedents databases, we've already cut that out totally. And you can see that our projection for next year, if we were to do that, is 75,000 and 50,000.

Mr. Upshall: — Just one last question. If the system were to be implemented as you request, you've got the out years to '98-99 of costs. What's the life span of what you request? I mean that's a tough question with the technology; I know that. But in terms of what other jurisdictions have and where they're going, my question I guess is: is the Chevy good enough or is it an expenditure that will just take us for five or six years and we'll have to do another major upgrade?

Ms. Ronyk: — We used to think that . . . And in fact our first two automation contracts were five-year leases, and we used to think that was appropriate. It isn't any more; that's far too long. Three years is what we really need to look at. And we haven't really built in here any great renewal of the PCs. You can see

that there's a little bit across the board . . . Oh, there's some across the board.

If you look up at the very top, code 270, new PCs and printers, we have a big amount this year, 235; and then the following years we still have some in there — 40,000, 65,000, 45,000. So that we will be doing basically what they do in government, is they have a basic amount that's for renewals, replacements. You know, they don't have to get a whole lot of extra each year but they do have some in their budget every year.

This may be too long a projection, but we're basically saying we get this, it's going to keep us for another three years after that. And then we'll likely be coming back to you in '99-00 with a request that will have more hardware requirements in it to replace some of these. And that's just the way the interest goes.

Mr. Upshall: — Is there any attempt by legislatures across the country to get together on these things to standardize what we might have so we can all be talking out of the same book?

Ms. Ronyk: — There is some real exciting things happening. And we are getting on to more standards if we get off of this old Digital thing we're on and get into a system where we're using Microsoft Word or WordPerfect — one of these standard software languages.

We already are communicating with other jurisdictions. They're asking when we send them stuff, send it on a disk, send it on a WordPerfect disk. So we're doing that kind of very basic sort of interchange, and we'll be able to do that better once we have WordPerfect or Microsoft Word, which we don't at the moment.

There are some exciting things happening, particularly in the sharing of legislative documents. Several jurisdictions already have their statutes available electronically. They're putting up on-line *Hansards* that we will be able to access as soon as we have the standard here that we're looking for through modem, through Internet eventually. We'll be able to talk to the Premier of New Brunswick, I guess, if he's on the Internet system.

There are some exciting things being done by some of the bigger jurisdictions. Quebec and Ontario are both putting big dollars into precedent databases that we will be able to access once we have, you know, the equipment that will allow that. And presumably eventually we will put ours up, and they will be able to access ours. And the House of Commons has been working on a procedural database for about 10 years and do provide us with a lot of reports off of their system that keeps us up to date with what they're doing, their precedents and so on.

As far as sharing of costs, you know we really haven't got that far. We're still worrying, looking at having some compatibility between the systems and equipment that will allow us to interchange information more. The libraries are probably more advanced than any of the rest of legislatures because they have to be on the forefront of moving into obtaining information electronically which is eventually much cheaper than buying the books and buying the subscriptions to periodicals.

If there's something that you only need to access twice a year, it saves a whole lot if you don't have to buy that thing, sit it on the shelf, store it, handle it, process it, but instead you can just access it through a computer database and pull off the article or two that you need and pay for that. But that's all you pay for is that particular use that you made of it.

So there's just a lot of scope there for the advantages of technology. And I think our library is doing quite well in terms of automation. They feel the need first because their equipment just never quite seems to measure up to what they really could be doing. But certainly the links of other libraries is particularly valuable in accessing information instead of interlibrary loans that take forever for this hard copy to move from here to there. They're exchanging information electronically, and it's amazing change.

Mr. Upshall: — Okay, thank you.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, I just have just a couple of brief questions, Gwenn. In terms of the sourcing of this equipment, would this be sole source? Would it . . . Are there a number of suppliers that might be invited to tender, or would it be an open tender?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, we go through the government, the SPMC tendering process. We use SPMC purchasing facilities. We just go through the same hoops that a government department does even though we don't have to. We're not legally required to follow those processes, but we say, well why not. If they're willing to provide us with that service of purchasing, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense for us to go off and try to do something on our own. And we want to get the best price, and if that system will do it for us, that's what we use. So we work closely with them and try to get the . . . you know, the stuff is tendered, and we get the best price for what we're getting.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. I guess a comment and a question. In terms of estimates for future years, I'm not a computer wizard, and I don't claim to know very much about them, but I would have expected that if we are to make this investment in this fiscal year that future year expenditures could be reduced quite dramatically I guess, for purchasing software, but I see you still in '96, 7, 8 and 9 there's ongoing expenditures in some of those areas. Do you think there's any flexibility in those future years, or are those pretty much pat?

Ms. Ronyk: — Well there is. What we're asking for this year is to establish this kind of standard level or base within the Assembly. The expenditures in the future years are where we hope to start providing enhanced services. You know, the on-line *Hansard*, the precedent database, the better telecommunications, services that will allow for the proper Internet hook-ups, the moving into putting our legislative papers on-line, hopefully allowing members eventually to communicate from their constituency offices say to financial services. The secretary can send in her time sheet via the computer and we don't have to have this problem of delay in

getting people paid because we have to wait for the mail to bring in the silly time sheet.

There's big things and there's small things that we would want to be providing for in the future with these dollars. But as you say we can say no, well we're not going to move into that new service yet and we still will be able to function and do the things we do now because we have this base there.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Can you tell me if there would be any impact on staffing either within *Hansard* or within your operation with respect to new equipment? Would there be a potential for decreasing the number of staff that are required? Or does this not have an impact on that?

Ms. Ronyk: — I doubt it because what we're doing with automation is, you know, absorbing more workload with the same staff and that's why we haven't had to really have an increase in the Assembly staff since 1980, in the core-support staff except I think two positions in financial services and a half a one in *Journals* in all that time because we've been able to keep up with the increase and the workload by the automation that's there.

I think staffing depends on a lot of other things. I mean if we change the way we do certain things or we stop doing certain things, that'll have, you know, more of a staff impact than just the automation. If anything I would say that we're maybe going to need some system staff to deal with the more sophisticated equipment.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Maybe we shouldn't buy these.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, well for example, Executive Council has fairly recently kind of tried to move into a more modern age and cabled with the new modern IBDN (Integrated Building Data Network) cabling within the Legislative Building. They can link with each other and with the minister's office. And they have three systems people dedicated to supporting that system. We have none and we do have to go out and buy the services of somebody that has some expertise.

Maybe it didn't matter so much when basically we're buying word processing systems. They just weren't as complex. When we're buying more sophisticated technology, we're trying to do more sophisticated things, we're finding we often are in trouble for not having the expertise that we need and we do have to buy it and that's always been part of our contracts, our leases, as the support and maintenance and we're paying for it one way or the other.

Mr. Swenson: — These quotes that you've given us here, Gwenn, these are to, say the last six months SPMC bid lists, or where did you get these numbers from, if you haven't found a tender yet?

Ms. Ronyk: — On what we figure these things will cost?

Mr. Swenson: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — That's the expertise of our system consultant who knows the market, and that's our best guess at the moment.

Mr. Swenson: — This isn't SPMC though, its quotes?

Ms. Ronyk: — No.

Mr. Swenson: — But they're the people you'd use.

Ms. Ronyk: — Well they're the people that we would use when we do actually go out and want to make these purchases.

Mr. Swenson: — And the reason I ask that, I have an acquaintance that's in the business and he services two fairly large government entities — one's a Crown and one's a line department — this stuff, on an ongoing basis. And most of the current tenders have training, for instance, built right into them. He, for instance, has an in-house facility simply to train people up on the various machines that he sells, which they do in off season or that type of thing. And he tells me that that's sort of the way the business is going, that they're going to a more all-inclusive package, because they also want the service work of course that goes with it.

Ms. Ronyk: — And that's the way we have operated in the past when we did our Digital lease. Digital provided all the training within the terms of that lease.

Mr. Swenson: — Of the lease.

Ms. Ronyk: — We still think it would cost the combination of those two figures. In fact \$20,000 for training is probably not enough.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — Any other questions? No further questions, we will go on.

Ms. Ronyk: — The 300 codes are for printing and publishing, and under the Assembly admin this is fairly minimal. But you will note under code 310 — and this is on page 7 in your budget document — there is where we're asking for the \$5,000 for the heritage . . . our share as a partner in the heritage video. That would be the Legislative Building and its value as a heritage building and so on. It would be a wee bit shorter than the current one that we've done.

Mr. Upshall: — What percentage is that?

Ms. Ronyk: — It's code 310 and it's \$5,000, and it's . . .

Mr. Upshall: — Yes, what percentage of the total would that be of our share? What per cent . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Oh, of the heritage video?

Mr. Upshall: — Right.

Ms. Ronyk: — Where I think they're budgeting about 40,000 again, and that's the same as we budgeted for our own. Or we didn't budget for all of that, but that was the total budget for the video.

Code 319, publishing, there's where we publish our educational brochures. It's this little package, if you're aware, that has the various brochures in it. And the money there this year is really the same as in previous years. The \$5,000 there I think this year will be spent on republishing the election of member brochure, because we will be into an election year in the next year or two. And after inventorying our supplies, that is the one that we're lowest on. And of course after an election we will need to do a new Speaker insert in that particular brochure.

The new cost here is the Board of Internal Economy verbatims which just started this last year and weren't in our budget previously.

The next section is travel and travel expenses. You won't see here the Clerk's conferences and so on. That comes under Clerk's office in a later subvote. But I do want to draw your attention to code 422. You'll note that it is zero, and that's because the Clerk has given up her executive vehicle from government.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Does that mean because the executive vehicle was getting too old, Gwenn?

Ms. Ronyk: — Could be, yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I'm considering that myself.

Ms. Ronyk: — The reason I draw that to your attention, it saves the Legislative Assembly about \$5,000, and I do want you to keep that in mind when we get to the Clerk's travel budget.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It's noted.

The Chairperson: — Well I do want to make a comment on this. When a car doesn't want to start — you have it in the garage plugged in and it doesn't want to start — it's about time to get rid of it.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. They're getting very ancient.

Ms. Haverstock: — I am curious, given all the comments, what the make and the year of these vehicles are.

The Chairperson: — I don't mind telling you. Mine is an 88 Olds, 1989, 205,000 clicks on it.

Ms. Haverstock: — That's a good ad actually, except for the not-starting- plugged-in-in-the-garage . . .

The Chairperson: — And having to hire someone to come and tow it.

Ms. Haverstock: — Is that a similar year for the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Swenson: — I don't know what the current one is like, but that's what the last one was.

Ms. Ronyk: — They're all that old. Yes.

The Chairperson: — I think most of them are '88-'89s.

Ms. Haverstock: — There's no purchase of gasoline or anything . . . like gasoline purchase included in this?

Ms. Ronyk: — This figure, yes, 428.

The Chairperson: — Look at 428.

Ms. Ronyk: — That 24,000 is for all the costs that the department pays to CVA (Central Vehicle Agency), and that includes maintenance and operation as well as the capital cost of the vehicle.

Ms. Haverstock: — You wouldn't think an '88 Chevy would be worth \$10,800 at this point.

The Chairperson: — Well I think my 88 Olds, I think, is worth about \$4,200. If you're lucky, you get 4,200.

Ms. Ronyk: — That's the problem. These things have long depreciated, but they're still being charged at the same basis because they do cost a lot to maintain them when they get that old.

Mr. Upshall: — Are you buying a vehicle soon?

Ms. Haverstock: — No, I was just very curious given all this discussion about not even wanting to drive one any more.

The Chairperson: — That is serious, that we've had a fair number of complaints of people who simply do not want to drive, them and they're not road warrant . . . what's the word I want?

A Member: — Worthy.

The Chairperson: — Yes. They just simply aren't. I mean if I could, I'd gladly trade mine in and give it back and say okay, pay me for my mileage. At least I'll have a decent car to drive. But I won't have to worry about it very much longer I hear, so I won't lose any sleep over mine.

Mr. Swenson: — Lynda, I was coming over the Belle Plaine overpass at about 110 kliks and the rear passenger window imploded, and I thought somebody was shooting at me.

Ms. Haverstock: — They probably were.

A Member: — How did you know? How did you prove they weren't?

Mr. Swenson: — I'm not kidding. That is a hell of a feeling to have an entire window and all the glass associated with it, about 500 . . . (inaudible) . . . all come in at you. And if it had been the one right beside me, I suspect I would probably be missing at least one eye and have crashed. That's a hell of a noise and a terrible feeling.

And I did think somebody was shooting at me. I drove the next mile with my head down because you don't know what . . . that's a scary experience.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, I'm just going to run past, under item 193, you have . . .

The Chairperson: — 193?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I raise it because of item 422 in the CVA (Central Vehicle Agency). How many miles would you put on on a CVA vehicle in a year? Is it fairly expensive, is what I'm asking.

Ms. Ronyk: — Not nearly as much as the members use, and that's why it only costs the Assembly about 6,800 there. I would only put on . . . I think I've put on only about 12,000 kilometres a year.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Would you be then . . . would you be charging back CVA rate to the Legislative Assembly? I mean what I'm saying here, Gwenn, is you know I appreciate the fact that you feel you don't require a CVA vehicle, and that the allocation has been budgeted is \$100 a month.

In other areas of government when government employees use their personal vehicles, they charge back to Property Management Corporation the SGEU negotiated rate which I think at this point is about 27 cents a klik.

And, you know, I guess what I'm saying is I think it's only fair that this be treated, that you be treated, in the same fashion as other government employees would.

Ms. Ronyk: — Well I think if you looked right back at the 193 code on page 5, you'll see a new item there is the taxable allowance, a car allowance that is there for senior civil servants if they don't have a car. If they're at that kind of deputy minister or very senior level, it's \$100 a month; it's taxable; it doesn't amount to a whole lot. But that is I think supposed to cover, you know, my mileage out on business.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — Supposed to be, but I don't see how that works.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I don't believe that's going to cover much because by the time you deal with income tax I would guess you're looking at a substantially reduced amount.

And I'm sorry that we can't supply with I guess more appropriate vehicles, but we've been reducing the number of

CVA vehicles that we bought in the last four years as part of the budgetary restraint, and I guess it's meant a little bit of sacrifice.

One of the concerns I guess — and I don't want to digress from this budget — but one of the concerns that we have especially in northern Saskatchewan and areas where we have public health nurses, we have shifted all of the low mileage cars to the northern part of the province and the more isolated areas simply because of the safety factors, public health nurses driving winter roads. And it's really a difficult situation for government and it's one that we're going to have to rectify. Hopefully when we're in a better financial position we'll be able to get back to purchasing the required amount of vehicles, because it really is a worry for government.

The Chairperson: — Mr. Lautermilch, could I reverse the process there and ask you a question. Is the government considering to maybe implementing an option policy where we simply charge the rate of the Public Service Commission and I'll give you my car back?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — That's available now.

The Chairperson: — Since when?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I think probably since the time that you were in government the last time.

The Chairperson: — It sure wasn't available when I became Speaker.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Actually yes, there was three options for senior . . .

The Chairperson: — No, I asked. I wanted to keep my car and I was simply told no, I couldn't.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It may be different for cabinet than for the Speaker.

The Chairperson: — I think it is.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I'm not sure of that, but I know with respect to department heads and other government employees . . . (inaudible) . . .

The Chairperson: — I'm given to understand the board could change that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well we want to see you get the optimum amount of miles out of your vehicle, Mr. Speaker.

The Chairperson: — You are. You're seeing it right now.

Mr. Hagel: — Just before we move along, because I guess I'm sitting here thinking this thing through, and the reality is that this really means, and I think it's not far off to say that in the context of PSC (Public Service Commission) rates that this is really reimbursement for about 300 clicks a month, in effect. It's

a taxable allowance and you're talking a hundred dollars a month.

And I appreciate the benefit to our budget in doing this, Gwenn, and I seriously do ask the question, is there not the other option available to choose? I mean if this is your choice, fair enough, fine.

Ms. Ronyk: — I guess there is for me as a staff person. I could take no allowance, you know, not the car allowance and just claim actuals. And I'll just have to see how that works out.

One thing I'd like to say though, in giving up this vehicle I don't want that to interfere in any way with the right or entitlement of a future Clerk to an executive vehicle. It does come to the Clerk because the Clerk is parallel to deputy ministers in government. And that shouldn't change just with my own personal decision.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay. So you're saying that there is that other option that's there but that's not the one that you're recommending.

Ms. Ronyk: — I just really haven't explored it that much, but I think it is. I don't think I can do both.

Mr. Hagel: — No.

The Chairperson: — Are there any other further questions? Okay, away we go.

Is there anything on page 8 — any questions on page 8?

Ms. Haverstock: — With the newspapers that are here, who receives the three issues of the *Leader-Post*?

Ms. Ronyk: — These are for the offices that are covered under this subvote. Speaker's office, Clerk's office, and room 123 get the *Leader-Post*; and *Star-Phoenix*, the Speaker's office and Clerk's office; and *The Globe and Mail* is the Clerk's office. We also put newspapers in the caucus lounges during session, but that's in the caucus admin budget.

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay. Just going down the page here with 610 and 620, since both of those are doubled, could you just comment? I'm wondering, do employees need to provide a doctor's certificate if they in fact want to qualify for special furniture, or how does that work?

Ms. Ronyk: — That's basically how it works now or has worked in the past, that if you had a health problem that required a particular kind of chair, SPMC would usually do their best to provide that if you had a doctor's certificate.

Things have changed somewhat there with the new occupational health and safety regulations. Now employers are required to provide occupationally healthy ergonomic furniture and work spaces to their employees.

Government has been wrestling with this across the board as to how they were going to meet these new regulations. And basically where it's at right now within government is that SPMC who normally provides the furniture to all government departments don't feel that they can afford to supply new chairs largely right across the board, which is probably what they'd have to do to meet the regulations. And it's been decided that departments are going to have to budget themselves for this.

And we've had a look at it within our organization. We figure that in order to meet the regulations it would cost us about \$20,000. We're trying to phase that in over a three- or four-year period and that's why we really have the \$5,000 in here.

We always had, as you can see, a bit of money in there for furniture and equipment. You can see in '93 and '94 it wasn't used. So pretty well this whole 5,000 will go towards replacing . . . making work stations more friendly to the user, trying to prevent the repetitive strain injuries that have become really endemic, especially with computers and mouses and so on. There's a lot of job hours being lost due to problems with people's health that derive from the repetitive nature of a lot of our tasks.

It used to be that in the workplace, in the normal office, people did a lot of different things. They were up and they were down and they were filing and they were answering the phone and they were moving around. Now more and more workers are working . . . do everything off their terminal. And there's a lot more repetitive type of small motor movement that is causing carpal tunnel problems, tennis elbow, and those kinds of things.

Ms. Haverstock: — And that can be prevented by furniture?

Ms. Ronyk: — It indeed can. In fact we had our own . . .

Ms. Haverstock: — Just the right placement of chairs and tabletops?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. The proper alignment of the body is the key. And occupational health and safety have done seminars and we've sent some of our people to these seminars. And they've come back and trained all of our staff in avoiding habits that are likely to lead to some of these problems.

And we can do a lot with just changing people's work habits, giving them the proper height of desk, the adjustable chairs that go up and down and they move back this way. They have arms, they have a small back support, and providing . . . making sure that your keyboard is at the right level so that your hands aren't in a stress position. Little accessories that . . . wrist rests and things like that, that help. So that's what the money will be for.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. I have one final minor question here. But with 160, which is the silverware, china, and so forth, is there an inventory method that's used or a marking system that's been put in place to keep track of these kinds of items? They're so . . . like some of them are very small. I'm just wondering if any have sort of gone missing.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, indeed. I think Debbie would like to report on that perhaps, because the Speaker's secretary is responsible for kind of coordinating the provision of . . . the expenditure of these funds and ensuring that we know where they're at and that they're being looked after.

Ms. Saum: — Actually I've been working with Pam in the Dome Cafeteria and we have implemented a marking system and a tracking system. And so it's working. It's been for the last year and it's working quite well. But there's still, you know, teacups and saucers that are broken over time and need replenishing. So anyway we are doing that.

Ms. Haverstock: — What about the teaspoons?

The Chairperson: — It seems that — Debbie doesn't want to say it, but I'll say it — it seems at every banquet or reception that we have, you may put out 500 spoons and you never get 500 back.

Ms. Saum: — Those are a bit difficult to mark because they're so small.

Ms. Haverstock: — You're checking your invitation list?

The Chairperson: — We were thinking of putting somebody at the door.

Over the years, the spoons have simply disappeared. And they're very expensive. They're very expensive but they have to be replaced. We're short quite a few right now. But that's not just this year; it's been over the years that this has happened. And this is the year we're just too short; we can't put on some of the receptions.

Ms. Ronyk: — Are there any more questions on page 8? And 9 is then just the personnel summary for this section.

The Chairperson: — All right. On page 9, any questions in the personnel summary? Those are the ones that you looked at earlier, I think, this evening. Page 10.

Ms. Ronyk: — The next subvote or the next organization within the general administration subvote is caucus administration. So here's where we have tried to collect the expenditures that are caucus-related. And starting on page 11, we can see the detail there. Personal services are detailed on page 13.

The Chairperson: — Are there any questions on page 11?

Mr. Hagel: — Just item 251. The expectation here is that the usage is consistent with '94-95, but the rates have been reduced. That's why the number is lower?

Ms. Ronyk: — Partly it could be lowered usage as well. But we have found that there's been a savings because of . . . no this is just rental. So this is usage.

Mr. Hagel: — I see.

Ms. Ronyk: — It's the next code 252, that's long distance. And that is where we have seen some savings due to the rates. Quite substantial there.

Mr. Hagel: — Right. Okay.

The Chairperson: — Any questions on page 12? If not, let's move on. Page 13, you've had a look at that. Page 14, Gwenn.

Ms. Ronyk: — This next subvote is the services provided by SPMC to the Legislative Assembly for accommodation and central services. While we do not pay rent for our space within the Legislative Building, we do — if you look on the detail on page 15 — we do pay for some storage space in the Gemini Warehouse, and we pay for the cost of postage in using the government postal system. Now this is largely postage that . . . Legislative Assembly postage but it's also the handling of members and caucus mail.

The Chairperson: — Okay, page 16.

Ms. Ronyk: — The second section there is the Legislative Library charges from SPMC which are largely for postage and courier services.

The Chairperson: — Seventeen.

Ms. Ronyk: — Page 17 is the next major section of the budget. And we call the Legislative Assembly Office but it is composed of . . . starting the next page with a breakdown by organization . . . deals with the Clerk's Office which is everyone else in the office but me, means the Deputy Clerks and the pages and the support staff of two people in my office. And a lot of the printing that we do for the legislature — the session — it has the clerks' training and professional development budget. We can get into the detail there.

But the other parts of this subvote, Clerk's office and *Hansard* . . . and we have a separate section for *Hansard* and for security and for visitor services and legislative broadcasting and so on. And so the first section is the Clerk's office. And they start again with the personal services, if there are any questions. There is detail on page 23. Here of course I wouldn't mind highlighting the fact that we're saving some substantial dollars in salaries in the Clerk's office primarily because we have new people in senior positions — the Deputy Clerk, the Clerk Assistant and with Joyce Rublee's retirement from my office, we have a more junior person in that position and a proposed reclass downward in that position that will save us dollars.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Back on page 20, codes 400 to 403 — it's the travel — there is a seminar in Newfoundland and a seminar conference in Tennessee. What are these conferences and who goes?

Ms. Ronyk: — These are the procedural Clerks' professional development conferences. The Newfoundland conference is the

Canadian Clerk's association and it's made up of the Clerks of legislatures from all across the country. And it is our opportunity — it's really about a two and a half day business meeting — where we share the developments that are occurring in each of our legislatures. We discuss with our procedural colleagues, procedural difficulties and problems.

It's really the only place where we can go to talk to somebody who understands what our particular job is. I mean there's only three of us in the whole province and we do need to have access to other professionals particularly with the parliamentary procedural aspect of our work. Although the administration of the legislature is also the responsibility of the Clerks in each jurisdiction and we find we benefit a lot by learning firsthand the experience of others. We don't have to reinvent the wheel quite so often because we can utilize or build on the experience that other jurisdictions have.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — What about Tennessee?

Ms. Ronyk: — Tennessee is . . .

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Is that one you go to annually?

Ms. Ronyk: — It isn't. The joint Canadian-American Clerk's conference is one that's held every two years. It hasn't been held now for, this will be four years between the last one, partly because it was supposed to be in Ontario last year and they said no, they didn't have enough money to host it and they cancelled it. But Tennessee has offered to host it this year in 1995. It is the opportunity for Canadian procedural officers to meet with our counterparts in the American system and it's the Clerks of Houses of Representatives in the various states and secretaries to the Senates in the various states.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Have we always sent . . . when they were held, did we always send someone down?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes we did; we always had it in the budget. I think there was a time or two when nobody could go because they couldn't leave for various reasons. It started in 1980 and so it's a relatively recent one. It's been happening every other year since 1980.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Well I guess I don't understand. It wasn't held last year; 413 which is last year's estimate is 2,120. This year you're going and it's 1,400. I don't understand the discrepancies on code 413. It's Clerk's professional seminar, two people, Newfoundland, and then there's one person to Tennessee. If you didn't have the American conference last year, how is it that last year's estimate was higher than this year when you're going?

Ms. Ronyk: — That code 413 is the accommodation and . . .

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Oh, I see.

Ms. Ronyk: — I don't understand either why it's so high. You can see our actual for the year before was only less than \$600.

And last year there was only the Clerk's conference and it was held in Manitoba. Oh yes, but last year we also budgeted to send two people to the Commonwealth Clerks meeting which is held in conjunction with the CPA (Commonwealth Parliamentary Association), the Commonwealth CPA in Alberta. And it was that for the accommodation, it was in Banff in this fall. Yes, the accommodation there was \$1,400 and you're right.

I had forgotten about the . . . we don't normally send a Clerk to the Commonwealth society of Clerks because it's held in some Commonwealth country every year and it's only if a Clerk happens to be going to the CPA conference that we go to the society of Clerks in the Commonwealth. But because it was in Canada last fall and it was in Alberta which is close in terms of travel costs, the Board did agree last year to send Clerks there.

I reminded you earlier that I was going to raise when we got here, remind you of the savings in travel. The other reason that I request this is that it is really the one opportunity that the Clerks have to have any professional sort of development. I mean there's no university courses we can go to. There aren't any ways to learn how to be a proceduralist. And we do have out of the three table officer positions in the Assembly, we have two people in new positions. Greg Putz is now the Deputy Clerk and is taking on a lot of administrative responsibilities that are new to him. Meta Woods, our Clerk Assistant is new, and I hate to say this, but she's badly in need of procedural training. The Driving Safety Committee is giving her a good start.

Mr. Hagel: — Learning from the best.

Ms. Ronyk: — I don't feel strongly about the Tennessee conference because other than I feel it's important to kind of keep up our support of that effort because it has value, it isn't as valuable to us in terms of our professional training as the Canadian one is.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — So you wouldn't lose a lot of educational experience or professional experience by not going to Tennessee?

Ms. Ronyk: — No, we wouldn't. What we would lose is the contacts with our American colleagues and what we benefit when we meet with them and see their legislatures is first of all the contact, that we can contact them at another time when we need information. But they are quite advanced in terms of technology. They have had computers in their legislatures for a long time.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Maybe you can talk to them through Internet.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, that's right. If we get our Internet we don't have to worry about travelling there.

Ms. Haverstock: — I'm just curious as to the in-city travel. What would . . .

The Chairperson: — That's evening when overtime is required, I believe, for people working at *Hansard*.

Ms. Ronyk: — I think that will be under *Hansard*. This is for pages. We have to take documents for the Lieutenant Governor to sign for royal recommendations for all the Bills in the House. We send a page to carry that over there and they're going back and forth fairly regularly.

Ms. Haverstock: — I was just curious. The other question I have is under 312, which is events. I'm just wondering between the '93-94 and this past — well the one we're currently in I guess, '94-95 — there's a \$1,200 difference. Is there any explanation for why that change was there? I know that the requested amount is to remain the same for this coming year.

The Chairperson: — Probably a big farewell for the Speaker. I mean everybody . . . they're so happy to see him go. Everybody is so happy to see him go they want to give him a big send-off. I'm just joking.

Ms. Haverstock: — That's under this, lots of flowers and gratuities part, right?

The Chairperson: — I think I heard Eric say let's do it earlier.

We'll have to try and find you an answer for that for tomorrow. We just don't have it with us right now.

Ms. Haverstock: — It's not a burning question. I was just curious as to why there was a \$1,200 difference.

The Chairperson: — We don't know.

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — We'll have to try and find it for you. Okay? Any other . . . Oh, Mr. Hagel.

Mr. Hagel: — Yes 319. Is that in essence the saving that comes with changing the size of the pages that the printing is being done on?

Ms. Ronyk: — That's only a small part of it actually. The things that we're doing here with the printing is going to the eight and a half by eleven format. We also did a review of our printing and we have cut the numbers that we are printing of *Votes*, and *Orders*, and *Journals*, and so on. We're finding that we order 800; we didn't need 800; we're cutting it to 7 or 6.

Mr. Hagel: — All right, 7, 800. Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — We also are going to see . . . we've incorporated some savings here from the new tender even though that new tender isn't really back yet. It won't be finalized for the next couple of weeks. The old tender for Bills was at \$57 a page and we're cutting that to 37 and we think, in our estimate here, we think it will come in easily at that. We know that some of our lower cost items like the *Votes* and the *Orders*, that may go up a

bit from the 21 . . . (inaudible) . . . page because of the cost of paper. But we think it will even out there.

The other thing that will change this, it isn't . . . okay, the other thing that isn't reflected here yet but will be next year is we expect the separate chapters to go over to Queen's Printer, as I mentioned earlier, and then we will only buy the ones that we need in the Assembly instead of buying them and mailing them out to subscribers, and basically subsidizing all these subscribers. The Queen's Printer can do that.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions? Okay. Page 21. Yes, Ms. Haverstock.

Ms. Haverstock: — I want to know who or what are Clerk attachments?

Ms. Ronyk: — Whenever we have a visiting Clerk, they call it attachment to the Table; really odd isn't it? We have had . . . we put a token amount in here, and we haven't for a few years but we've had quite a program of having attachments from Table officers from developing countries who are trying to start parliaments or develop their parliaments.

We've had attachments here from Malawi, from Zambia, from Ghana, from Sri Lanka. And we've had . . . We do training, kind of. We exchange Clerks within Canada. Now somebody . . . Manitoba will have a new Clerk Assistant. They'll send them here for a couple of weeks to observe and get some kind of in-depth sort of experience. We send ours to other parts of the country too, for training. We'll probably be sending Meta to the House of Commons for a few weeks next year after the session is over. That kind of thing. That's what this is for. It's just to assist us in doing that. And they're kind of a irregular sort of thing, but worthwhile.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions? Anything on page 22? All right. Page 23, you have your personnel. You've had a look at that before. Page 24 — *Hansard*. Page 25.

Mr. Swenson: — Item 200. Is that the change in occupational health and safety?

Ms. Ronyk: — No. This is a position that's been there for a couple of years. It was a better service a few years ago, but we follow the Public Service Commission policy. And now we do provide for people who operate video VDT's (video display terminal), the terminals, on more than half of their time . . . are entitled to an eye exam on the years when the MCIC (Medical Care Insurance Commission) doesn't cover it, and I don't think they even cover it at all any more. So now we offer it to those people annually but at a maximum of a \$50 visit, which doesn't quite cover it for a good many eye specialists, but it's an assistance.

Mr. Swenson: — So that's so many hours then you've got to do this.

Ms. Ronyk: — We do it once a year regardless of the hours, as long as they're people who are intensively at their terminals.

The Chairperson: — Okay, any further questions on page 25? 26? 27? Still *Hansard*. Okay, 28?

Mr. Swenson: — Do you think anybody ever got eye strain, Eldon? Do you think anybody ever got eye strain from a VLT (video lottery terminal)?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I don't think so.

Ms. Haverstock: — Your eyes are looking pretty puffy.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Through long hours of work.

The Chairperson: — Page 29 — broadcasting.

Mr. Swenson: — I suspect the pay-out would be the same.

The Chairperson: — Any questions on broadcasting, page 30?

Ms. Ronyk: — It's basically a zero budget there on broadcasting.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Visitor services, page 33.

Ms. Ronyk: — Now you'll see there a 4 per cent increase overall and that's primarily because we have to provide a large-screen television and a VCR (video cassette recorder) in order to show our new video to visitors and tours and school groups, and so on, when they come to the building.

Ms. Haverstock: — I didn't turn my pages fast enough. I'm still stuck on 31.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Fine, we'll go back.

Ms. Haverstock: — . . . which is under broadcasting. I'm just wondering, where it says distribution costs to SaskTel for eight cable television stations, what's the status of the dispute with Cable Regina over carrying proceedings?

Ms. Ronyk: — I should have just checked into that before this meeting. I don't know that it's been kind of publicly resolved, but I think what's happened is that Cable Regina is going to be able to carry the coverage in Regina by the fact that they have made a direct fibre optic link to the Legislative Assembly and they are getting it direct from us instead of taking it through SaskTel. I'm not sure if it's the end of that matter but that apparently is how it can operate now and will do so unless something happens to prevent that from happening.

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay. One minor question then. Where it says the monies to be expended — this is 430 — to entertain visiting dignitaries, is that in conjunction with the conference that it says up here as far as events for \$1,380, host for legislative broadcasters' conference?

Ms. Ronyk: — It likely will be used for that this year. But as you see, it's there each year. And it's just . . . our television system has been quite state of the art and we've had delegations from as far away as Australia come to see it. And this is just . . . we have other legislative committees looking at television in Canada who've come and different people coming to see our system, and this is just a token amount in case we want to buy them lunch when they're here.

Ms. Haverstock: — So we're hosting both . . . like *Hansard* is hosting a conference and the legislative broadcasters' conference is here?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

The Chairperson: — Oh yes, yes, they are.

Ms. Ronyk: — They're combined in a sense because they're somewhat related, so they do usually have their conferences in the same location. They have some combined meetings and some separate meetings. They do share some common interests and concerns so they do usually meet together, and we are hosting them in Saskatchewan this year. The broadcasting element particularly is not very expensive, but it's all the legislative broadcasters from across the country and representatives from the various *Hansard* operations across the country.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Any questions on visitor services, page 34? If not, let us go on to 35; 36, visitor services.

Ms. Haverstock: — I am interested in this 650 item where it is large-screen television and VCR for showing educational videos. The \$6,000 associated with that is quite different from previous years. I'm wondering, is it available to . . . like to whom is this available, the large-screen television? And is it there because of the video that was made, or why is this . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — We're buying it because of the video that was made so that we can use that video when tour groups come; we can show it to them and so on.

Ms. Haverstock: — Where is it going to be?

Ms. Ronyk: — We're purchasing a mobile system so that it can be used, you know, if a member is hosting a group, in room 218 it can be put in there. It can be moved around. What we're really going to try to do for the tour groups that come, the students and so on, is we're going to set it up in the lower rotunda in the basement level in the lieutenant governors' gallery. And we're hoping to have some innocuous benches made that we'll just set up the video on one side and we'll put the students on the benches in the middle of the rotunda there, and they'll watch the video and they won't be using any of the precious space that's hard to find in the building.

Mr. Hagel: — And this would be something that when there's contact to the Legislative Assembly about seating for a visiting school delegation, they would just automatically be advised this is available, and encouraged to plan their time of their visit to include that?

The Chairperson: — That is correct. And it will be inquired at the time as to whether or not they've already seen it and do not want to see it again. And there would be many groups who will not have seen it and wish to see it. And so yes, it will be made available to them. And some will not be able to incorporate it into their schedule because they have too many other activities, but we're hoping that . . .

But even people who just simply come through, we were just discussing it the other day, and I was thinking you might have a continuous run so that people who are coming through at the high tourist season may just want to simply stop and have a look at the video as it's running. You see that in some other legislative chambers, you know, when you go through. They have something continuously on the screen, running. But basically it's for groups of students and other groups that may be coming in who have not seen the film.

Mr. Hagel: — Right now the school visit is probably about an hour and a half, a tour or a question period, visit with the member, and we'd be recommending that they make it a two-hour visit instead of an hour and half.

The other thing, I appreciate the need to locate it in that kind of place. Is there any concern about the way you see it being done that it might take away from the dignity of that rotunda area?

The Chairperson: — We had some concerns about that, but when you look at the space in this building, there really isn't any other space available. That's the problem that you have.

Ms. Ronyk: — We would be concerned about that and try to do it as unobtrusively as possible. That's why we picked the basement-level rotunda. It won't interfere with the surrounding offices. Normally the tours don't even go down there. So there's not, you know, a lot of outside traffic down there.

And one of the advantages is that we will be bringing tours down there now to that gallery and closer to the poor cafeteria that's kind of desperate for patrons now and then . . . promoting it.

Ms. Haverstock: — Just to follow up on this. How often is the dining-room used, the members' dining-room?

Ms. Ronyk: — Well we don't manage that service so . . .

Ms. Haverstock: — That space is not . . .

The Chairperson: — It's really being used more and more though.

Ms. Ronyk: — We do use it for groups, visiting groups.

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes, I know that. I was just wondering if that's a better place to have a . . .

Mr. Hagel: — I totally endorse what's being attempted here. The significance of this building is . . . I mean there is some of the heritage and the history and the dignity that's captured in that lounge as it exists now. And actually what twiggled when you suggest the possibility of sort of continuous showing, it has the potential to have two substantially different environments overlapping one another, both of which are very valuable.

Ms. Ronyk: — It's something we should consider and it is a factor. We haven't yet blown this idea by the heritage watchdogs that do watch over this building quite a bit.

We did think that one of the advantages of that space is that it's a pleasant location. It's there in the gallery, rather than hiding them off in some dull little room somewhere. You know it has pros and cons. But the thing is we've made this mobile so that we can . . . If there's any doubt there, it won't be there. It will only be used when needed.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Any further questions on visitor services? Otherwise we'll go to the Office of the Sergeant-at-Arms. Are there any questions on page 39? You'll note the personnel again on page 42.

Mr. Swenson: — Yes, on page 40, item 550, you can probably nix ashtray replacement?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Eldon was feeling really good about having it there.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, we can get rid of the ashtrays.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I take offence to that.

The Chairperson: — That one, when I went through this, just slipped. I didn't see that. Eldon, I'm sorry about that, but we shall take that out. I can assure you there will be no ashtrays bought.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It's been months making my life miserable, and he still pushes it in my face when we go over the budget.

The Chairperson: — All right. Are there any questions on page 39? 40? 41?

Mr. Hagel: — Item 650, is this replacement or is this additional equipment?

Ms. Ronyk: — 650 is replace . . . It's buying actually three new of the hand-held radios that our security and protective staff use. They wanted 10 because the old ones, you've seen them, they're huge and they're very cumbersome. They're old.

The Chairperson: — Sessional.

Ms. Ronyk: — The sessional staff who man the doors of the galleries and the Chamber and the Sergeant-at-Arms' permanent staff.

The thing is, though, these still work. And even though they cost us a wee bit to maintain, they still work. And we've decided just to ask for three so that we can have three that are smaller that will fit in a pocket or a purse. They're not so obtrusive. And they still will work with the old ones — be able to communicate.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Page 42, I think that is self-explanatory there. All right, Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk, pretty well a pat stand budget there.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — On page 44.

The Chairperson: — Page 44, all right.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I just . . . The legal translation services, that's a service you just started last year apparently.

Ms. Ronyk: — No, no. It has been there. It's just that nothing was spent in '93-94.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — It's being used more and more?

Ms. Ronyk: — No. When we first put that in there, I think the budget was 10,000 and it's been pared down to . . . It was 5,000 for a number of years and we've been paring it down each year.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Is it a contract that you go . . . If there's an inquiry in French, you . . . Or is it somebody on staff?

Ms. Ronyk: — No, it's a contract. We communicate by fax to a translator down in Ottawa. And it's really for when a member wishes to introduce a Bill in both languages, as Ms. Haverstock did a year or two ago. It really was put in there initially because the government has a bit of a commitment to translate some of the basic legislation in Education and Justice into both languages and that hasn't happened yet. But if it does, the House amendments will have to be translated through our office and any private members' legislation would be covered here. The original translation of the main Bill, if it's a government Bill or a minister's Bill, will be covered within Justice. But any changes or any private members' work would be done under this budget.

Also we have to produce the *Rules and Proceedings* in both languages and we did a major . . . or a minor revision last year and we've had to have that translated, and there will be some costs. And you could see, '94-95, there were actually \$4,000 worth of costs there.

The Chairperson: — Okay, any other questions on legal counsel?

All right, Legislative Library. Any questions on page 48 on Legislative Library? Page 49? 50?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I see the travel again. Could you tell us what each of these conferences are for and whether you go annually to them?

Ms. Powell: — Certainly. The conferences that you see on this page and the total that comes on the following page represents the normal conferences that we regularly attend. Last year, you may recall, we made a choice to not attend CLA, the Canadian Library Association, in favour of the biennial parliamentary librarians meeting. But this is the odd year for that so we've restored the Canadian Library Association.

The Saskatchewan Library Association, we send one person and basically the increase in this code is represented by the fact that that conference is out of Regina. Last year you'll notice, in '94-95, it was in Regina so there were no travel costs, and the previous year was out of Regina. But basically this is a standard routine conference.

The other conferences which we attend, the NOTIS (Northwestern Online Total Integrated System) Users Group, this is our library computer system conference. It's always held in Chicago and we do send one person to keep abreast of what's going on with our system.

Canadian Library Association this year is in Calgary; Computers in Libraries is Toronto. We try to keep abreast again as much as we can of the current upgrades in computers in library use. And the Special Libraries Association is normally in the United States. It's a North American association.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I remember talking about it last year.

Ms. Powell: — This year is its 10th year and it's in Canada; every 10 years it's held in Canada because 10 per cent of its membership are Canadian.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — And these are conferences that are regularly attended?

Ms. Powell: — That's right.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — This is not a different year than last year or the year before.

Ms. Powell: — These are exactly the same. Normally in the past we have also, when CLA has been in close proximity, we tried to send two people; and we haven't budgeted for that this year. And as well, we have normally attended the CAL conference, the Canadian Association of Law Libraries, but it's being held and hosted in fact for the first time in Regina this year and so we will find an event amount that we're asking for for that conference, but there's no travel involved.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions on that? Page 51, any questions on page 51? 52 — this is your personnel; and 53? Any questions on those?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Back to 51, and I don't know where the costs are. Is there an increase in postage cost that is substantial? Are you worried about any changes in postal rates? Or that's not affecting you.

Ms. Powell: — Well it will affect us. The postage is actually charged against the expenditure item, when in this instance will mostly be 503, magazines and newspapers.

We are in fact hoping to do two things. You'll notice that there's no increase projected for our subscriptions. We're actually forgoing approximately \$13,000 in anticipated costs in the hope of two things happening.

First of all, we are going to make some cuts. And secondly, we're hoping that our equipment will allow us to take full advantage of the file transfer capabilities that will allow us to do as Gwenn had mentioned in the equipment presentation, more of a per-use access to a lot of less frequently used things we presently subscribe to. So we're really interested in the equipment decision because it does have a big impact on one of our normally big increase items. And this was budgeted in anticipation that we would be able to make some changes. This will be a transition year and we'll see how well it works.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — In 505, it says first increase in eight years, but actual '93 was 49; what you have is 47.

Ms. Powell: — We've been budgeting 42 for quite a long time, but when the bills come in we do have to pay them. No, we haven't had an increase for a very long time. We're something now like 30 per cent purchasing power on our original books, so we can't buy very many. We thought this year we'd better put some emphasis on the book allocation.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — In 404 didn't we have some microfilm replacement last year or some equipment that we talked about? Or am I in the wrong library?

Ms. Powell: — No you're in the right library. We had equipment and it's — if I can find the right code here — 610. If you look at 610 you'll notice in '93/94 was \$15,000 there. That's a replacement microfilm reader-printer and that's perhaps what you're remembering.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — So what's the 19,000 this year then? It's just continued use of film?

Ms. Powell: — This is 504 that you're referring to.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Okay.

Ms. Powell: — Yes, the \$19,000 there, that is part of an ongoing space initiative on a small part. And what we've targeted for this year and next year is to microfilm our Saskatchewan newspaper clipping file because it's so important to us. We've put a lot of effort into it and it takes a lot of space. So that's where we intend to be spending that money.

Mr. Hagel: — Item 503, Marian, in order to meet your hold the line on that item, what are the criteria you use to decide not to renew subscriptions?

Ms. Powell: — Well basically we look at a variety of things. The most important one is use either by our clients or by ourselves to serve our clients. And our first priority targets are going to be high cost, low use items. And those are exactly the ones we're hoping we could fall back on, still have access to them, but do it on a per-request basis, rather than subscribe, through various other kinds of means, principally electronic.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions? All right, let us then go to page 54, committee support services.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, on page 55, item 400 to 415, employee travel, a Special Committee on Regulations, I note \$3,620 worth of travel. As I understand it, that is some kind of a junket to where?

The Chairperson: — No, you used the wrong . . . that is travel to Australia.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — What's the purpose of that?

Ms. Ronyk: — The Special Committee on Regulations is only one of three such committees in Canada, and the jurisdiction which is the most advanced in the review of regulations and delegated legislation is Australia. They're more advanced than any other place in the Commonwealth. And they do host every year a conference on delegated legislation or regulations as we call it.

And last year the committee did send, through CPA, a couple of members to a conference that was held there, and they found it was extremely valuable. And they would like to send two members again this year, but they also want to host a similar such conference in Saskatchewan down the road in a couple of years. And one of the reasons for attending this one is to prepare to host one ourselves in a couple of years. And the idea is that we would try to do it to promote the development of regulation scrutiny committees, which is pretty weak in Canada. It's only Ontario, the House of Commons, and ourselves that have such a committee and it's usually important even though it's quite boring for members, I think.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions on page 55, 56?

Ms. Ronyk: — Well perhaps I should explain that these committee costs are the non-member cost. These are the budgetary part of committee cost. This is the verbatims and the, you know, travel or costs of staff, the cost of the intersessional readings for the verbatims, coffee, whatever, at the committees. Later on in the statutory part, we'll see actually the members' cost to the committees.

Mr. Upshall: — So the same would apply to . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — That's on page 65, right?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. So these two together add up to the cost of committees.

The Chairperson: — Okay, page 57. All right. Now page 58.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, this is the indemnities, the allowances, allowance for additional duties, third party and opposition.

The Chairperson: — Right.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Government caucus grants.

The Chairperson: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And these figures are all indexed, I understand, estimating a 2 per cent increase.

The Chairperson: — No, only the . . . I believe only the ones at the bottom are indexed. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Which are indexed and which aren't here?

Ms. Ronyk: — The indexing only applies to those items that are described in the note. The per diem allowances, constituency office allowance, Office of the Leader of the Opposition, Leader of the Third Party.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — And they are incorporated in the top.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And these by motion have been frozen over the past years by the board of . . .

The Chairperson: — That is correct.

Ms. Ronyk: — In the past, yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — How many years that we had these frozen at this point?

Ms. Ronyk: — These particular ones were frozen as of April '92. This is not the members' pay, the members' salaries. Regular MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) salaries have been frozen since 1990. And I think ministers took a cut the year before that, but ministers aren't in here.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Are there any questions on page 59 or 60?

Ms. Haverstock: — I'm assuming here that you have to budget for all 11 Regina members, even though one doesn't take their per diems? Right?

The Chairperson: — Yes.

Ms. Haverstock: — Just to have it in the . . .

The Chairperson: — Yes.

Ms. Ronyk: — This budget is based on the legal entitlement. We don't always spend it all. We have vacancies; a variety of things, but it is the legal entitlement.

The Chairperson: — Okay, any questions on 61; 62; and on 63? Any questions on 63?

Ms. Ronyk: — Just to note there on 63. The requested number is of course at the legal entitlement and if you want to see what's actually being paid to the people holding these positions you look in the actual column of '93-94.

Mr. Hagel: — And that would hold true for '94-95 as well?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

The Chairperson: — That's correct.

Ms. Ronyk: — Other than the whips. There we've budgeted for three caucuses and we're only paying two.

The Chairperson: — Any questions on 63? All right, 64? And 65 you had looked at them before; 67, the board; 68 the board continued. Any questions on page 70? Any questions on page 71; 72? Oh, did you have another question, Ms. Haverstock? I thought I saw your hand go up or am I . . . were you turning . . . I wasn't sure whether you were turning the page or putting your hand up.

Ms. Haverstock: — No I'm still on 70; it doesn't matter.

The Chairperson: — Okay. No, we can go back.

Ms. Haverstock: — No, no. That's okay.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Ms. Haverstock: — I've got it all sorted out now.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Page 73? 74?

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay, sorry. I'm still pages behind. On page 71 where it says grants and salaries to each caucus research staff, directive no. 9, where we've got this 5,118 plus 6 per cent, what's the source or reason for the 6 per cent increase? Is that PSC related?

Ms. Ronyk: — That was added to the formula in 1988. It's been there ever since. It isn't an increase over last year. It was just to enrich the formula, and it was just added, you know the RO (research officer) 4 and RO 3 salary levels plus 6 per cent, just in order to increase the formula.

Ms. Haverstock: — And of course the things that were declined previously like the 2 per cent increase and stuff that's not listed anywhere right? The annual grant . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — They are actually. The 2 per cent are in here, and that's what shows there. And if the board says to not take the 2 per cent, then that will come out.

The Chairperson: — Okay. I am on page 75. I don't know if I'm getting ahead of the members or not. The same formula applies there. And then the last part of the budget revenues, are there any questions on the revenues. You see they aren't very great.

Mr. Hagel: — Just on that, I know we actually spent a fair amount of time last year in discussion about the possibility of generating revenue through visitor services kind of activity by the sale of mementoes and souvenirs and that sort of thing. And I remember there being reference to the fact that that was explored, and it was thought at that time to be not a profitable enterprise that would generate surplus revenue. And I guess I simply ask whether that continues to be the view. If I remember it correctly last year when we talked about this, it was something that was being done or was it, had it been, completed.

The Chairperson: — Had been completed at the time. And that view has not changed, Mr. Hagel. It simply . . . there are several factors that have to be kept in mind. Number one is the space. We are really, really cramped for space. And there is really only one place where you could put it, and that would be right at the entrance. And then you have to make a decision as to whether it's going to be open continuously and therefore you have to man it. And if we're going to do it the right way, then it can't be kind of a shabby thing because it's right at the entrance of the Legislative Building.

Number two, there was a real concern and I must admit the concern that I had and that was the effect it would have on other businesses within the jurisdiction of the Legislative Building. And some of them had expressed some concern that it would have an adverse effect on their business. And I just felt at the time that unless we . . . there was very little adverse effect on those other businesses — and that was not shown to me. They proved to me that there would have adverse effect — I simply felt at the time that we should not proceed with it. And everyone — except for those people who were not involved in looking at it, who were all enthused about it — almost everyone to a person who was involved in looking at it, recommended not to proceed. So we did not proceed with it.

And this is not the first time this has been looked at. This goes back many years. And each time when they look at it, they come to the same conclusion. And so I've gone back into the history of it, others have looked at it, and I came to the same conclusion, that it simply would not sell. And we would have to subsidize it and subsidize it to the disadvantage of other businesses in the area, so we did not proceed.

Mr. Swenson: — Maybe if you sold . . . (inaudible) . . . they wouldn't steal it.

Mr. Hagel: — Souvenirs.

The Chairperson: — Unless we locked it up very tightly, they'd go missing there too. So that was the rationale for it. Okay.

Well that takes care of running through the budget. We still have a half an hour. Now I don't know how members want to proceed. I know this is basically the first time that you've run through this. Whether members wish to leave it for the night and peruse some of the things for themselves and come back tomorrow morning and to go through the budget saying where you have some concerns; or if you wish to express some of your concerns tonight to us, if you need further information that we can bring forward by sometime tomorrow, we might be able to do that. I don't know how you want to proceed now. As I say, I had scheduled this from 7 to 10. Okay.

The other thing that we have to . . . we have one major item that we have to do. And that is the personnel reclassification. And as I indicated earlier, we want to do that in camera. And I think the half hour that's remaining, we could certainly do that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes. Mr. Speaker, I think before we would vote on the budget, we should consider the classifications and the requests because they do impact on the budget.

The Chairperson: — Right.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I know the media is all terribly interested in this budget and I'm sure that they'd just as soon go home for the evening. I have a few . . . there are a few items in the budget that I would . . . that I think we would want to look at. One would be the continuance of the freezes as we have in place, listed on page 58 --the per diems, constituency office allowance, and some of the other grants that are included in there.

I guess my goal was to try and see if we could achieve a zero increase again for this year. I know we've put some real pressure on this budget in the last years as part of our balanced budget initiatives. And I want to commend the staff for the work that they've done in terms of putting this budget together with the recommendations that only a 2.39 per cent increase. I think you've done very well.

I would like to say with respect to the computers, as much as I know we wouldn't be able to come in with a zero increase unless we eliminated that portion of the budget requests, I think that we need to look at that. And I think we should probably proceed with the purchase of those computers because I think the longer we let this go — we're inevitably going to have to face that cost. And I think in terms of the efficiencies of *Hansard* and the efficiencies of the Legislative Assembly

Office, we'll have to look at that. But there are some minor cuts that I'd like to see us achieve if we could.

But I think maybe if we could go through the classifications, maybe we could go in camera. And if we have the opportunity, we can vote the budget off tonight or leave it for first thing in the morning. I guess it doesn't matter whether it's voted off tonight or that, but I think it's imperative that we do have the discussion on the reclassification.

The Chairperson: — All right, is that agreed? All right, then the committee or the board shall go in camera.

The meeting continued in camera.

The meeting adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY
January 6, 1995

The Chairperson: — It now being 9 o'clock, or past 9 o'clock, I think we should start our deliberations this morning.

Mr. Swenson: — Not that I eat a lot, but when are we scheduled for lunch?

The Chairperson: — Twelve o'clock.

Mr. Swenson: — At 12?

The Chairperson: — Yes.

Mr. Swenson: — What do we got to have for quorum?

The Chairperson: — We have a quorum.

Mr. Swenson: — Because I'm going to have to deek in and out a little bit this morning.

The Chairperson: — Oh well then we don't have a quorum. We need you on that side.

Mr. Swenson: — In other words, I control the committee this morning.

The Chairperson: — You sure do. Power there this morning.

Okay, ladies and gentlemen, last night I don't know if there were any specific things. I think we're in your hands this morning, so I will recognize any person who wishes to . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes. We didn't, I guess, quite complete our deliberations on the Legislative Assembly budget. There were a couple of items that I wanted to raise to the attention of the committee. And I think we might be able to have some cost savings if we were to initiate some of the moves in that regard. On page 58 . . .

The Chairperson: — What page are you on?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Page 58.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I note that some of the allowances had the provisions for a 2 per cent increase that we haven't been taking for the last couple of years. And from our perspective, quite clearly I think we would . . . We would support the freezing or not taking the 2 per cent increase in our caucus grant. And we'd support the freezing of constituency office allowances as well as members' per diems.

And I'm wondering if we shouldn't continue with that. I can't . . . And I won't speak to the Leader of the Third Party's office or the opposition's office. I guess that would be a decision they might . . . may want to make. But from our perspective, government would like to see the caucus grants frozen.

The Chairperson: — Okay. That has been duly noted. Is there any further discussion on that?

Mr. Swenson: — Mr. Speaker, the numbers at the bottom in brackets then would be . . . each number then in the other codes would be reduced by that amount. Is that the way I understand that?

The Chairperson: — That's correct.

Mr. Swenson: — And that would leave it at the current, the '94-95 numbers?

The Chairperson: — Yes.

Mr. Swenson: — I concur with that.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Now we can't make a decision on the other, I suppose. Or we could, but I get the feeling it's not the decision of the committee here to make that decision on the third party, office of the third party. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I don't know. We can do it, but I mean she may want to speak to it herself.

The Chairperson: — Yes. Well are the members inclined to bring this up if she should arrive later on, and let her speak to it? Okay.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — But anyway, let's . . . I don't know when she's going to be here. Oh there she is. Good.

The Chairperson: — She's right here. Okay. Ms. Haverstock, we are on page 58 and the decision has just been made not to accept a 2 per cent increase on those items listed on page 58, but we are awaiting your decision on the office of the third party. You concur?

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — So then that would be an aggregate amount of 52,914?

The Chairperson: — That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. There was on page . . . and I think it was reflected in two different areas, on page 65, item 428, which is I think travel related to the Regulations Committee.

The Chairperson: — That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And a trip to Australia.

The Chairperson: — That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I think we could do well without that. It's an expenditure of \$10,460 and I would certainly think we should remove that.

This is dealt with in another part of the budget, Gwenn, and I think I've lost it. In the Reg Committee budget itself there's I think some 3,000, or whatever it is in there, for staff for that same trip.

The Chairperson: — Yes, but, Mr. Lautermilch, you are lumping together what is needed for the work of the committee here, to do their committee work here, with the other. That 5,400 on page 65, that is the amount that is required for the committee to do its work here.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Just a minute. On page 65, item 428, there's an amount of \$10,460.

The Chairperson: — Yes, okay.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And that's indicated that that's for two members to travel to Australia. I'm recommending that we do away with that. Gwenn, what page is the Regulation Committee budget on?

Ms. Ronyk: — I can get you that in a sec, but 2,400 of that 10 is the travel for the regular intersessional committees. So the difference there was what you're looking for.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay, we should exempt that, but then take . . . so that would be less 2,400?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, and it's page 55 in the report.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, that would then be under 400-413, employees' travel. Is that part of sending a staff person, or is that . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — How much of that would be for the Australia trip?

Ms. Ronyk: — I think all of that, because there would be no travel otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay, then we can do away with that, right?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. So that gives us . . . what's the aggregate amount there then?

Ms. Ronyk: — On page 65, what I would suggest is giving the committee the same as last year, the 5,400 which was what they needed to do their regular intersessional meetings. So the difference there is 8,060 is what you'd save there by giving them the same as last year.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — All right. So it's 8,060 . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Plus 3,600 from the employee travel.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — So 11,660 would be the aggregate amount then?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. I'm just trying to go through some of the notes that I made as we went through the budget here. Some of the . . .

The Chairperson: — Excuse me, Mr. Lautermilch, I think that we should really vote on that, as to whether that is agreed, item by item.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Sure, fair enough.

The Chairperson: — Otherwise we're going to lose as to what we have agreed to or not agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay, you want to go at them one at a time, we can do that.

The Chairperson: — Well yes, I think we should. Yes, I think we should do that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — Are there any further discussions on this item? Is the committee agreed to that? Okay, agreed.

Next item . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, we voted on the freeze for allowances?

The Chairperson: — Yes, we did.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — . . . thousand?

The Chairperson: — Yes, everybody agreed to that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — On page 33, I wanted to question the amount that we budgeted for the large-screen television and VCR. Is this a special kind of a television or what? I just . . . and I'm maybe not in tune with what this kind of equipment costs any more. I used to be in that business but I'm not now, but it just appears to me that 6,000 is a fairly hefty amount for a television and a VCR, even a big one.

Ms. Ronyk: — It's a 54-inch screen that we've costed out here.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — So it's one of those big ones. And it's a mobile unit so that we can move it from room to room wherever we

need it. And the VCR, I think we were told that a Toshiba is the best for that.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — So it's within . . .

Ms. Ronyk: — Well I think so. In fact we were told that this was kind of the Price Club price, so we may not get that particular one at that range, and we will be going through . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Price Club was the lowest on that, but we will be going through the tendering process for it. And if we don't spend it . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay, I'm satisfied then.

On page 35 there's a visitor service conference to Halifax, and I'm wondering if that would be necessary or if we might be able to do without that trip for this year.

Ms. Ronyk: — The visitor services conference is a relatively recent development in the last about four years, and it is the opportunity where the visitor services people from all the legislatures do get together and discuss what steps they're taking and the programs they're initiating to deal with the best ways to improve the rapport, I guess, between constituents and legislators and the public and Legislative Assembly. It's part of an outreach in an educational program.

And the visitor services people are the first line people in dealing with the public, and it's more than . . . it's beyond, you know, kind of dealing with tourists. It is part of an educational program, and that's why we're moving into, you know, the videos and so on as well as our little kit. And those people are part and parcel of finding the best ways to do that. Many jurisdictions have gone into it in a far bigger way than we have. But this opportunity, our people have to kind of learn what they're doing and . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Have we sent people to this conference in the past?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, we have. We hosted it here I think it was last year. That's why there's probably a . . . yes, it was last year that we hosted it here . . . or two years ago here in Saskatchewan. Two years ago because the zero, the zero in the actual column, that's because we hosted it here that year. I think this is about the fourth or the fifth year for this meeting.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well when I look at the overall budget and I know the goal has been, at least from my perspective, when we're setting this budget, to try and maintain if and when we can, last year's expenditures. And we've done, you know, a number of initiatives that have helped us to do that. And one of them has been postponing the purchase of the computer network that you require and I think we're at a point where we would need to proceed I guess with the computers. Your arguments have been more than overwhelming this year, Gwenn, and we understand some of the pressures that you've been under and we'd certainly like to proceed with that.

And I guess what we're trying to do is see if there's some other areas and some small areas where we might be able to at least bring it down to some degree. And frankly I don't see an awful lot of that in the Legislative Assembly budget. I've been part of the deliberations in this budget for a number of years and it really is one that's had a lot of scrutiny. And I want to commend you and your staff for the work that you've done in terms of keeping it at the level that it is.

But I'm thinking that we may be able to do without this trip for this year and maybe look at next year re-introducing it again and sort of try and rotate these because there seems to be, you know . . . and I know these conferences are important and we know the staff need the training and the interaction with other jurisdictions but I'm wondering if we couldn't just put this one off for this year and maybe look at it again next year.

Ms. Ronyk: — This is one that because it's far away this year it is more expensive then when it's closer and I would think that this one, as compared with some of the professional conferences, is easier for us to give up.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, well I'll move that we remove that trip.

Ms. Ronyk: — The total there of reduction then would be 1390.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — 1390?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

And in the spirit of assisting with that I think I would be quite willing to offer the Canadian-American Clerk's conference as an unrealistic . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Gwenn, where is that one, what page is it?

Mr. Upshall: — Is that the Tennessee one?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. That is under page 20.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Oh I got . . . here it is, page 20. Okay what would the amount of that one . . . what that would work out to?

Ms. Ronyk: — We'll just have to tally that. A total of that savings will be fourteen twenty.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. Mr. Speaker, do you want me to just carry on with . . .

The Chairperson: — Well I have to ask whether the committee is in agreement with those. The visitor service one to Halifax, and the Tennessee one. Okay. Everybody's in agreement? Fine.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — There was just, Mr. Speaker, one other on page 46. The parliamentary counsel conference in Charlottetown, and I'm wondering if the committee might not want to agree that we would put this one off for this year as well.

Ms. Ronyk: — I would like to make a comment on that. Our Legislative Counsel is the president of that association this year, and it would be very awkward if we couldn't send him.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay. Fair enough. I have no other issues with this.

Mr. Swenson: — I want to ask some questions about the \$5,000 for the birthday video. You said yesterday that we did a \$40,000 video that people tell you is actually a \$100,000 video. Why can't we just lift out segments out of this \$100,000 video and put it into whatever they want? I mean why are you re-inventing the wheel?

Ms. Ronyk: — Well this will be a different video, and there are a few small segments in our parliamentary video on the building. But this new video is going to be on the Legislative Building and the heritage aspect of the building and the more of it as a tourist attraction than our video. There would be only, you know, a very small proportion of our parliamentary video that would fit into that. Probably some of the shots that they took — if it happened that the same production company got this new contract — they would be able to use. But this is a different focus, and it really isn't overlap.

Mr. Swenson: — How long a video are we talking about here?

The Chairperson: — Thirty minutes.

Mr. Swenson: — Thirty minutes.

The Chairperson: — Same as the other one.

Mr. Swenson: — So we're talking another \$40,000 effort, and our contribution is five minutes. \$5,000 is going to give us eight minutes. Or less.

Mr. Upshall: — Five thousand dollars gives us 30 minutes because it's a cooperation.

Ms. Ronyk: — That's right. We will use the whole thing.

Mr. Swenson: — Well I know. But I'm not . . . I haven't really heard anybody out there getting really thrilled about the birthday.

Ms. Ronyk: — It isn't just for the birthday. It is something we've been wanting to do, and it's something that the tourism and the heritage branch of, I think, it's Municipal Affairs, are really quite interested in. In fact it will be that branch that chairs this group of partners, and we will be, you know, just one of the committee in this one where . . .

Mr. Swenson: — You really wanted to do the one last year, and after a lot of machinations and we got it done.

The Chairperson: — Oh the one last year, certainly we make no bones about that. We really wanted that one. And so if I'm quiet on this one, it's not because I'm not as enthused about it. But the one last year, I've been after that one for years that I think we ought to have something on the role of the MLA and democratic government. And we certainly got our money's worth. I think the company that got the contract did a marvellous job on that. The comments that have been coming in on that . . . I don't know how many of you people have seen it but it's really top quality work and we'll certainly get our 40,000 back on that one.

Mr. Swenson: — Well okay, that's my thoughts anyway. The committee can . . . that's 5,000 bucks and we've been nickel and diming it through here with our employees and I guess I'll have to see the other one.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Well if I could speak to that. I think the heritage branch view this as one of the prime historical buildings in Saskatchewan and they do believe that it is quite relevant and quite necessary to do a video on the preservation and the historic significance of the building. So anything, I suppose, could be put off for another year but because we are approaching the 90th anniversary, I think there are other significance factors around us.

So I know that we've been pretty lean on a number of occasions but if we don't do it this year when there's such an opportunity to have guests coming back and to show it, then it sort of loses some of its potential and the usefulness of it. So I guess it's just a matter of timing and this is really the year when we should be doing it if we're going to do it at all.

The Chairperson: — Well I'm in the hands of the committee.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I think I would continue to support it. I know the heritage branch has looked at it very carefully and they are very careful with their budgets as well, but they do view this as one opportunity to make a significant video that would be historical for Saskatchewan about one building that is very significant to both our present and our future.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Well I think what I'll do because . . . are there any further discussion on it? I think I'll put it to a vote and see what the members feel about it? All those in favour of leaving the 5,000 in? Opposed? Carried.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I just have one other question with respect to the reclassifications and some of the issues that we spoke of last night, part of it being deferred but the other part of it may being able to be acted on. Is there any budgetary impact for this budget on those discussions of last night?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, the decisions that you made last night will result in savings of 26,800 to what's in your budget document, and that makes an overall difference in our total increase; instead of 2.39 per cent it will be 2.2 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And that the aggregate amount then is somewhere just under \$100,000 right?

Ms. Ronyk: — Oh, all these . . . yes, okay. Yes, that's right.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — I just have one thing I'd like to clarify. You said last night that you were wanting to go ahead with the ones that were straight reclasses, and those figures that I gave you reflect adding one more of that group that I didn't explain last night and that's the accounting clerk 1 to an accounting clerk 2 reclass. We would do it as a straight reclass without any affecting the range. And if you're willing to go along with that, that is in these figures. It actually ends up saving us money because we're converting from a non-perm to a perm, and we end up saving \$3,000 there.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Ms. Ronyk: — I would like to take this opportunity to just mention that since last evening I have discovered that the proposal that we were making for kind of the expanded range is done in government in out-of-scope positions under the Public Service. They even have a term for it; they call it broadbanding.

And the example that was given me is in Treasury Board, the budget analysts, where they come in as bright, young people but green to government. They pay them at a lower rate at that point and then they are able to move through up to three ranges within the M and P (management and professional) plan without a formal reclass because they are very valuable as they become experienced. So that's kind of an example and it's the kind of the same rationale that we were using.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We should be then able to, I think, get some kind of clarification at least to satisfy our concerns from the Public Service Commission quite quickly and then get on with what you want to accomplish here. Okay.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions on the budget?

A Member: — We didn't vote on the computers.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We didn't vote on the budget.

The Chairperson: — No, no. There are a few other things we have to do before we can do that. I'm trying to find the motions here.

Okay. Would you turn to item 1(c) in this book, item 1 (c), because there are a number of things we have to move before we can . . . the motion on item 1(c). If you go 1(b) and then just keep on turning, there is an item there 1(c). Did you find it?

A Member: — Yes.

The Chairperson: — We need someone to move that motion on the middle of that page. Moved by Mr. Lautermilch on the motion that the directives listed below are not to be increased April 1, 1995 to the annual cost of living adjustment. You have already agreed to that but we need to . . . Seconded by? Mr. Swenson. Any discussion? All in favour? Agreed unanimously. Okay.

Now the next item, turn to the next page, item 1(d). Oh, this is a new item. All right, I had forgotten about this one . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes. This, ladies and gentlemen, will affect the budget by the amount that you will see on page 2 about the middle of that page if we proceed with this item. And the item is as per requested by the caucuses. So I am in your hands on this item.

Mr. Upshall: — Yes, Mr. Chair. I wasn't sure where this request came from from our office, although they don't tell me everything. I checked with Mr. Hagel last night and he wasn't aware of it either. So I think until we find out . . . I know there are some frustrations but I'm not sure that at this time we really need something until we find out exactly how this request came. I'll make a motion to table this.

The Chairperson: — We have a tabling motion. All those in favour of tabling the motion? Tabled.

All right. This next one, because of some of the changes made this morning, it'll take a little while. Have we got it? Okay. Because we have to move the actual number.

Okay. Could I have someone move the following for me? I'll read it for you:

That a budget of \$14,784,840 be adopted.

Just for your clarification, that is a 1.02 per cent increase.

Mr. Upshall: — What was the number again, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairperson: — \$14,784,840.

Mr. Upshall: — And the 1.0 . . .

The Chairperson: — 1.02 per cent increase. Could I get someone to move that motion? Moved by Mr. Lautermilch. A seconder? Seconded by Ms. Carson. Is there any further discussion on that motion? All those in favour? Carried.

Okay, we need one motion on the revenue.

Mr. Swenson: — Does that cover off the computers? Does that do the computer stuff?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes.

The Chairperson: — That includes the computers.

Mr. Swenson: — That's the entire package. Oh, I didn't realize. Okay, I guess I slipped up. I thought we were going to dissect that a little more.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — We'd looked at it but . . .

Mr. Swenson: — It was all or nothing?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well I think in looking at the thing, if we're going to bring the thing up to speed we may as well do it and get it out of the way this year. We could piecemeal it, I guess. But when I look at some of the initiatives that are coming down the road for say '95-6, '96-7, you know, and '8, '9, there are I think some fairly hefty expenditures coming down the road. So I think it might be just as wise if we take the bite with the hardware and the base for that in place this year and then look at what we might need in terms of expanding for future years.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay, I have one final question to Gwenn. I raised last night the issue of how you . . . when you go to tender and those things. I would like you to explore more options. I honestly believe that there's equipment out there that will have your training component included in the price, not a separate item.

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes. In fact that is the way we have to work when we purchase our systems. We have to purchase the equipment and the maintenance and the support because we don't have anybody internally to do it. And depending on what it is and who we're getting it from, we would include training in that package when we go out to tender.

I'm not just sure . . . I think we've broken it down here so that we know the components of the costs. But I think that we would still be looking at a package when we do go out.

Mr. Swenson: — And these tenders then are going to be done through SPMC?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes.

Mr. Swenson: — And they will go when?

Ms. Ronyk: — Well not till after April 1 because that's when we get the budget. What we will do is probably try to go ahead with the tendering soon after the new year and we wouldn't implement it until after session. We just can't, you know, be down for a week or two weeks during session. So we would be looking at doing it for July.

And we will look at, you know, where we're going to . . . how soon or how late we will go to . . . The later we go, the more likely we are to get decreases in the costs of the technology.

Mr. Swenson: — Okay.

The Chairperson: — Okay. I need one further motion now. Would someone move that the revenue estimates of 50,300 be

approved? Moved by Mr. Upshall. Seconded by Mr. Lautermilch. Any discussion? All those in favour? Agreed.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you could go to item no. 2 in your booklet. We have a special warrant request for 1994-95, and you will find that on item 2 of your agenda. On that page you will see that we're asking for a special warrant of 200,000. That is made up of \$74,000 for additional days that the House will be sitting in this fiscal year, and also 48,000 for the Committee on Driving Safety, and 78,000 for the independent commission to review MLA salaries and allowances. And that makes a total of 200,000.

If I could have someone move a motion that we request a special warrant for \$200,000.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, if I could just ask a question. When would this be done? I mean I can see with respect to the committee on driver safety and the committee to review the MLA salary, and I understand that that would need to go soon, because I know that work is ongoing.

With respect to the expenditures for the session, I don't know that . . . would it be prudent to separate these, or is this sort of the normal course of action, Gwenn?

Ms. Ronyk: — It is the time when we have to deal with special warrants. Now they have to be through Treasury Board prior to a week before session. So this is probably the time to catch the board, is now. It is awkward because we have three months left in the year, and we may not need all of this. For example, last year at this time we asked for a special warrant of \$50,000. We weren't just sure how many weeks of session we would still have in the old year. As it turned out, we did not need it, and we didn't use it. It was turned back.

The Chairperson: — Okay, could I have someone move that motion please? Moved by Ms. Carson. Seconder? Mr. Upshall. Any discussion? All those in favour? Agreed. Carried.

Let me at this time thank the board members very profusely for your dealing with the budget. I very much appreciate the way you dealt with the budget last night and this morning, and I want to thank the members for it; I think it was very successful deliberations. Thank you very kindly.

If you want to take a five-minute break before we start on the Provincial Auditor, we can do that. Or if you want to continue, that's fine.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the staff that I really think they have done a great job. We've come in — even with the fact that we've included all the new computer system — we've come in at an increase this year of 1.02 per cent. And I think that speaks very well of the staff and the work that you do. We appreciate that.

Ms. Ronyk: — Thank you, and I would like to thank the members of the board. We're very pleased to finally get the go-

ahead on the computers. I think it will do a lot to giving all of our staff a real shot in the arm, and we're very pleased with that. And I also would like just to thank all of my staff, the Legislative Assembly staff here, for all of their work in this effort.

The Chairperson: — Let's take a five-minute break, all right, before we begin with the Provincial Auditor's budget.

The meeting recessed for a period of time.

The Chairperson: — Ladies and gentlemen, I think we should get this meeting going again.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are now due to consider the Provincial Auditor's budget for 1995-96. Before I do so, I will introduce the Provincial Auditor. I think everybody knows Wayne Strelieff. And I'll let him introduce his officials to you, and then we could maybe be on our way in considering his budget.

Mr. Strelieff: — Thank you, Mr. Chair and members. With me today are Fred Wendel, the Assistant Provincial Auditor. Bob Paisley, helping us put together this business and financial plan — Bob is leaving us at the end of January and is going to be working for the Department of Finance. And Kevin Taylor is taking over some of Bob's responsibilities in terms of helping us prepare this information. So Fred Wendel, Bob Paisley, and Kevin Taylor.

The Chairperson: — All right. We are now . . . I don't know if you have your document, business and financial plan. Before I turn it over to any of the members, I will do as we did last night with the LAO budget. I'll ask Mr. Strelieff to give us a brief overview of his budget, and then we'll go into more details of his budget.

Mr. Strelieff, overview, please.

Mr. Strelieff: — Thank you, Mr. Chair and members. And thank you for the opportunity to meet with you here today. Certainly 1994 was a challenging year for all of us and no doubt 1995 will be equally challenging. So what I'd like to do is just briefly review the business and financial plan that we provided to you for your information.

The index just sets out what we do, where we are going, how we are going to get there, what our measures of success are; and then moves into our financial plan and also the more detailed appendices which set out the details of what we do, and also provides some historical trends and future information.

On page 4 then, what we do begins with the legal status of The Provincial Auditor Act, our mission, how we carry out our mission in terms of our lines of business. In paragraph 4, the examinations that we carry out and the objectives of those examinations — that we examine financial reports to determine whether reports that you receive from the government are reliable and credible, that the government is complying with the

main legislative authorities that you provide to them, and that we examine various aspects of the government's management systems and practices for safeguarding assets and preparing reports and managing the public's resources. Those are the main elements of our examinations and our reports.

As you know, we also serve the standing committees on Public Accounts and Crown Corporations. We have different relationships with those committees but we do try to help them do their job. We train professionals or we have an extensive training program that we're bringing university graduates into our office and trying to make them or provide opportunities for them to get professional accounting designations and then work with our office or work elsewhere. We also, as part of what we do in our examinations and report, we try to enhance awareness of accountability and management issues.

So those are our lines of business in terms of what we do. We think that our work and reports are essential for system of governments and also that we, I think, our examinations and reports help you carry out your responsibilities of holding the government to account. And also help the government itself carry out its responsibilities to use sound management systems and practices.

The paragraph 12 talks about what we bring to the table when we carry out our examinations and reports. The importance of the objectivity part, the independence from the executive government, which means the ability to determine what we examine, the scope, and also the ability to determine what to report to you — very important part of what we bring to the table. And also managing our operations and determining how best to carry out our work.

We also have knowledge of how government works and the legislative authorities that are all throughout government, that impact all government agencies and corporations, the information systems, the accounting, auditing standards. And of course by being in the system of government, that we have knowledge of the issues facing government organizations and all the different dimensions that the government has responsibility for carrying out. And then what we also bring to the table is professional training and practical knowledge.

The next section deals with where we are going in terms of carrying out our mandate and responsibilities. Our goals and objectives, we identify four general ongoing goals. The first one relates to providing the assurances to you that the government is providing you reliability, reliable reports, that they are complying with legislative authorities, and that they are maintaining adequate management systems and practices. The purpose of that or the objective is so that you can rely with confidence on what the government is doing.

The second goal is trying to look for or search for opportunities to improve the information on the government's performance that is provided to you, and again the objective being that we want you to be able to understand and assess the government's

performance and hold the government accountable for managing the resources that are entrusted to our government.

Goal 3 is looking at or searching for or encouraging the government to strengthen its management systems and practices. And of course the objective of that is so that the government manages public money as effectively as possible. The fourth goal is a constant look at our performance. And the objective there is to ensure that you, the government, and other stakeholders value what we do: our work, the assurances, the advice that we provide you, and our reports.

Fifteen, that sets out the values that we try to live by when we carry out our work, focusing on accountability and integrity on our employees, well-performing organizations, good working relationships, and earning the respect and confidence of the public and you.

In paragraph 16, it sets out some of the factors that affect how we carry out our responsibilities and goals and objectives and reflect what we know about what government is all about: the level of government's revenue and spending; the number of government organizations; the quality of record systems and practices; the government's use of appointed auditors, professional standards, and the cooperation that we hope to receive from government officials and others when we carry out our work.

Paragraph 19 sets out some of the key forces that we see out there that affect all of us including our office, the three being the ongoing increasing pressure on scarce public resources and the changing demand for public services. It affects what you do. It affects what the government does and therefore affects how we carry out our work. The second one is the increasing demand, the ongoing demand, for improved public accountability which affects again what you do, what the government does and therefore how we carry out our work.

And also I heard you speak this morning about computer systems and the changing computer technologies, another key force that just is moving through society and affects what you do, affects what the government can do, and therefore it affects how we carry out our work in terms of our examinations of systems and practices. And just the nature of our work changes as the nature of how information is processed and accessed. And that is ongoing.

The next part shows how we are going to get where we want to go in terms of achieving our goals and for improving our performance, examining and reporting on government organizations, auditing each government organization each year following professional standards.

We plan to continue to encourage the government to provide complete business and financial plans as being a major thrust for the office, to encourage you and the government to use the summary financial statements as the primary financial accountability document to refer to when you're trying to understand the finances of the province, to encourage more

useful accountability reports from each of the government organizations and the ongoing worry about strengthening the management systems and practices of the government.

We also set out how we're trying to improve our own performance and we report each year on our performance according to what we plan to do and provide that to you. We plan to meet, establish deadlines, and comply with standards, and try to continue, I hope, obtaining the support of members and the public and the government for our advice and recommendations, trying to strive to improve our communication skills and practices, improve the working relationship with all stakeholders.

As many of you probably know, we are working to implement some recommendations of a task force on the roles, responsibilities, duties of auditors which is establishing new protocol relationship with management, with appointed auditors, and with our office. And we think that that is moving practices forward and also strengthening the audit system.

We're also constantly focusing on trying to improve our skills, knowledge, and training. As you know, we go through a lot of different programs in government, varying from education, health, to telecommunications, and liquor and gaming. I mean there's a whole series of different types of businesses that we get involved in and the training, the skills, knowledge and training of our office is extremely important. We've done a lot of work on that, and more and more our training is being used by other people from government departments and agencies who are joining us in our own training programs. We welcome that.

For example about a month ago, we did a training program on how to improve carrying out audits of government organizations and about 18 people attended. And there was only about six or seven from our office and the rest were from other places within the government.

We also have demands for helping the district health boards train some of their . . . or provide some skills in training for some of the people involved in that area as well as some of the public accounting firms wanting training in the area of how government works and legislative authority.

So that's an important part of what we do as well as the training of students to become chartered accountants and certified management accountants to work with us and work elsewhere.

Again, we try to continually challenge what we do and we use as a basic management tool the budgeting for each of the projects that we take on — the expected results. And we monitor how we carry out those projects as well, to make sure that if there are significant variances they are investigated and we know why and take corrective action if it's necessary.

In terms of our measures of success, it's making sure that we are auditing in accordance with standards. We get inspected to

make sure that that's actually happening. We get inspected by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Saskatchewan.

We want to work it according to our values and we have various survey mechanisms to make sure that we are monitoring that, trying to complete our work and reports within the costs set out in our plan and within the established deadlines.

As you know, we've also moved to a spring and fall report, and certainly appreciate the support of the Legislative Assembly in changing our legislation to facilitate the release of more timely and, therefore I think, useful reports by our office. As you know, the fall report was the first one of that . . . well our first fall report.

Another key measure of our success is a support for our recommendations and advice particularly from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts who work with our reports, and we certainly appreciate their advice and comments and support, and also the moves that the government takes to address issues that we bring to their attention.

We consider debate healthy. We bring issues to the table in some cases because we think the issues should be debated, and that debate is an important ingredient to successful change and improvement.

Forty-eight refers to the financial statements of our office which are provided in this document, and notes that we are audited and we're inspected. And they examine the auditor's reports on our practices, our management practices, our compliance with legislative authority practices, and our financial reports. There are opinions on that, and we also are inspected by the institute.

Page 11 begins the financial plan for the office. As stated, the cost of our work plan is affected by the government's management systems and practices, the number of government organizations, the use of appointed auditors. And on page 12, it sets out our work plan proposals for the current year and for the previous three, and for the '95-96.

On that table 1 on page 12, note that those columns refer to the government's year end. So the column that says 1994-95 refers to our examination, or the cost of our examination, of what the government did in the year 1994-95. Now most of those costs would be included in the budget that you're addressing right now, our '95-96 budget. It sometimes gets a little confusing in terms of sorting that relationship out. So table 1 sets that out in terms of our work plans and also refers to the details of those spending proposals that were provided in previous years, and then of course the details of the spending proposals that are provided for you to consider this year.

On page 13 it moves through some analysis of why the changes have happened to the costs of our proposed work plans. The increase from '92-93 reflects the government's decision to create district health boards. And the boards are subject to an audit under our Act and therefore the work program costs to carry out

that work from '92-93 increase significantly, as well as the government's decision to have us audit directly CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) and the Liquor Board.

The large decrease in the '95 plan — so that's the moving in table 1 the column from '93-94 to '94-95, the \$4.7 million plan to this year's proposed 4.384 plan — reflects our plan to carry out our responsibilities following the recommendations of the task force on the roles, responsibilities, and duties of auditors. By moving to a different protocol relationship, we're hoping and we're acting this year to make sure that the costs of our audit work is less.

The decrease also reflects that several health boards that we're examining directly are moving quickly in integrating their administrative practices. As you know, many of the district health boards started off with perhaps 20 to 25 different facilities and are integrating them into one integrated operation. And that impacts how the financial administration . . . finances are administered and also the . . . our work, so that's decreasing our costs.

Page 41, less new government organizations created, and 42, less new government . . . or old . . . or government organizations disestablished during the year.

And then paragraph 58 refers to the '95-96 forecast which is reduced a little bit, anticipating further integration of the administrative functions at health boards.

Now in paragraph 60 we set out how we plan to finance our work. As you know, that since '87 our revenue has not been sufficient to carry out our work plans so we have not been doing all the examinations, and in many cases there have been no reports or late reports to you.

Page 45 to 50 shows which organizations we did not audit during the past three years, including the year that we're working on right now.

Table 2 also shows a five-year summary of how we financed our spending. You can see that increasingly we're financing our costs through audit fees negotiated with government organizations. You can see that the trend on the appropriation versus the audit fees used to finance our spending.

With the ongoing uncertainty as to whether the government will pay our costs at any point in time, we need to finance costs before we are paid. So we need to carry out the work before we're certain whether we will be getting revenues or audit fees from government organizations. As a result, we do now maintain sufficient money to finance short-term revenue shortfalls. This allows us to plan our ongoing expenses more effectively.

For example, if we find out in '95-96 that the government will not be continuing to pay our fees at some of the organizations where we are collecting audit fees, we can . . . we do have the

necessary resources to incur the necessary costs to reduce our staff and to fulfil contracts that we've entered into to get our work done. At March 31, '95, we expect to have about one month's revenue on hand to offset any changes in the audit fee requirements.

On the other hand, we continue to recommend that our funding comes from an appropriation from the Assembly. Concern that our funding depends on fees from the organizations that we examine rather than who we work for, which is you of course, and really don't know why the Assembly would not provide our funding. As you can see, the government appears to be willing to enter into agreements to ensure that the work does get done.

On page 15, it shows that now if . . . it shows the impact of alternative funding levels, making sure that you know that if we do not receive sufficient funding, the types of examinations that we won't be carrying out — the revolving fund, some smaller health boards, agriculture marketing boards and commissions, and certain CIC-related Crown corporations. That's the general in the appendix on page 17.

There's an index of all the different detail schedules that we've provided you: a five-year summary of our requested funding; a five-year summary of our spending trends; the costs of our detailed work plan for five years; government organizations created and wound up; information about our salaries, salary trends, and our averages; the utilization of our staff resources; the schedule of the audits that have not been completed; and then our own audited financial statements and our own auditor's report on our management systems and practices and the institute's inspection report.

And in appendix 2, we also provide information about questions that this committee and the Standing Committee on Estimates have previously posed to us, thinking that if you asked for these types of questions in the past that you might want the information at this time, related to our spending trends or out-of-province travel, more detail on our salaries of our staff and senior management salaries, some special assignments, our training costs, professional dues that we pay, and the billings that we have incurred during a number of years. So that's an overview of our proposals. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson: — Thank you, Mr. Strelieff. Are there any questions or comments on any aspect of what he has indicated or on the budget that is before you?

Mr. Swenson: — Wayne, on your payables, what's the normal schedule? Like government's on — what? — 60 days normally. Like you said that a lot of these organizations that you do a fee-for-service audit on and they pay. What's the normal lag time before you get paid?

Mr. Strelieff: — It's about 30 days.

Mr. Swenson: — So you can usually rely on 30 days after you complete your work that you're going to get paid?

Mr. Strelieff: — That's been our practice in the past or experience in the past.

Mr. Swenson: — Thank you. And so basis that you're saying by the end of March you'll have \$360,000 in payables that'll come in, and therefore you'll have one month's leeway.

Mr. Strelieff: — That we'd have . . . What it is saying in this document is that at March 31, '95, we'd have \$360,000 on hand to finance any shortfalls that we incur in '95-96. So if during '95-96 we find that the revenues that we received in '94-95 this year don't materialize, we then have a cushion to downsize, to make sure that we can fulfil contracts that we've entered into related to that work and manage more effectively.

Mr. Swenson: — So you're saying, you don't know year to year whether you have a contract with various agencies?

Mr. Strelieff: — In the past, our funding has come from appropriation only. Only recently have we begun to enter into agreements with government organizations. And no, we're not sure. Right now for '95-96, in terms of the funding that we know with reasonable certainty that we receive, I think we have agreements for about \$100,000 in place. So we know that that should be received in '95-96. And '94-95, the schedule shows that we entered into agreements or received funding of about \$500,000. So we're pursuing some other agreements, but until the government or a government agency or the government as a whole decides to enter into the agreement, we don't know.

Mr. Swenson: — When do they do that?

Mr. Strelieff: — It's ongoing. I can remember two years ago, when we began to enter into agreements with the government on revolving funds, we entered . . . the discussion began in February and the agreements began to get settled in November. So that was the first time, pattern, of going into that. So that took quite a while. For the next year, this last year, we entered into discussions in November, December, January, and I think most of the agreements were in place by February.

Mr. Swenson: — Yes, because wouldn't an auditing cost be part of the appropriation that they would ask for, either in the House or through Treasury Board? I mean if you know you've got an audit cost, you should build that into your budget.

Mr. Strelieff: — The first year, that didn't happen. The first year, that was a new practice. Our funding wasn't sufficient and we said, well we're not going to plan . . . we're not planning to do . . . using the example of the revolving funds. And we sent out advice to many of the government organizations that are responsible for revolving funds, saying that we don't plan to do these revolving funds; however, if you want us to do them, we would have to enter into an agreement.

Now this started, as I said, two years ago, in February. By that time their budget for the year had already been settled and therefore they never had that money in their appropriation. I'm not sure if they have their . . . Pardon?

Mr. Swenson: — Are the arrangements with the private sector auditors as loosey-goosey as yours?

Mr. Streliaff: — As uncertain? As uncertain, you mean?

Mr. Swenson: — Yes.

Mr. Streliaff: — Ours are uncertain because we don't know whether the government will enter into a contract with us until it actually happens. I don't know how to answer that question in terms of . . .

If we go to an example of the Crown Investments Corporation, and we enter an agreement with them just like a public accounting firm would and therefore making sure that the expectations are on the table, so it's quite similar in that case.

The Liquor Board, the same kind of thing, or the Liquor and Gaming Commission. It was: here's the expectations and here's what it's going to cost and here's what the fees are. The revolving funds have been a different kind of . . . (inaudible) . . . because it involves many organizations. And I think there was uncertainty — at least from what I could read from what was going on — uncertainty as to whether the government was going to actually have us do those audits and pay for them, until . . .

Mr. Swenson: — If you don't do it, somebody else has to. Right? So all I said was: if they don't use you, they've got to use somebody from the private sector. Is there that amount of time lag before the decision is made to engage either one of you? Or is it sort of . . . All I'm looking for: is there a structure?

Mr. Streliaff: — Yes, just on the revolving fund side, there wasn't a structure there in place as compared to Crown Investments Corporation, the Liquor Board, so the structure had to be created. And it's still working out in terms of making it more rigorous.

Mr. Swenson: — Because this . . . You know we're being asked to grant you a fairly large sum of money here and part of that sum has predicated on you doing so much work and if you can't get that money then you . . .

Mr. Streliaff: — Negotiate with the government.

Mr. Swenson: — There is some work here that obviously you aren't going to be able to do and you're talking about staff reductions if you don't get X amount of dollars, okay. So I don't want to see CIC-related Crowns go unaudited. That's why I'm asking you, if you aren't the guy that's contracted to do that, who is? And you know, how does that affect your bottom line?

Mr. Streliaff: — Well if for example you maintain the 3.815 appropriation, which is what we've received in the past three years, if you've decided that that's what you're going to continue, what we would do then is . . . As I said we do have one contract in place with the Crown Investments Corporation. Now if you provide us our full appropriation we would still

continue with that contract but return it to the General Revenue Fund.

But if the funding remains at 3.8 what we would do is then make . . . continue to negotiate with the Liquor and Gaming Commission, the different revolving funds, to establish audit agreements. Here's the cost, here's what's the deliverables, the timing, to make sure that it gets done.

We also have similar agreements with various district health boards where we . . . in some cases where we employ agents that work in the communities and we will negotiate with Pipestone District Health Board for example, saying here's the work that's going to get done, here's what we're planning to do. We're planning to employ a whole series of public accounting firms that are in your district, and here's the cost of that. They pay us; we pay the agent; we pay the public accounting firms. And so we enter into those kind of agreements, and we are entering into those agreements as we speak.

Mr. Swenson: — And that's so that you do comply with your Act, right?

Mr. Streliaff: — Yes, so we can carry out our work. The one wrinkle that then that creates is we're then negotiating with the government to come to an agreement on the audit rather than getting our funding from the Assembly. It just makes it more complex.

Mr. Swenson: — So if you get your appropriation and you then enter into an agreement with any of these entities and they pay, you then turn that money back to the . . .

Mr. Streliaff: — Well no. But if . . .

Mr. Swenson: — If anything over your 4.3 whatever?

Mr. Streliaff: — Well yes. I mean if you provided us the full appropriation of 4.3 . . .

Mr. Swenson: — Triple three.

Mr. Streliaff: — Seven seven. Then what we would do, we'd still continue to enter into contracts with Crown corporations and agencies, but we would return that money. If you provide the 3.815, what we would do is use the revenue that we received from entering into those agreements to finance those costs.

Mr. Swenson: — Well you've basically spent the 3.815 because that's the work you had to do.

Mr. Streliaff: — Well as you can see in the '94-95 forecast, this is on page 14, our appropriation was 3.815. Our spending forecast is 4.342. So we are using in this current year right now, we're using the audit fees that we've received to finance the costs of this year.

Mr. Swenson: — Right.

Mr. Strelieff: — And right now, well we're wondering what to do next year.

Mr. Swenson: — Right, I understand. That'll do for now, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions? Comments?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Just a couple questions. I was going over the pages in the appendix on the agencies that did not get audited, and I guess I don't understand. There was one that I'm unfamiliar with which is the Doukhobor fund. Are we responsible for auditing the Doukhobor fund and do they not pay for their own auditing? Or is this one of the charges that you . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — Which page is this, please?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Well I noticed this. . . and I'm not quite sure where it was when I was going through this. It was one of the agencies that didn't get audited in one of the years and it just struck me as strange that . . . I guess it's an example of those organizations which some people would say operate at arm's length or independently of the government but have some connection to the government through legislation. My question is, is your office and this budget responsible for auditing those organizations that are more or less autonomous and outside of government but operate under government legislation?

Mr. Strelieff: — Page 23 shows our detailed work plan that we're dealing with today and shows that . . . that's the last item is the Doukhobors of Canada.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — That's where it is.

Mr. Strelieff: — We're required by law to examine this one.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Is that a fee that you charge against them, or like I'm just not . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — No that comes out of our appropriation. We've been auditing this organization for a lot of years, and just the way it was set up it is a Crown agency and therefore we are required to audit this one.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Do you pass on that audit fee to them? Is that one of the ones you would charge a fee to?

Mr. Strelieff: — No we haven't.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Are there a number of those organizations like the Doukhobor fund that we . . . because it really is their money. It's not like it's government money, but it is a trust account that is set up under legislation and they contribute to it. And I just wonder why we are responsible for doing the audit and for paying for the audit. It's small stuff but it's a symbol of what I want to know about the larger operations.

Mr. Swenson: — It's not that small; it's 47 hours of work.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — No I know it's 47 hours and \$2,000 but it's . . . are there a number of those agencies like that and why are we obligated to pay those costs when they're independent?

Mr. Strelieff: — The lists that we provided on page 21 to 23 show all the organizations that are required to be audited under our Act other than on page 20 we note that the Saskatchewan Safety Council is one that is not required to be audited under our Act but we've been doing that for years and it's more of a tradition to do that. The Doukhobor fund . . . the general criteria of whether we audit an organization or not relates to whether it's a Crown agency or whether it's administering public money. And when we look at what the Doukhobors' group is doing, it falls under those definitions.

Now there are many organizations perhaps that depend a lot on public money but that are not . . . perhaps their boards are . . . there's a lot of non-profit boards that receive all their money from the government but we don't examine those.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — So if we were to change the legislation, I'm just . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — For the Doukhobors? Sure.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — And then we wouldn't be obligated to pay the cost. I'm just curious about this organization but wondering how many others like that, where it is a trust account established under legislation, with their money under a board of directors that are appointed by the provincial government, but it is completely autonomous. They make those decisions, and it seems to me something like this, it would be appropriate that they pay the cost of doing that audit instead of the Government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Strelieff: — When you mentioned that their board is appointed all by the government, in our legislation it says when that is the case, when the government appoints all the members of the board, our legislation says, Provincial Auditor, you examine that. You audit them.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Yes. I guess my question is, in these circumstances would it not be appropriate for you to pass through the fee to them?

Mr. Strelieff: — Well in general I take the position that the audits are being done for the Assembly and really all audit costs should be in our appropriation, and if . . . rather than having it in the budget of a specific organization because the audits are being done for you, really all the audit costs . . .

Hon. Ms. Carson: — But in this case it's not being done for us. It's being done for the Doukhobor trust fund which is like . . . it's not government money. It's their money that they have put in and they've asked us to establish it under a trust and we have. I guess I can't argue with your view of it because it's a legitimate legislative view that you have.

I'm just wondering how many other agencies do we have in government that operate this way, where it seems to me that maybe we should re-examine our relationship sometimes. Maybe it's a historical thing that has been built up but when we are thinking about these costs and where they are significant or where they are relevant, we should examine year over year these organizations to make sure that . . . this may be public money but it is contributions made by the Doukhobors. It's not contributions made by the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And that's I guess a difference that I'm making here, but obviously because of legislation you . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — There's a few agriculture and marketing boards that are like that, that the . . . through the legislation the government . . . the legislature has ensured that the government is responsible but yet the board will be collecting fees from farmers and will be using those fees to carry out its operations and quite often will not receive any money directly from a government or the government appropriation, but yet it has a different kind of relationship so there are some organizations like that.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I'm just wondering if there are categories when you look at where it's appropriate to charge a pass-through fee, which is external to government, and where internal to government, where through appropriations a department or an agency of government which is integral and a part of government, then it maybe doesn't make any sense where you charge them a fee and they get the appropriation from the General Revenue Fund and it just passes through.

But on other agencies that are definitely outside of the integral working of the government, would you not feel that there should be an examination of whether there should be a different category or a different system set up for them, to charge them, as opposed to internal government?

Mr. Strelieff: — Well it can be examined. I still do recommend to you that the cost of auditing these organizations, all government organizations, should really be under your purview, so that you're able . . .

Hon. Ms. Carson: — We're not saying it's not. I'm not saying you shouldn't audit these groups. I'm just saying we have now a precedent where you can charge a fee or pass through a fee to some agencies, and you have done it in the past. The last couple of years you have been doing it.

Again, there is a distinction between two groups of organizations — those ones who operate within government and government purposes, and those organizations that are under legislation that are still external — their operations are autonomous or external for their own purposes. And maybe their fees should come from that organization as opposed to coming from the taxpayers of Saskatchewan. And there it would be appropriate to pass on a fee to them and to do their books, but to require them to pay their fee as opposed to the internal organization.

Mr. Strelieff: — You're thinking organizations like the Doukhobors or my example of the Vegetable Marketing Commission which receives its revenues from check-off fees from producers rather than in another way.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I'm not trying to deliberately target the Doukhobor trust fund. I'm just using it as an example of how we have a variety of organizations here that we treat the same. And maybe we should start looking at separating some of these and looking at a different approach to cost recovery.

The Chairperson: — If I could just . . . I think I understand what you're saying but I think it does require an amendment in legislation. It could be a very simple amendment, that the Provincial Auditor would not be required to examine or do an audit of all those agencies of government where the boards have been appointed by government and where public funds are not involved.

If you make a simple amendment by saying that if the public funds or the funds that are being used are outside of direct government contribution, that the audit fees are going to be passed through to the organization. I think that's . . .

Hon. Ms. Carson: — I'm not saying that the Provincial Auditor shouldn't have an obligation or a responsibility to do the audit.

The Chairperson: — No, I know. You're talking about the fees.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — In the sense of the fees, where we already have established a precedent — and you've talked about it already that you have charged internal government a fee — why not charge the external people a fee, or external organizations a fee, and separate your budget?

But it seems to present quite a problem, that it's not possible. Because I don't understand how you can do it as you have done it in the last two years. It seems to be a legitimate approach. We approved a couple years ago that you could charge a pass-through fee or whatever, a recovery. But you have sort of done it with everybody and you haven't separated those that are internal to government to those that are external to government. And I just wondered if it wouldn't be a rational approach to look at a different way of charging that pass-through fee.

It seems to be either all or nothing what we have here. It's either we give you the total appropriation so you can do everything and not have a pass-through fee, or we don't give the appropriation and therefore you're going to start continuing . . . or you will continue with the approach that some will be cost recovery.

The Chairperson: — Any further comments or questions on this?

Hon. Ms. Carson: — No. I'll just leave it as a comment and perhaps at some point in time it could be examined to see whether it's a useful approach or not.

The Chairperson: — I agree and it is duly noted. We will have a look at that. I'm not so certain, in my own opinion, I'm not certain that that is incumbent upon us to do that or government to do that, to have a look at needed legislation. I think we should both look at it — at needed legislation in this particular area.

Hon. Ms. Carson: — Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson: — Okay.

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes, to refer to page 21, and I'm actually going to ask some questions relative to pages 21 and 25. And let's just for starters go to the Department of Health. This of course, is for March 31, 1995, from October of '94 to '95.

I'm curious as to why it is you expect to spend 11,495 hours from October '94 to March '95 at a cost of \$916,500 . . . 16, yes, thousand, not 499, when on page 25 the actual March '94 to October '94 hours was 8,700 hours at a cost of \$595,500.

Mr. Wendel: — Maybe if I could, Ms. Haverstock. What we're showing you on page 21 is the hours and costs we expect to incur to audit the Department of Health for the year ended March 31, 1995.

Ms. Haverstock: — Right.

Mr. Wendel: — And as Wayne was explaining earlier, those costs will more than likely mostly be incurred after March 31, 1995. So this is not costs we're going to incur between October 31 and March 31. All this is, is based on our knowledge at October 31, okay, we think we're going to have to spend 11,495 hours and \$916,000 to audit the government organizations in existence at October 31. And we project they'll be there at March 31, '95.

A member: — That's total hours.

Mr. Wendel: — Total hours. So that's projecting that the Cancer Foundation will still be there at March 31, 1995. The district health boards will still be there, prescription drug fund . . . excuse me, my voice is going. You say, well, based on our knowledge there and based on the spending level of Health that we know about in October 31, 1994 — because we haven't seen the budget for '96, but we have seen it for '95 — we say that's what it's going to take to audit that organization. Okay?

And we're going to start that work maybe a little bit in March '95 and the rest after that. That's on page 21. Now if you turn back to page 25, we say there that we have forecast to spend a million dollars auditing health boards for 1994, and up to October 31, 1994 we had spent around \$600,000. And we're still working on them. We're not finished the year ended March 31, 1994. So we're still working on the Department of Health's appropriations and revenues on district health boards, and we're continuing to incur costs on those.

Ms. Haverstock: — So in fact . . . just help me here because I may have this wrong. In fact the likelihood is pretty good. If

we're looking at what you have projected for the entirety of 1994 which is on page 25, that would be 13,584 hours. Then this 11,495 hours is actually a decrease.

Mr. Wendel: — That's correct.

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay. That's what I wanted to know.

Mr. Strelieff: — There's one other point on 25, that the starting point of 13,000, that assumed that we were going to examine all 30 district health boards, and we're not.

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes and that brings me to page . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — And therefore it won't be as high.

Ms. Haverstock: — Right, well page 49 then, you see part of my confusion when we're looking at this page 25 with the numbers of hours and the projections and all that sort of stuff . . . and this is for the Department of Health. If you go through this schedule of audits that will not have been done for 1994, that equals 23 district health boards out of the 30.

Mr. Strelieff: — That's right. So if you remember last year when we came in . . . and one of the implications of not receiving our full appropriation we put on the table was that our approach to the district health boards would be that we would examine the major ones — Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Regina — and three smaller ones — Moose Jaw, Pipestone and Twin Rivers. And as a result, on page 49, it lists the ones, the 23 that we're not planning to do. Therefore on page 25, the initial proposal of 13,000 hours at a million dollars, we're not planning to carry out. It won't play out that way. And this year on page 21, we indicate that to do the 30, examine the 30 health boards, the cost would be 11,000 hours and 916,000. And that's . . . be involved in each one of them. Okay.

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes, I am following. I have one other question just for clarification, and it may in fact, if I could extrapolate from what you've just said, apply to this question too, so just bear with me.

This is the Department of Education, Training and Employment on page 21. It appears here, fewer hours at greater cost, if we compare it with page 25. Am I right on that?

Mr. Strelieff: — So the 7,900 hours at 484,000 and 8,400 hours at 494,000. It looks like fewer hours at less cost.

Ms. Haverstock: — No, fewer hours at greater cost.

Mr. Strelieff: — Or at greater cost, sorry. We're trying to sort out why that is the case.

Ms. Haverstock: — Okay. It's not a burning question but it's a curiosity question.

Mr. Strelieff: — Depending on how we carry out our work, whether we're relying on another auditor, when we do that, we

usually use senior time for that. Because we're reviewing what a public accounting firm did. And when we do that, we use senior people in the office. And therefore the cost per hour would be higher. When we carry out the work ourselves, we would be using more junior time in terms of the mix of people, and therefore the costs per hour would be less. Now I'm not sure if that's the full reason for this.

The Education includes the universities, the regional colleges, SIAST (Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology). In SIAST we've changed from doing work ourselves. There's one, I suppose. In the prior year we did almost all the audit ourselves, and in this year, we are moving more to . . . there's a public accounting firm in place, and we're just overseeing that. We were there for, I guess, one or two years in a direct sense because there were a lot of problems there. And now we're moving back and saying okay, have a public accounting firm which . . . and then our resources, the time we spend, would be with more senior staff. That's one example. But I can't provide you right now any more explanation on that.

Ms. Haverstock: — Thanks.

The Chairperson: — Any other questions?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I just have a couple of questions. I know, I think it was on page 66 you had a draft with respect to government expenditure on the bottom graph and the Provincial Auditor expenditures. And I think one of the inquiries that I had made last year, or maybe one of the other members had made, was with respect to total auditing dollar. And if you would be able to put together some kind of an indication or just exactly how much we, both with private and public auditor, we've been spending as comparison in terms of overall government expenditures. And I didn't see that in here. I think it would have been . . . I think it would be helpful in terms of information for the board if we had the overall expenditure in terms of auditing.

Mr. Strelieff: — We do have some of that information in some of the detailed schedules, like on page 29 to 30 and 31. But what you're advising us is you'd like to see that built into the graphs as well.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Right. Or even another graph if you would want, you know, make the three. But I think it might be helpful because it does give some indication then of the . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — The magnitude of all this.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — The magnitude of that kind of expenditure. I'm going to be brief here. I just don't have an awful lot for you today in terms of questions.

The Chairperson: — That's all right.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, you will not argue with me on it. In terms of the salaries that are paid by . . . and say the cost of operations with respect to your shop,

how would that compare say with other provincial audit bodies in terms of say staffing as a percentage of your overall costs?

Mr. Strelieff: — So the percentage of our costs, if it's \$4 million and we have \$3 million in staffing costs — 3 is 75 per cent. How does that compare to other . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — To other jurisdictions, say the federal government or some of the neighbouring jurisdictions. Are we pretty much . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — We do carry out similar businesses, so the staffing relationships, I mean, if it is — let's see, what is it . . . 70 per cent? — 75 per cent of our costs are staffing costs. They should be doing something similar.

There would be differences. For example, Alberta, the Auditor General of Alberta has, in his budget, the total cost of all audits. And so he, through negotiations with his Board of Internal Economy or equivalent, they decide what portion of that total cost would be used to hire public accounting firms. So his costs would be quite different. Because if his costs are 10 million, say, he may have 5 or say \$3 million on public accounting firms, and then it's 7 million. And then what portion of the 7 million would be staffing? So each office has a different kind of mix.

My general understanding of the various offices — and we are in contact quite often — is that we do carry out similar kinds of operations. And when we are carrying out direct audits ourselves the mix of staff versus travel and computer equipment and space would be pretty similar.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Wayne, can I ask you, in terms of percentage of . . . you cited Alberta as an example, of how they put their package together. The ratio of private and public audit dollars, are we somewhat similar to where Alberta would be, or Manitoba? Which is the reason why I ask about that graph, because I'm really curious to know how other jurisdictions are handling this. How much they are doing, you know, within a shop like yours and how much is being contracted out?

Mr. Strelieff: — I think it would vary quite a bit across the country. And it also depends . . . I was talking percentage. I was thinking also it depends on the extent of how important the government public sector is in the economy, and therefore what percentage of the audits are being done by public accounting firms. I don't have that information.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I'd be really curious to see that. I think that it would be something that I would wish you would put together for us so that we could do some kind of comparison.

Mr. Strelieff: — Really, I don't have that information for Saskatchewan even. I've requested information about the costs of work done in some of the government organizations being audited by public accounting firms. We haven't received that

information yet. So even in Saskatchewan I don't have that information.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Which areas would you not receive that information from?

Mr. Strelieff: — Several firms have not provided us that information.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Do you not get that through Public Accounts or through Crown corporations' estimates? Is that . . . no, not available?

Mr. Strelieff: — Crown corporations don't have estimates.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Well Crown corporations' annual reports.

Mr. Strelieff: — It wouldn't be in those annual reports. What we'd do is write letters to the public accounting firms asking them to please . . . and I think this committee, or maybe this committee in the past — we say, the Board of Internal Economy has asked us to provide the committee with information on the total costs of auditing; could you please provide us with the costs that you've received or incurred and in some cases we receive it and in some cases we don't. Now I don't have the information on which ones we've received it and which ones we haven't but we are . . . and then we write follow-up letters. I remember sending out a follow-up letter just in the last month or so trying to gather this information.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions or comments?

Mr. Strelieff: — Just a side point on the audit costs. One of the factors that affect audit costs also are the use of internal auditors and the more that the government uses internal auditors the more . . . or the less the audit costs. It's just a side point.

Ms. Haverstock: — I was just going to mention that Mr. Swenson had to leave for a few moments but he does have some questions for the Provincial Auditor so I'm wondering if we can just take a five-minute break and wait for him.

The Chairperson: — Yes, before we do that I want to . . . last night you had asked a question which I did not answer this morning on the LAO and it was a very minor one and that was on the events as to why, and I should have thought of it. We had a retirement of a Lieutenant Governor. We also had the installation of a new Lieutenant Governor which we usually don't have and those were the increased costs. And we are going to be over-budgeted on that one again this year because we have not yet the Speaker's tea for the opening of the session which still has to come out of this year's. So that's the explanation for those.

Okay, we'll take a five-minute break. All right.

The meeting recessed for a period of time.

The Chairperson: — I think we have Mr. Swenson on the list.

Mr. Swenson: — Just one short question. I noticed in the '94, where are we here, back to pages 26, anyway, the year ended March 31, 1994. You had Liquor and Gaming together and you went over your projections by about a hundred-and-odd hours or something which I can understand because of the build-up on the gaming side. In this next round you now have the Gaming Corporation and the liquor corporation?

Mr. Strelieff: — Those are two separate corporations.

Mr. Swenson: — They're two separate entities now?

Mr. Strelieff: — The liquor and gaming corporation continues but then this Sask. Gaming Corporation is the one I think that is supposed to run the casinos, build them. So it's a separate . . .

Mr. Swenson: — Well the reason I ask is when you total those two numbers up there you've allocated virtually no more time but you've got a corporation that is fairly large. It spent over \$20 million in taxpayers' money just buying machines and then all the other entities and you're dealing with vast sums of money rolling in. And I don't understand how you could allocate the same amount of hours given that there's so much more there when your own projection from the year before went, you had to up it and you're virtually at a stand cap . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — On page 26 on the year before, the reason that we incurred additional costs is that the Authority wanted us to do some additional work related to the VLTs so we actually discussed with the Authority the nature of the additional work.

Now I don't know if that additional work will . . . will it be necessary to do additional work this year. So the budget, the two elements for this year, assumes that there's not any special requests for work to be done in addition to our normal audit. The year before they wanted us to help them in terms of organizing the systems that they use to establish the VLTs. And this year there were some issues related to how the Authority was going to account for their pension cost and obligations. And then there were some issues related to getting the work done in a time period that was changing, so we had to adjust the way we got it done. Perhaps we wanted to get it done in June, and that didn't work for the Liquor Board; therefore we had to change our work schedule and get it done in September or August. And as a result it cost more.

Mr. Swenson: — Well don't get me wrong. I want you to get your work done. I'm very interested in this area.

Mr. Strelieff: — But you're right, it is a complex operation.

Mr. Swenson: — I don't want you coming back, looking for more budget either, you know. I agree with your budget, but I think that should be sufficient.

Mr. Strelloff: — Well this is our best estimate on the Liquor Board unless there are some special requests that the board or the Gaming Corporation wish us to carry out.

Mr. Swenson: — I think it's a little unrealistic, but I guess we'll have to wait and see what comes down the pike.

The Chairperson: — Anything further, Mr. Swenson?

Mr. Swenson: — No.

The Chairperson: — Any further questions or comments? If not, then we need to have a motion, and the motion to read:

That the board approve an allocation equivalent to \$4.377 million for the Office of the Provincial Auditor for 1995-96.

Do I have someone to move that? Mr. Swenson. Seconded by Ms. Carson. Any further discussion? All those in favour? Well thank you very much.

That ends the Provincial Auditor's budget for this year. And we will allow the Provincial Auditor to say a few words.

Mr. Upshall: — He's stunned.

Mr. Strelloff: — What I'm thinking of is those 23 health boards that haven't quite got the plans in place to carry out the work. But now you've provided us the funding to carry out our responsibilities, we're going to have to move very quickly. Thank you very much.

The Chairperson: — Well thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It's certainly very much appreciated the way you dealt with the budget, 1995-96 budget of the Provincial Auditor. And I want to congratulate you and the Provincial Auditor and his staff in the presentation that they have made. And we look forward to next year.

Any further comments for anybody?

Could I have a motion to move adjournment of the meeting? Moved by Mr. Lautermilch, seconded by Mr. Swenson. All those in favour? Agreed. Carried. Thank you very much.

The meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.