



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

**HANSARD VERBATIM REPORT**

---



**No. 8 — August 19, 2014**

## **BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

Hon. Dan D'Autremont, Chair  
Cannington

Hon. Ken Cheveldayoff  
Saskatoon Silver Springs

Ms. Doreen Eagles  
Estevan

Mr. David Forbes  
Saskatoon Centre

Hon. Jeremy Harrison  
Meadow Lake

Hon. Nancy Heppner  
Martensville

Mr. Warren McCall  
Regina Elphinstone-Centre

[The board met at 09:03.]

**The Chair:** — Okay. I'd like to call this meeting of the Board of Internal Economy to order for August 19th, at 9:03 a.m. You have before you a copy of the agenda. I wonder if we could have someone move the adoption of the agenda.

**Mr. McCall:** — So moved.

**The Chair:** — Mr. McCall. Secunder? Mr. Harrison. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay. Next item is the approval of the minutes for meeting no. 7/14. Are there any questions regarding those minutes? If not, would someone move the minutes be adopted as presented? Ms. Heppner. Secunder? Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay. Item no. 1 is the tabling and decision item, the approval of the Legislative Assembly Service's first quarter financial report for the fiscal year 2014-15. It's pretty straightforward. Are there any questions related to the LAS's [Legislative Assembly Service] first quarter report? If not, would someone move that we approve this report? Ms. Eagles. Secunder? Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay. Item no. 2 is the tabling and decision item, the approval of the Elections Saskatchewan's quarterly report for the period of April 1, 2014 to June 30th, 2014. Are there any questions related to that? If not, could we have someone move that we approve that report? Mr. Harrison. Secunder? Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

#### Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay. Item no. 3 is a discussion and decision item, funding request for the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner, Mr. Ron Kruzeniski. So I'd like to ask Ron and his staff if they would approach the table, and we can commence the interrogation. Well thank you, Mr. Kruzeniski. If you could introduce your staff, please, and then commence your presentation.

Oh I guess I should have introduced who we had here — I didn't do that this morning — the people at the committee. We have the Hon. Jeremy Harrison, the Hon. Nancy Heppner, MLA [Member of the Legislative Assembly] Doreen Eagles, and MLA Warren McCall here, present today. So, Mr. Kruzeniski.

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With me at the table is Diane Aldridge who's the director of compliance with the commission office, and Pam Scott who is the director of operations, who is also with the office. Also here today is Darcy Hislop and Jeremy Phillips who are with the LAS

communication technology service. And I think, as I talk, you will understand that we've had discussions with them regarding some of the proposals that I plan to provide to you today.

I do thank the board for this opportunity to make this presentation, and I hope through my presentation I can answer maybe some of the questions you have in your mind. And at the end, I'd be most pleased to answer any other questions. Obviously we are here to discuss the supplementary request for funding, and I would like to talk about, first of all, our five-year plan that we've been working on over the last six weeks. And I'm going to ask Pam to pass out a copy to each board member. I then would like to talk more specifically in our request about staffing, visual identity, website, and case management.

When being appointed to the Office of Information and Privacy Commissioner, it became clear that the board wanted me to basically assess the situation: the needs of the office, the staffing needs, and the funding needs. But, Mr. Speaker, when you suggested that we might meet in August to discuss this, I went into a form of panic and saying, how would I get all of it done? And then when someone in your office suggested the material should be filed by August 6th, I further panicked. But in fact, Mr. Speaker, we've done it. We've done the assessment. We've prepared the materials. And we've done a five-year plan which I want to talk to you about in a bit of detail. Certainly it's with the staff, my two colleagues here and the rest of the staff at the office.

From time to time, because of the short timelines, I will refer to things as preliminary or draft, and that is because I think further discussions and consultations can occur as I meet with various people who are part of government or the opposition. And if people have good ideas, you know, this might evolve. But I believe overall the road map is set and that we have a plan that, once we sort of stamp it final, it will be on our website and it will be in the next annual report.

So first if I could address the five-year plan, because our supplementary request really is based on this plan, and the first heading there is citizens first. I believe people in Saskatchewan as citizens, as taxpayers, are entitled to good service from whatever agency that receives taxpayer dollars. In our case we have three Acts. They set out the rules. Most of those rules are clear, but occasionally there are differences of opinion, different interpretations, and the information and privacy office becomes the referee. When doing that refereeing, I believe citizens are entitled and public bodies are entitled to a timely response, a timely resolution of whatever their issue is. Now what is timely? Well in this case we're setting a goal for ourselves of saying things will be reviewed within six months, 80 per cent of the time.

Now just to let you know where we are at the moment, we're reviewing things and closing them within six months, 27 per cent of the time. So we in effect have a fair ways to go, and I think that last number of 27 per cent is reflective of a backlog that has existed for some time. And another example of the backlog and the difficulty and my concerns about citizens getting timely service, in 2014 other files were closed, but five of those files, three of them were over two years old, one was two and a half years, and one was almost three years old. And

that really is not citizen service.

Part of the plan and part of the mix in terms of requiring resources to do it is we plan to have a collaborative approach — early resolution as much as possible whenever and wherever possible. This does take time. And why does it take time? Because it takes more phone calls, more emails, more letters, more meetings, more possible mediations. The results are much, much better. Earlier resolution really results in happier citizens and happier bodies because the issues have just been dealt with and taken away. So a collaborative approach you'll certainly see, and hopefully that means citizens are happy sooner, but it does take time to make it all happen.

The third point under citizens first is promoting among public agencies an open information strategy. And what is that? Well as access requests come in, public bodies know the trends. They know what people are asking for and they know what are the things that they can legally provide. So one step of getting ahead of the game is just encouraging them to post that sort of information on their website and put it out there. That reduces the number of access requests and I hope in the long term maybe would reduce the number of reviews that we have to do, and does result in happier citizens, and information being out there.

Now we can't insist or enforce that. It's a matter of encouraging, persuading, promoting, cajoling. And basically I would say over the next two to five years, I hope we have some success in just getting people to put relevant legal, accessible information on the website.

[09:15]

The third heading in our plan is to have a new look. Our website was developed and designed in 2003, and really needs a major revamping. The advice that we've gotten from LAS IT [information technology] services is, start by knowing what, defining your visual identity. What do you want to look like? What touch and feel do you want your website to have, and all your other communication vehicles? So as part of the website proposal to redesign, we start by I guess what would be called, in the private sector, rebranding. LAS has done it. That was done prior to the Legislative Assembly website being designed and built and we need to proceed along that way.

Once we do the visual identity part of it, we then need to move to designing the website, getting the templates there, getting it operational. And then we have a major job, some 1,000 documents to upload, review, modernize, or just delete.

And finally, another part of our plan is to explore the potential of social media. Many organizations are using it very effectively and I think we, to be an effective organization and to reach a certain portion of our community that is very socially media savvy, I think organizations have to be there in a practical and responsible way.

The next heading in our five-year plan is information for all. And that is part of our mandate, to educate people so that they understand when they can have access and when they can't. I've discovered, and I've mentioned this to the board before, I find a lot of fear among staff that work for public bodies. And

I'm fearful that their fear results in them saying, sorry, I can't give you that information; it's private. And that's not necessarily totally following the rules and people aren't getting what they easily should have.

On the other hand, there are folks who have a lack of fear. We generally refer to it as snooping. Some others refer to it as a criminal offence. And we have cases, sample cases. We have one situation where one person snooped into 153 individuals' records. We have another case, and this one blows me away, where one person snooped on 504 individuals and actually accessed the system 1,431 times. I find that just totally unacceptable.

Now could there be discipline and consequences? Of course, when it's discovered. But I think it starts with education, number one, taking away the fear in the right cases and instilling a bit of fear in other cases. So to counteract that, I think we need to design an education program that goes after all of that. I see the website in these days as the primary source of achieving that, and it needs to have a focus on learning, information for citizens, the basics of all this access stuff and what they can do and can't do, and for public body staff who join organizations and need to know the rules.

Our hope would be to do as much of this in collaboration with other public bodies. We can design online courses ourselves. Much more effective if we can design them with someone else, much more effective if they're modular and even if, at the end of the day, someone gets a certificate that they can put on their personnel file saying, I took the course. And so our hope is that we could promote public bodies to make it I guess basically mandatory that new employees, as part of their orientation, take these access and privacy modules.

But you know, most staff aren't going to deal with access, privacy issues every day, and I think we need a way of them taking an annual refresher. And I hope we can promote the idea of annual refreshers. I know one employer that does that in town and, you know, maybe it's a 10- or a 15-minute refresher course that you have to certify, I took that on my anniversary date of my employment or whatever the rules are. Again don't plan to do it all alone; want to do it jointly. For example, the government has three modules up on its website. Maybe we can work with them to expand those modules or make them more applicable. We have different sectors. The government sector has slightly different rules than the health sector or the local authority sector, so there needs to be work with all the different interest groups to achieve these online courses that people can take.

The next heading is updating the rules. All legislation, over time gaps occur. Judges find gaps. Different interpretations occur. Clarity arises. I always liken it to a ship as it goes through the water. It gains barnacles, and at times you have to go and brush off those barnacles. Developing new legislation is a time-intensive process, an important process. It's probably our longest term goal and would take, you know, the next . . . from now to five years to achieve it. I think I've said to you in the past, I'm an incrementalist. You work on these things bit by bit and find commonalities and find things . . . [inaudible] . . . change. Along the way we certainly plan to give advice on legislation tabled, policies proposed, or practices proposed by

public bodies. And all of that takes more time.

The last heading is effective and efficient. Certainly incumbent on the office to look at what it's doing, and the best way in part in doing that is establish a series of performance measures that you put in your annual report and say, here's what we're out to achieve. Now one of them certainly will be achieving reviews within six months, 80 per cent of the time. We've flagged that one, but we can develop other performance measures that we can report to you, the board, and to the legislature, and let you know how we're doing in terms of getting along with getting our job done.

Our processes. Any process in the world can be looked at and you can find steps, and the lean methodology is a good methodology for achieving that. And we need to look at our processes and streamline them. We've got a session for September 15th to start that process. And hopefully, you know, we can work on a system in our office. And it's usually referred to as continuous improvement.

We're proposing to switch to an electronic filing system. This will allow us in fact to be much more efficient in terms of how we store our documents electronically and, without breaching privacy and being respectful of people's privacy interests, promoting, communicating with citizens and bodies electronically wherever possible, storing their electronic submissions. And we plan to embark upon that course September 1st, although some of the staff are already experimenting with it and seeing how it will go. That will take us hard work, and it will probably take us one or two years to complete that process.

Implement a case management system. Obviously this is part of our financial request. At the moment we don't have a case management system. We do have a series of spreadsheets. They are cumbersome to operate and maintain. It is hard to get relevant reports out of them. There's a bit of risk with spreadsheets of data just disappearing with you. So with some hard work and implementing a case management system — and I want to talk about that later — I expect it will take us some 15 to 18 months, if you approve funding, for us to achieve that goal.

And another thing we want to do is work with others, share services with other officers with the Legislative Assembly, and those discussions are going on now as to what we can share and how we can share. A memorandum of understanding was signed in February and I plan to pursue that and expand that where possible.

And finally, finally, there is an initiative where four officers are looking at sharing space. It's at the initial stages in trying to define the requirements, but if that comes to pass, and I'm sure that would be in front of the board because it'll have implications, there's a lot of work there in designing the new space, planning the move, and effect the move. So that's there.

So in summary, we have a five-year plan. I believe it is ambitious, but there's no use proposing an non-ambitious plan. But I also think it's doable. We could not achieve this plan with the staff we have. We could not achieve this plan with the funding we have. We could achieve this plan with a

complement of 12 people and the board looking at the funding requests that we've made.

If I can move into a bit more detail on the supplementary request that I've put forward, we are in effect requesting \$257,000 in this fiscal year. That is made up of \$90,000 for salaries for about five months worth for three staff, related rental cost of \$31,000. And we believe we've got space in the building to do that. It may not be adjacent space, but it's close enough by using the elevator to get there. And \$136,000 for the one-time expenses to start off and finish the visual identity, start off and finish the website, get design of a case management system, and related furniture and that sort of thing for new staff.

I would like to address these in a bit more detail and talk about them so you have an idea of our thinking. We're requesting three staff, and that involves an analyst, previously called a portfolio officer; an early resolution officer, previously called an intake officer; and an education or communications coordinator. The title isn't set. I would probably lean towards much more of a communications orientation, but I do plan to talk about that in a little bit more detail.

I first would like to address the analyst situation. I think from what I've said, and I'm sure what the board has heard in the past, the office has had a workload issue. I said it earlier: closing files and five of them being over two years old, and that just really not being good citizen service. The staff have been working hard over the last year to close some of those files and wrestle that backlog, but I think to them it feels very much like a treadmill — working hard, you know, walking fast, and they still keep coming in the door. And then on top of that, you have a new commissioner coming in saying, you know what? We're going to target doing them all six months, 80 per cent of the time. And that just sort of is adding to I guess the goals and the pressure and the need for an additional analyst to get the job done.

Added to that is some issues, and it centres around maternity leave, sick leave, vacation leave, and early departures. And to give you an idea, we've had nine maternity leaves in the last eight years. And usually when someone's away, they're away for a year. And you'd say, why is that a concern? You know, you just hire a replacement person.

The problem is the training of the people that come in. It takes about 9 to 12 months to train somebody. I've been in other organizations where this is the case. There's no SIAST [Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology] course, there's no university course that trains you for this, so you only learn it on the job. And you can be a very smart person, but you're not going to be contributing very much the first number of months when you're there.

And we just had a situation where there was a maternity leave. A person came; they were there for five months. They got a very good offer, and they took the good offer job, which they should do. The end result is almost got no value for the five months training that was put into that person.

All of that kind of leads to a backlog. And it's put us in the spot where we now normally have three analysts, we have two. And currently we have 110 open files, and if you do the math, that's

55 files per person. I think we're better situated when an analyst has 25 or 30 files, particularly if we're going to say, you've got to get them out in six months or less.

I think the working on cases and trying to deal with the backlog has probably resulted in a little less emphasis on presentations and education, and I think that is an important plank of the office, as I have said early. And then again you have a new commissioner coming along who says, here's a five-year plan and, folks, we'll want you to . . . There'll be some further demands upon you, including working collaboratively getting these things resolved, spending the time to make the collaborative approach work. So there are a variety of reasons why we in effect are asking for that analyst.

The other additional person we're asking for is an early resolution officer, previously an intake officer. We have two now. And I need to say that the office handles a considerable volume of summary advice complaints, and these intake officers get a good portion or bulk of them. Historically there's been 2,800 to 3,600 such summary advice inquiries a year.

[09:30]

And I've done some arbitrary math in saying, if each of them took you half an hour — and that is an arbitrary number — 2,800 of them would be 1,400 hours or 175 working days, which is getting pretty close to one person's full time. It doesn't work that way. It's spread around. But one person full-time, just there to give people advice. They're asking questions and educating them on the process. So again I come along and say, we want to resolve these things earlier. So I am encouraging these individuals to make more phone calls, do more emails, clarify, narrow the issues, educate people on the process, and get things solved sooner.

With the five-year plan, these early resolution officers will be very involved in developing the website, loading those, reviewing those 1,000 documents. And since they are the main keepers of the spreadsheets at the moment, a case management system is certainly going to impact them in doing all the conversion and defining. And you know what happens when you try to implement a new system. You hire consultants. But they come in and they say, okay, we need a couple of days with staff to sit down and find out all about your work. So the staff become the subject matter experts, helping the technical people get your system going.

The early resolution officers have other duties in terms of responsible for the entire record management system of the office, managing the website, and finalizing reports that go out to the public. So in addition to the summary advice things, they've got other responsibilities, and the five-year plan is just going to add to that.

Finally, the education coordinator, the one where the title is not settled and possibly more like an education coordinator, the emphasis, the important word here is coordinator. I believe this person will be involving many people in the office and in the public bodies. And I think there's a major, major component that is electronic and digital. I'd like to think that we will end up with the best information privacy website in Canada when we're . . . [inaudible] . . . done. And a website, to be effective,

needs to be up to date all the time or otherwise people stop using it or thinking that it's relevant. All of that takes daily effort to make it happen. Similarly social media; daily effort is the only way that that will occur.

The communication coordinator obviously has to be very involved in the visual identity definition process of what do we want to look like on the website or wherever, and somewhat involved in converting these 1,000 documents that are now there, but quite difficult to find when you need them.

The coordinator needs to be involved in the training modules I referred to earlier, and needs to work with public bodies again where we can find those collaborative efforts to make that happen. And again the modules have to be tailored to three Acts and different sectors. There's different professional bodies that have different needs. So a big job there. So that's the digital communication side. This is a rough guess, but I would expect 60 per cent of this person's time spent on that type of thing.

But face-to-face work needs to be done and I believe we need to develop training courses. The Ombudsman has an Art of Fairness course and I think we need to have something similar, probably shorter, put on a monthly, bimonthly, quarterly basis depending on demand. It takes a lot of time to set up and coordinate courses on a systematic basis and you have to work with others. You have to get them to register, you have to develop the curriculum, and you have to give some of the presentations yourself. This person, if the board approves us going ahead with this, is going to be an extremely busy person and a pivotal person in terms of coordinating the office, staff in the office, and me, and the public bodies to get things done.

So in summary, we have a staff right now of nine. The last person added was Kim Mignon-Stark, July 1st, and she is mainly there to assist me. And I do appreciate and thank the board for their accommodation in approving that. That has been very helpful to me.

If you approve three staff, we would be up to 12. How does that stack up across the country? Have we designed a Cadillac or a Chevrolet? And basically, if you look at Alberta, Alberta has 42 staff. But they have, you know, three to four times the population that we do. So if you looked at 12, we would be under a third of what they have, which I think kind of says we're somewhat in the ballpark.

Manitoba. Manitoba has a combined Ombudsman and privacy commissioner office. But they have nine staff that are dedicated strictly to information and privacy. They have another nine staff that are shared by everybody. So if you just did this arbitrary, and I say it is arbitrary, three of those nine shared staff worked on information and privacy stuff some of the time, you'd sort of get right around to 12 people again. So it strikes me, although it's a little bit of comparing apples and oranges, we're sort of in the ballpark.

And finally Newfoundland, who has about a half a million people, has a staff of 12. So I would like to say that I think we're in the range. It isn't excessive when you look at other legislatures across the country, based on population. They've kind of designed offices in the range that we're talking about.

I've been very specific in terms of talking about an analyst and an early resolution officer and a communications coordinator. But the reality is, for us to achieve the five-year plan, it's going to take all 12 of us working hard. I don't think we can achieve it with nine, and 12 would be a number that would allow us to do that six months, 80 per cent of the time. It would allow us to streamline our processes, rebrand, and do a website and implement a case management system. I foresee a very, very busy two years coming up, if the board is inclined.

Now I did want to briefly talk about some of the one-time initiatives. And I've talked about rebranding possibly too much, but it is the lead-up step to the website. But if I may talk about it a little bit first as they say, people say, start there. In our plan on the website, we plan to work closely with the LAS IT office. Why? Because they have the expertise. Secondly they have the experience. And in talking to LAS, Darcy Hislop has agreed to assist us with our projects and to provide some project management services. Obviously depending on the decisions of the board today, details of that will be worked out. We desperately need that project management coordination stuff. If done well, that tends to keep a project within scope, on time, and within budget. So I think this co-operative effort is essential to making this work.

In addition there's some real other advantages here. Basically the Legislative Assembly has done it. They've done the rebranding and they've done the website. And we plan to beg, borrow, and steal as many concepts, use the same platform possibly, if we can, use the same consultants. And our estimates of cost of doing this are \$65,000. That's lower than the LAS. And why is that? For a number of reasons. I think our situation is less complex. The Legislative Assembly website keys on a calendar feature, which we don't need. It has more functions. It has to serve MLAs plus other things. Really ours is a single purpose website and we can use the same platform all centred around Microsoft's Dynamics CRM product, which I want to talk about a little bit more in the next topic.

And the next and almost the last topic, Mr. Speaker, is the case management system. As I said, there's no case management system now. There's a series of websites, and some of that data is somewhat at risk and it's certainly cumbersome to operate. Now the above website proposal would operate off Microsoft CRM. The case management system can operate off Microsoft CRM and the Legislative Assembly is already using Dynamics CRM. And I hope the board can see how the stars are kind of aligning for a project that could be designed and moved in without major, major implications because people are already familiar with these products.

Alberta is testing and implementing a new information and privacy case management system there. They are using Microsoft CRM. We've got the screen prints of what they have and we like it a lot. Pam Scott and Jeremy Phillips have visited and have seen it, and were very impressed with the end result of the product. Now you might say, why don't we just grab it and take it and borrow it and negotiate a price with Alberta? And if that was the least cost option and you approved the funding, I would be on it right away.

There are some difficulties in just doing that. One, they've designed a system for 42 people versus our 9 or 12 people.

Two, they have an adjudications unit that we don't have so they've built in a bunch of functionality that we don't need. And they have an extensive, extensive security system which have increased their development costs because they've made it so secure. We don't need that secure a system. Do we need a secure system? Yes, but we don't need to go as far as they have gone. Number one, we're a much smaller office. And the initial preliminary advice — and once we engage consultants, we'd get better advice — is the cost of you taking out some of the stuff they have might cost you more than starting, copying, begging, and borrowing where possible, but kind of building it, customizing it your way.

So the steps and the process to follow is, we need to define our processes. What are going to be our future processes? Well we have a lean event for September 15th that will do that. We then need to define our requirements, starting to get into the technical talk of what the developers say they will need. And then we need to design the system — a key step, a key step where you prevent many misunderstandings from occurring. That would happen in this fiscal year. Developing it will cost money and will be dealt with in the next fiscal year and I need to address that briefly.

We know Alberta's costs, and because of their added functionality we know our costs are going to be less. So thus in this year we are requesting \$45,000 for that requirement and design phase. Next year our preliminary estimate is \$90,000 and it's based on the fact that we know we need less than Alberta. Obviously as consultants come on board they will define and refine, and we can certainly keep the board up to date as to the costs. But we're pretty confident in terms of the costs because we know what LAS has done and we know what Alberta has done.

There's always questions about how can you control costs on IT projects. I think we have a number of factors working in our favour. One, we know the costs of Alberta and the LAS website. Number two, we know we need less functionality than those two projects. We know these are short-term projects which allows tighter and easier control. We know there are fewer variables and that really results in fewer risks. And in the scale of IT projects, we're dealing with pretty small dollars which just allows you to control it further.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, and board members, I've probably taken too long and I've provided you with a lot of information. I did want to convince you that I've tried to think about this very carefully and thoroughly. Let me conclude that I came July 1st. I have done I guess what you'd call a very quick assessment. I've consulted with staff, consulted with others. We've developed a five-year plan that is ambitious but doable. I think it can be achieved by 12 staff in the office. It would allow us to do a number of things — do our visual identity, a new website, and a new case management system — and achieve some of those goals of getting reviews out to citizens within six months. I think we can do it all so I am requesting, in this fiscal year, a supplementary amount of \$257,000.

I thank you, board members, for the time, and I certainly am pleased to, with my colleagues, Diane and Pam, answer any questions that you may have.

[09:45]

**The Chair:** — Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Kruzeniski, a very thorough presentation. Now I look to the board. Any questions? Mr. Harrison.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Thanks very much, Ron. That was a very thorough presentation, and I know we had reviewed the documentation in detail prior to the presentation. And I think in terms of questions, you have answered mine, and I appreciated the conversation that we had as well the other day and further addressing some of the questions I had at that point.

So you know, as we had said during the process for the last budget for the Privacy Commissioner's office, that we would give consideration to requests in terms of needs once the new commissioner was on the job. We appreciate the short time frame that you've turned this around in and brought this, you know, very solid plan before the board.

As you all know, the board approved one additional FTE [full-time equivalent] shortly after you were selected for the position, so there's one more there in terms of that position.

The analyst position, this has been a long-time request from the commissioner, the previous commissioner. And we think the case has been made on that, and the government will be supporting another analyst position.

In terms of the early resolution officer, I want to say I like the change in the terminology as well. I think it's a reflection of where we want to go with these sorts of things. The case I think has been made as well there, so the government will be supporting that.

In terms of the education coordinator, I know we had a discussion with respect to the role, and I know that you have a clear idea as to where you want that to go. I know there's been discussion as well around how that position would be named. I think where we're at on that one is we're not saying no to that. What we're going to ask is if, you know, some additional maybe work can be done on that and brought as a part of the budget process that we'll be starting up once we get back into session here.

In terms of the office space, you obviously are going to need more space. We know that. So what we're going to say is yes to the cost, but we want to know kind of exactly what the cost is, so I think we would ask if you could work with Central Services to find out exactly what's necessary. You know, we're agreement in principle or approval in principle, but just to actually get the cost nailed down, exactly what it is before, and then bring it back to the board for approval on that.

I know there's been discussion for some time in terms of a joint office space for the officers. I actually heard that there's some progress being made on that, which is a good thing. But obviously you need space in the short term.

In terms of the website and case file management system, I think where we're at on that is I know for the case file management system you're asking for 45 now and approximately 90 next year. I think what we would ask is if, on

that and the website, is if you could bring that through the budget, the normal budget process as well, where we can consider it in the context of the entire submission that we're going to have from the officers and the LAS. Again, not saying no, not in any way, shape, or form saying no, but just where we can consider it in a broader context.

So I guess that's where we're at on things and would be interested in the opposition's position.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Harrison. Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — Would the officers like to respond on that first? Give them the option and then I can get my two cents in, if you wouldn't mind.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Kruzeniski, do you want to respond to Mr. Harrison's comments?

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — Mr. Harrison, you may have to refresh me on the series, but one was you were asking for more specific on the rent costs. I'm going to ask Ms. Pam Scott to comment on that, but I think we have quantified it for this fiscal year at about \$31,000. Am I right, Ms. Scott?

**Ms. Scott:** — Yes, that's right. We've worked closely with Central Services to find out if there, first of all, was any extra space within the building that we had. And they did find some preliminary space that think may work. In fact there was three offices, I think, that were built, and so quite small space, 140 square metres, I believe. So we have worked very closely with them, and that's the number they gave us.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay, good. If you've worked with Central Services and that's the number, then we're good to go on that.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Kruzeniski, officials, thanks for joining us here today. As I chime in with my counterpart opposite, a great presentation, well thought out. And I guess I may not be alone in this feeling, but certain of these items have been a long time coming, and I'm glad to see the kind of progress represented in the presentation here today, represented in terms of my colleague opposite's indication of the support of the government. So I won't mess with that progress. We'll just take the progress and run.

The one thing I would ask and look for a bit further illumination upon, and I know this is the kind of work that's near and dear to the officer's heart. It was touched on generally in the report, but where, in terms of the basic operations of the Information and Privacy Commissioner's office, I think we've got a good piece of work here under way and I think we can see that progressing, another outstanding file is what's happening on the legislative front and the legislation that governs the Information and Privacy Commissioner's duties and office. I guess, does the commissioner have any sort of thoughts on the go-forward as regards the legislative changes that have also been hanging fire for quite some time?



**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — I take it, Mr. McCall, you are referring to bills 137, 138? I guess two things on bills 137 and 138, which is a small piece of the whole legislative puzzle. I think the officers are talking and working and having discussions, and hopefully, you know, resolution and proposals can come forward. I guess they eventually get to the Ministry of Justice that will deal with that, and that's the shorter term basis.

On the broader term basis, as I said, when you have legislation in the case of FOIP [*The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*] that's just about 25 years old, and LAFOIP [*The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*] which is a year younger, you certainly are going to have what I call gaps discovered, lack of clarity, different needs. Words can take on a different impression almost 25 years later, and there's just a need for clarification. So I will certainly be working with anybody that will work with us to talk about what sort of legislation reform is possible. I think, as I said in the whole interview process, I'm an incrementalist, so I kind of search for those things where people would generally agree. I believe that great legislation is legislation that passes through the House sort of unanimously or consent of both government and opposition, and we would be searching for those types of changes first of all where we could make some changes.

The Minister of Health has talked about the report on HIPA [*The Health Information Protection Act*] and the recommendations there. And I understand that, you know, HIPA amendments will be coming and I certainly applaud that, you know, having read those recommendations. That is a really good first step. So I am supportive of legislative change and will be searching for colleagues in the House and in government and in Justice who say yes, it is time that we move forward.

**Mr. McCall:** — Thank you for that. And I guess it was that, the latter set of legislative changes that have been long outstanding, was what I was looking for. I wouldn't want to get into 137, 138 today. We'll save that for another day certainly. But it was certainly the latter part that I was looking for. But I guess I'd leave it there, Mr. Speaker, and thank you again for a good presentation.

**The Chair:** — Okay, thank you. Mr. Harrison.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, just kind of one technical question. With respect to the request for the computer hardware expense, computer software expense, and the desk, telephone, and chair per staff member, did you work with Central Services in coming up with those numbers? It's just that the 13,000 for a desk and a chair and a telephone per member seems pretty high.

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — I'm going to ask Ms. Scott. It certainly does initially look high but the costs of those types of things are kind of surprising when they add up. But those are on standard estimates, are they not, Ms. Scott?

**Ms. Scott:** — They are somewhat an estimate. Certainly if we don't need all of that money, we would be giving that back to the GRF [General Revenue Fund] at the end of the year. Difficult to say in terms of where the space is in our building and how our network's going to have to connect. You know, in

terms of the computer hardware, we are going to an electronic system so we will have a computer system that we may have multiple screens per employee. So there's a little bit of an increase from just a normal one screen and one desktop type computer system there.

Software, I believe we need Adobe Acrobat Pro to be able to scan our documents in and be able to copy and paste those and use those documents in the electronic system that we're going forward with. And the desk, telephone, chair per staff person, that may be a little high. However, they're more or less based on the furnishings that we have just purchased for the new FTE that we just received when Mr. Kruzeniski came on board.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — All right. No, thank you very much for that, and that clarifies that.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Are there any other questions? Okay. If not, we have some motions that we need to make and obviously we're going to have to revise the initial estimates based on only two staff persons. Pam, go ahead. Ms. Scott.

**Ms. Scott:** — I'm just wondering if you need any numbers to help you with that.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — I've added it up to 111.3. So I don't know if we want to make expenditures on my math skills.

**The Chair:** — You're out slightly. You're out slightly based on mine. I had 111.2.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Oh, okay.

**The Chair:** — Ms. Scott.

**Ms. Scott:** — So this is based on, I believe, the one analyst and the one early resolution officer. Is that correct? So the total for the five months would be 218,575.

**The Chair:** — If I can perhaps interject here, I believe Mr. Harrison had indicated that what the government was prepared to approve was the two staff, the analysis and the initial intake, as well as the rent for the building and other space. So that would be 30,609 plus the computer hardware, software, desk, chairs, etc., of twenty-two two thousand. That would not include the 69,000 for contractual services and the 45,000 for the case management, and that was to come back in the budget process.

Okay. So if somebody else would check those numbers.

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — Mr. Speaker, in responding to Mr. Harrison's proposal and I would just wonder whether the board would consider some smaller amount for consulting services in order to come back to this board in January or February with numbers that would mean more if we were permitted to do a bit of work. For example, you know, define the requirements of the case management system. That would give the board an extra degree of confidence in terms of the numbers we're proposing and the direction that the whole thing would go.

So I would ask, before the board sort of puts the motion to the vote, where we've asked for 45,000 to work on the case

management system, if the board might cut that in half and give us, say, the 22.5 to do some of that preliminary work so the board would get more concrete answers.

[10:00]

**The Chair:** — Mr. Harrison.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Sure. So you'd ask for half of that amount right now and then we would have . . . Like how good of an idea right now do we have that that final number would be 135, which is kind of the 90K [thousand] for next year and the 45 for this? Do we know that already pretty definitively?

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — I'm not sure I follow you, Mr. Harrison.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. Just in terms of the total cost of the case file management system, I think you know, in your submission, you've indicated that you had a pretty clear idea that that's what the number would end up being. You know, I don't know why we'd want to or need to have a contractor to be able to tell us, if we already kind of know.

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — I understand. I guess the only supplementary thing I could say, Mr. Harrison, is that, say with 22.5, we could define the requirements. As I've said, we need less than Alberta needs but we could define that further and then we'd come back with a more concrete number on design costs and, in turn, development costs. So defining our requirements, sort of springboarding off Alberta but saying we need much less security and we don't need an adjudication thing, and getting right into what we need would be of assistance to us and may be of assistance to the board.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Well I think where we're at . . . We just had a brief discussion. I think we'd be more comfortable considering the full amount when we go through the budget process rather than kind of doing it piecemeal in supplementaries.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Is there any other questions or discussion? If not, would the government like to move a motion for the approval of . . . I think we came up with the number of 111,300. Do you want to round that off to either 111,000 or 112,000?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — 111,300.

**The Chair:** — Okay. You're rounding it off. Okay. The motion would read:

That additional funding in the amount of \$111,300 be approved for vote 055, the Information and Privacy Commissioner, for 2014-15 fiscal year; and that the said amount be transmitted by the Chair to the Minister of Finance for approval as a special warrant by October 1st, 2014.

Before we move on, I just want to indicate to the board that the Office of the Privacy Commissioner did go through the proper request forms to meet the requirements of treasury board as to emergency funding needs, and treasury board has agreed that those steps, proper steps have been taken.

Would someone move? Mr. Harrison. Second? Ms. Heppner. Okay. The motion before the board is:

That additional funding in the amount of 111,300 be approved for vote 055, Information and Privacy Commissioner, for 2014-15 fiscal year; and that the said amount be transmitted by the Chair to the Minister of Finance for approval as a special warrant by October 1, 2014.

All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

**Mr. Kruzeniski:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kruzeniski.

#### Office of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner

**The Chair:** — Okay. The next item on the agenda is the discussion and decision item, salary for the Conflict of Interest Commissioner directive change. You will find that under item no. 4.

As previously discussed at the board, the Conflict of Interest Commissioner, his salary is also tied in with the ethics commissioner. And he is requesting, and for the lobbyist as well, the lobbyist commissioner, he is requesting that his salary be as the lobbyist commissioner, a 30 per cent of a DM [deputy minister], as the salaries are set for the other officers.

His request is asking for this for one year. His expectation is that he will need this time to develop the program in the first year, that it would subsequently be reduced after that as not needing as much time. So the salary would come back to the board for a change at that point to reduce it.

The motion for this is outlined in motion 4, and I will read the whole thing if you wish:

Salary of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner Directive

Conflict of Interest Commissioner

(1) Section 22 of *The Members' Conflict of Interest Act* provides that:

“The commissioner is entitled to be paid:

- (a) a salary to be fixed by the Board of Internal Economy; and
- (b) an allowance for travelling and other expenses incurred in the performance of the duties of the commissioner at a rate approved by the Board of Internal Economy.”

(2) On and from November 1, 2014, the Conflict of Interest Commissioner shall be paid a salary equal to 60 per cent of the average salary of all deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers of the government calculated as at

April 1 in each year.

(3) Any benefits or payments that may be characterized as deferred income, retirement allowances, separation allowances, severance allowances, or payments in lieu of notice are not to be included in calculating the average salary of all deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers pursuant to section (2).

(4) If, as a result of a calculation made pursuant to subsection (2), the salary of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner would be less than the Conflict of Interest Commissioner's previous salary, the Conflict of Interest Commissioner is to be paid not less than his or her previous salary.

(5) The Conflict of Interest Commissioner is entitled to receive any economic adjustments that are provided to deputy ministers.

(6) The Conflict of Interest Commissioner is entitled to be paid an allowance for travel and other expenses incurred in the performance of the duties of the Conflict of Interest Commissioner at a rate pursuant to *The Public Service Regulations, 1999*, for employees of the public service.

Any questions? If not, would someone move approval of the changes to directive 20.2? Mr. Harrison.

**Mr. McCall:** — Second.

**The Chair:** — Second, Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

### Lobbyist Registrar

**The Chair:** — Okay. Item no. 5 is the secondary part of this salary, as I discussed earlier. Okay. And I will read the proposed motion. This is a new directive.

That directive 30, salary of the lobbyist registrar, is adopted as follows:

Salary of the lobbyist registrar

(1) Clause 2(q) of *The Lobbyist Act* provides that: "registrar" means the Conflict of Interest Commissioner appointed pursuant to *The Members' Conflict of Interest Act*.

(2) On or from November 1, 2014, the Conflict of Interest Commissioner has assumed the duties of the lobbyist registrar and shall be paid a salary equal to 30 per cent of the average salary of all the deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers.

(3) Any benefits or payments that may be characterized as deferred income, retirement allowances, separation allowances, severance allowances, or payments in lieu of notice are not to be included in calculating the average

salary of all the deputy ministers and acting deputy ministers pursuant to section (2).

(4) If, as a result of a calculation made pursuant to subsection (2), the salary of the lobbyist registrar would be less than the lobbyist registrar's previous salary, the lobbyist registrar is to be paid not less than his or her previous salary.

(5) The lobbyist registrar is entitled to receive any economic adjustments that are provided generally to deputy ministers.

(6) The lobbyist registrar is entitled to be paid an allowance for travel and other expenses incurred in the performance of the duties of the lobbyist registrar at a rate pursuant to *The Public Service Regulations, 1999*, for the employees of the public service.

Any discussion? If not, would someone move the adoption of this directive. Mr. Harrison. Second? Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

### Members of the Legislative Assembly Travel and Living Expenses

**The Chair:** — Okay. Item no. 6. Okay. This was previously discussed at one of our meetings, changes to the MLA travel and living expenses, that out-of-province conferences, the travel to and from out-of-province conferences by members be pre-approved by the Speaker before registering for the conference or incurring any travel or living expenses. So I'd open the floor up for any discussion on this. Mr. Harrison.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Sure. What's the rule right now, Mr. Speaker, with . . . You have to give approval for members that are travelling to conferences outside of the country? Or is it . . .

**The Chair:** — No. Currently I only give approval for the registration for conferences outside of the province. Or actually it's conferences I think that are more than \$50.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay. So this change then would be that you would give approval, not just for the conference, you'd have to give approval for the conference and also for the travel and accommodation and that sort of thing. So it's not really that big of a change from what we have now.

**The Chair:** — No. The only change . . . The actual fact is most people think . . . They request the travel be approved by the Speaker's office, and we only approve the registrations. And this would include the travel costs as well then.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay.

**Hon. Ms. Heppner:** — So you're actually just putting into rules what people do in practice now.

**The Chair:** — That's correct. They're already asking for that

approval even though they don't need to. Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — I've got a request to pass along from my colleague, Mr. Forbes, our caucus Chair, of course. We haven't had a chance to discuss this as fully as we'd like in terms of our caucus so I'd actually request that we table this until a subsequent meeting of the board.

**The Chair:** — I do have a request of the Clerk because I think the last time we tried to table something, he indicated afterwards that was not the appropriate . . . Okay. With the approval of the committee, this will be deferred to a later date. Thank you.

[10:15]

#### Amendment to Directive #4.1

**The Chair:** — Okay. Item no. 7. This motion deals with directive 4.1(7). There has been some confusion as to the wording and intent of the advertising or sponsorship terminology and this is an attempt to clarify this once again. And I know that the LAS staff are prepared to make some commentary on this if needed. Mr. Harrison?

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes. No I mean, this is fine. That's how we had kind of understood it, I think, at the board when we had gone through the directive reviews. So we're fine with that.

I would note, just kind of for interest's sake though, the federal Board of Internal Economy just changed their rules around this to allow for members to do sponsorships up to \$500. So I just put that on the record for . . . not that I think we should do it.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. In my discussions with various members from around the Commonwealth, there are various sets of rules, some of which I don't think we want to copy when it comes to sponsorships and other disbursements of taxpayers' dollars. Mr. McCall.

**Mr. McCall:** — I don't know if this will help clarify matters, but we're all on board for clarity as well over on the opposition side.

**The Chair:** — If Mr. Putz or any of the staff would like to clarify exactly what it is we're doing here this time so that we can minimize the confusion.

**Mr. Putz:** — Mr. Harrison hit the nail on the head. This was what the board did consider through last summer and what we thought was . . . We thought we were achieving that by the changes to the directives last October 1st. Apparently there was some confusion over the wording and it's actually Brad's people who had to grapple with that and Brad had requested to you, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps we have some clarity on this so that members have a better understanding. That's what the attempt here is, to definitively outline what the rules are as far as members and sponsorship of various events. So I don't know if, Brad, you want to add anything to that because you're the group that has to deal with this.

**Mr. Gurash:** — Yes, thank you. Yes, back in October when we completed our more substantive directive review, you know, we

were intending to ensure that members could still communicate with their constituents at community events but we really wanted to mitigate the perception of the use of discretionary funding for sponsorships. Unfortunately at that time — and we kind of noticed this, myself and my managers — member payments, as we were doing a more thorough review of each individual clause in here, there was a word "only" in the clause that kind of created some ambiguity around what would or would not be allowed in difference to what the spirit and intent was at the October 31st.

So what this change will do is to clarify that language to remove any ambiguity in relation to sponsorship. So essentially if an ad has a member being noted as a sponsor, that's where we would be able to draw a line and say, I'm sorry; this isn't allowable at this time. It's not eligible for payment. So as long as you convey a message other than that you're a sponsor, we're fine with that.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Any other discussion? If not, I will read the proposed directive change:

That directive 4.1, constituency service expenses, clause (7) be repealed and the following new clause (7) is adopted to take effect immediately:

(7) Subject to the restrictions outlined in clause (11), members may advertise at various community events. These events may include but are not limited to community barbeques, rodeos, golf tournaments, music festivals. Costs incurred for advertising at these community events shall not exceed \$1,500 per event. Eligible claims are restricted to costs related to advertisements only. Members must ensure that their advertisements include the member's contact information. Advertisements that indicate the member is a sponsor of an event will not be eligible for payment. Sponsorship in whole or in part of an event is strictly prohibited.

Would someone move that motion, please? Ms. Heppner. Seconder? Ms. Eagles. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

#### Amendments to Directives #2.1 and #4.1

**The Chair:** — Okay. Item no. 8. This is a discussion and decision item, amendment to directive #2.1, telephone and related expenses, and comes in three parts. Part (a) is clause (5), part (b) is clause (8), and (c) is associated amendment to directive 4.1, clause (21), constituency service expenses.

The first one, clause (5), is related to the purchase of iPads, tablets, and other computer equipment and how it's charged to the constituency service expenses. And I would ask the Clerk and staff to explain exactly what this one is about.

**Mr. Putz:** — In essence what this change involves is adding, to the list of items that can be transferred to Executive Council, tablets and iPads. You'll recall that previously the board made a decision that members who are appointed to cabinet, we have

an option that they can take with them their smart phone, their iPhones with them as long as Executive Council accepts the cost of the unit and also takes on any plans that go along with that. With that agreement then, we transfer the item from the MLA's asset list to Executive Council. Beginning in . . . Well after the last cabinet shuffle, there was a request that members also be allowed to transfer their iPads and tablets. And Brad's group had got the request, why is it just restricted to smart phones? So the proposal here is to extend that list to include iPads and tablets. So I don't know, Brad, do you want to . . .

**Mr. Gurash:** — Well that pretty much captures the spirit and intent of what we're hoping to accomplish here.

**The Chair:** — Any questions? If not, would someone move that we adopt directive 2.1(5)? I'll read it, if you wish, again.

That directive 2.1, telephone and related expenses, clause (5), is repealed and the following new clause (5) is adopted to take effect immediately:

(5) Equipment purchases such as iPads, tablets, and other computer equipment able to operate wirelessly are not eligible for payment from this provision. The costs related to purchasing these devices are eligible for payment from the constituency services expenses provision and is subject to clause (8).

**Mr. Putz:** — If I could just add, this does not change the existing situation, the operative part of that, "and is subject to clause (8)" and that is the permissive bit of the directive now that allows the transfer.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Someone move the adoption. Mr. Harrison. Secunder, Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay, (b), clause (8). We now come to the permissive clause that allows for the transfer to Executive Council. The motion reads:

That directive 2.1, telephone and related expenses, clause (8), is repealed and the following new clause (8) is adopted to take effect immediately:

(8) Members who are assigned ministerial responsibilities may continue to maintain and operate their wireless devices such as smart phones, iPads, and tablets acquired with the telecommunication and related expenses provision or constituency service expenses provision. In these instances, the devices must be purchased by Executive Council from the Legislative Assembly based on a prorated amount of remaining asset life. Further costs for this equipment must be assumed by Executive Council.

Would someone move adoption of this directive? Mr. Harrison. Secunder? Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried.

Okay. Item (c), associated amendment to directive 4.1, clause (21), constituency expenses. As you can see, it's in your binders and is related to other furniture that the member may no longer have a use for but can be utilized by another member. I wonder if the Clerk's office would care to give more of a dissertation on this particular motion.

**Mr. Putz:** — Again this directive remains the same except the middle paragraph which now speaks to the transfer from the member's asset list to the asset list of executive government if executive government agrees to take on the cost and the ongoing cost of the iPad or tablet service.

**The Chair:** — Any questions? If not, I will read the motion:

That directive 4.1, constituency service expenses, clause (21) is repealed and the following new clause (21) is adopted to take effect immediately:

(21) All equipment and furniture or supplies that have been purchased by a member pursuant to this directive is the property of the Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan and accordingly shall be adequately insured by the member. A member may utilize this equipment and furniture in the manner the MLA considers appropriate to best exercise the member's duties.

When the office equipment has been assumed by executive government as described in directive #2.1, telecommunication and related expenses, clause (8), the member's inventory shall be updated accordingly to reflect any transfer of assets.

When the office furniture and equipment is no longer required by the member, the member shall advise the Legislative Assembly Service, financial services, prior to disposing or transferring the equipment or furnishings to another MLA. When a member ceases to be a member, the equipment and furniture shall be disposed of in accordance with the MLA capital asset disposal policy.

All in favour? Oh, I guess we need a mover first before we approve it. Would someone like to move this motion? Ms. Heppner. Secunder? Ms. Eagles. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — Carried. Okay, Mr. Harrison.

[10:30]

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes, just a quick clarification I'm looking for. Greg, I'd sent you an email the other day about directive 4.1(22) where it talks about, you keep the annual, the inventory of all capital assets of \$250 or more, and it goes on from there.

Just in kind of my case, I have a bunch of stuff that I had gotten, that Maynard had bought, you know, 20 years ago that's 50 bucks and 100 bucks and still on the inventory list though, but it's less than the \$250. So I guess what I'm getting to is, I mean if there were historic items that are less than \$250, perhaps we should remove those because the policy going forward is

anything over 250.

**Mr. Putz:** — Yes, you raise a good point. And as we had indicated, I think — well not actually I didn't indicate — as Brad had indicated to you through correspondence, the intent wasn't to keep those sort of items on, and in fact Dawn Court and her people will be out to your constituency office as they visit all the constituency offices through a term and items like that will be reviewed and removed. The only thing that might stay on, if it has a residual value after assessment, say a desk or whatever, because the idea was that if you were ever to retire or lose your seat — heaven forbid — that those items still need to be on the list so that a member coming in, there's still a desk and bookshelves and that sort of thing on the inventory. Maybe I'll get Brad or Lynn to speak to that. I hope I've assessed it properly.

**Ms. Jacobson:** — Yes. We're looking at items that still have probative value in terms of going forward that haven't met their useful life or need to be destroyed. So it's to capture those kinds of things as well. And so when the folks go out from financial services, they're looking to remove from inventory listings, like we've had coffee pots or things of those natures that have no . . . should be destroyed or have no more useful life. So that's the intent of going out on that inventory. And we'll clarify those things.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay. So just to clarify then on say, like a piece of office furniture that's valued at \$50 that's on the list right now, that would be removed then if it's under \$250.

**Ms. Jacobson:** — If and provided that it has no further useful life. I mean we have chairs here in this room that are purchased in the '70s that we would still consider on our inventory because they still have useful life.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — But I guess, I guess what I'm getting at is, I thought that . . . My recollection of the directive review was that we would only have stuff that we would be tracking in an inventory sense that was over \$250 in value.

**Ms. Jacobson:** — The discussion at the time was to change to that new level.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Yes.

**Ms. Jacobson:** — So anything going forward. We hadn't had a discussion, I don't think, in a more fuller aspect in terms of going back and remove. So as we go through and my folks go out to the different constituency offices, we're trying to remove it through that process.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay. Yes. It's just kind of a pain. I mean administratively I don't know how it is, but it would seem to me that it's kind of, when you're tracking stuff that's \$50 . . .

**Ms. Jacobson:** — We didn't want to make sort of one-off decisions without having been in the office in terms of removal of those items.

**Hon. Mr. Harrison:** — Okay. Well I guess I haven't had this discussion with the opposition yet. But I think where the government would land on this is that we just kind of say, hey,

if it's under \$250 on the inventory list right now, all those items would be off.

**Ms. Jacobson:** — Okay.

**The Chair:** — Well if that was the case, I wouldn't have any desks or chairs on the list. Yes, yes. You've got to remember I bought this stuff a few years ago second-hand so . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Yes. So we've got furniture in some of our offices that are older than some of our members and . . . [inaudible interjection] . . . Well Jeannie's happy with it so there's no need for upgrading it. And you know, I think we need to keep those items that have a useful purpose.

Some of the things that I consider to be on the inventory list that probably do need to be removed and fall into that under 250 category is, like, the original copy of WordPerfect we bought. You can't use it any more any place, but it's still on the inventory list. You know, those are the kind of items that no longer have a useful life and yet it's a hassle to go through the disposal process. And I think that was what the discussion was, was to be able to eliminate those kind of things from the list. But this is a conversation that we can discuss some more.

Is there any other discussion? If not, would someone move we adjourn?

**Mr. McCall:** — So moved.

**The Chair:** — Mr. McCall. All in favour?

**Some Hon. Members:** — Agreed.

**The Chair:** — This meeting stands adjourned to the call of the Chair.

[The board adjourned at 10:35.]