



FOURTH SESSION - TWENTY-SECOND LEGISLATURE

of the

Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

MINUTES AND VERBATIM REPORT

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



No. 5

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1994

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

Hon. Herman Rolfes, Chairperson
Saskatoon Nutana

Hon. Carol Carson
Melfort

Glenn Hagel, MLA
Moose Jaw Palliser

Lynda Haverstock, MLA
Saskatoon Greystone

Hon. Eldon Lautermilch
Prince Albert Northcote

Rick Swenson, MLA
Thunder Creek

Eric Upshall, MLA
Humboldt

MEETING #5 1994
BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY
Room 10 Legislative Building
4:05 p.m. Monday, November 28, 1994

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

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

MINUTES Moved by Mr. Hagel, seconded by Mr. Upshall, ordered, that the Minutes of Meeting #4/94 be adopted. Agreed.

AGENDA Mr. Lautermilch added, to the agenda, a report on the Independent Committee on MLA Compensation and Payments.

The Chair added the tabling of the three Caucus Audit Opinions to the agenda.

Moved by Ms. Haverstock, seconded by Mr. Hagel, that the agenda, as amended, be adopted. Agreed.

ITEM 1 Decision Item - Review of the Budget for the Select Committee on Driving Safety

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

That the proposed budget, in the amount of \$87,398.47 for the Select Committee on Driving Safety for the 1994/95 fiscal year be approved.

The question being put, it was agreed to. Mr. Hagel, in his capacity as Chair to the Select Committee on Driving Safety, abstained from voting.

Minute #1344

ITEM 2 Table Item - The Chair tabled the Audit Opinions of the three Caucuses for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1994.

Item 3 Report Item - Independent Committee on MLA Compensation and Payments

A brief verbal report, given by Mr. Lautermilch, indicated that the Mandate, Time Frame and Budget for the Committee will be finalized shortly.

A Board of Internal Economy meeting will need to be arranged for final approval of the Committee.

Moved by Mr. Hagel, seconded by Mr. Upshall, that the meeting be adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Herman H. Rolfes
Chair

Deborah Saum
Secretary

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY
November 28, 1994

The Chairperson: — It being 4 o'clock now, I think we should start the meeting. The first item on the agenda is a review of the minutes of the last meeting, and they are in your holders immediately where it says: minutes, meeting.

I wonder if you people have perused those, and if I could get someone to move that the minutes be adopted? Moved by Mr. Hagel. Seconder? Seconded by Mr. Upshall. Is there any discussion on the minutes? I'll just give you a minute to peruse those. If there's no discussion, all those in favour of adopting the minutes? Carried.

Ladies and gentlemen, the next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. Are there any further items that members wish to add to the agenda for today?

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Just a brief report with respect to the discussions regarding the independent commission.

The Chairperson: — Any other items to be added to the agenda? I have one which is really not an agenda item. I wish to table the audited opinions of the three caucuses today, so I will do that a little bit later. That's really not part of the agenda as such. Any other items? If not, could we have a motion to adopt the agenda? Moved by Ms. Haverstock. Seconded by Mr. Hagel. All in favour? Agreed.

All right. We will then turn to the item that this meeting was called for: review of the budget for the Select Committee on Driving Safety.

The item before us is that the recommendation for the proposed budget for the Select Committee on Driving Safety for the 1994-95 fiscal year be approved as attached. Is there any discussion on the budget or any questions on the budget? I think we all have — I shouldn't say we all have — I think all caucuses are represented on that committee. Is that correct, Mr. Hagel?

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Chairman, would you just like a brief overview for the interest of . . .

The Chairperson: — Yes, I think it probably wouldn't be a bad idea to have a brief overview of it. You're the chair of the

committee, okay. Mr. Hagel, you have the floor.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay, thanks, Mr. Chairman. Members will have the detail — and I won't read it to you; everyone's capable of reading — just if I can put it into context. Members will be aware that in September the select committee met and named five government members, two opposition members, and one member from the third party to serve to hear public response to legislation that was tabled in the spring sitting on proposals having to do with the introduction of probationary licence for new drivers; on changes related to the requirements for impaired drivers, convicted impaired drivers; and then thirdly, related to dealing with drivers who are driving while suspended.

The committee has been working hard and, as I think probably everyone is aware, has already scheduled its hearings. And in fact they begin on Monday of next week.

I think it's worth noting that in preparing for the public hearings the committee wanted to be particularly sensitive to comments from rural Saskatchewan and from northern Saskatchewan. And some of the criticism of the hearing schedule that I've heard is that it isn't as active in some of the central parts of the province as some would like to see. However in the context of the budget proposed and the time available, the committee made some priority decisions to ensure that we had adequate opportunity for rural and northern Saskatchewan to make comment, particularly as some of the proposed items in the legislation have the potential to result in inconvenience that may be felt more strongly in more remote parts of the province outside of urban Saskatchewan.

The other interesting part of the schedule, I think, is that the committee is bending over backwards to make sure that young people will have opportunity to have their voices heard in the bringing of the legislation. And so in 13 days of hearings, the committee will be holding 18 different meetings in 16 towns or cities. In addition to those 16 towns or cities for public hearings, the committee will stop at 19 different high schools en route. And so in the case of the 13 days of hearings, the committee

will in fact have 37 actual meetings, 19 of which will be in high schools.

In selecting the high schools that we're stopping at, basically it was as time permitted when you were between points A and B. And I'm very pleased to report that absolutely every school that was offered the opportunity to receive the select committee, I think probably both from a social studies perspective as well as the fact that the legislation proposal will directly impact on some of the students, was enthusiastic about receiving the committee.

The public meetings are listed on the top of the budget, the locations of those; you can see those yourself. And the school locations for the hearings are listed at the top of page 2 in the decision item page. So you can see the locations there.

Do you want me to make comment on the budget itself, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairperson: — Yes, yes, go right ahead.

Mr. Hagel: — Okay. The budget request, start at the bottom line, in total is \$97,398. You'll find that on the last page is the summary there. In arriving at that — and I think what I'd like to do is just walk through it with you — we were able to use the experience of the Environment Committee to a large extent to help us estimate our costs.

There are some distinct differences between ourselves and the Environment Committee. The Environment Committee used air transportation as part of its reaching into the North. And the Environment Committee's members tended to live, by and large, much closer to Regina. The members, I'm pleased to say, on the Select Committee on Driving Safety represent absolutely every corner of the province, and so I think that's helpful for the decisions of the committee as well.

On the item no. 1, the bus transportation, I just want to advise you that since . . . the budget you have before you was approved by the committee. I just want to give you one slight amendment here since then because of changes having developed. Because the particular vehicle we were considering just was too small to serve our purposes, item no. 1, for your purposes . . . the bottom line will not

change, but for your purposes it will be changed to \$5,900. It will be \$830 more.

The accommodation costs then — and you'll see that members are working hard to make that minimal — are item no. 2. And that's based on again actual checks that we've done in the locations that we're meeting.

The meeting rooms are actuals, item no. 3.

Item 4 are the meals then for the members and staff who will be participating.

No. 5 is the coffee service for the public hearings, and we're using the estimate on that, as you can see: it's outlined and based on the Environment Committee's experience.

Item no. 6, the members' meeting per diems. And those are based on the 13 days of hearings.

No. 7 is members' mileage and travel. And that will be a higher item than the Environment Committee because of the homes of the members. We may be able to do better than this; I'm optimistic, because we will be doing some travel by bus together to keep costs down, and I think also to increase our effectiveness.

Advertising is a little higher than the Environment Committee, but that will be related to the fact that it's into more locations.

And we've already run in the daily newspapers two weekend ads, just letting the public at large know. And starting this week, we will be running, a week in advance, ads in the local papers of the centres in the week prior to our being there. And we're confident we can come in at that budget.

Mail-out and stationery, we think this is realistic again, based on Environment.

The intersessional meetings, then if you'll make an adjustment we find the 830 that we had to add to the bus charter reduced this figure then on the eight members. The sub-item 17,920 becomes 17,090; it's subtracting 830. And therefore item no. 10 becomes \$18,020.18.

Our research assistant then, we were able to get through the cooperation of the Department

of Highways a secondment, which assists our managing of the budget.

And then the printing of the final report, we've budgeted for 500 copies of a 75-page report, is what we've done.

Then in addition to that on the next page, the addendum to the budget — and by the way, when it refers to . . . sorry, in item no. 11, that was in consultation with the chair. That had not been approved in the minute of the committee because at that time we had not made a decision about exactly what we were going to print; that was subsequently decided. So that's why the reference to the consultation with the chair.

And then item . . . on the addendum, what we're including here is the implied *Hansard* costs as well. This has not been the tradition when committees have come to the board, to include those, but it is part of the Legislative Assembly's budget and so therefore we draw attention to that.

What you'll see then on the final page is the comparison of the Driving Safety Committee's proposal as compared to the Environment Committee, which is this legislature's most recent experience. The Environment Committee had 15 public hearings; the Driving Safety Committee will have 16 public towns and cities for hearings and 19 school hearings.

Then item no. 1, members' expense, I explained already because the members are on average more remote from Regina.

No. 2 we're a tad lower because we have the good fortune of one of the staff members is on training and so isn't charged to the committee. So we hope that she learns well and we appreciate the help with the budget.

Our researcher then, because we were able to get some secondment, that enabled us to help with the budget.

Transportation, we're less because we're not using aircraft.

Meeting expense comparable. Advertising a bit higher because of the increased emphasis on local advertising. Postage about the same.

Transcription on *Hansard* about the same. And

then we made a decision to not print the *Hansard*. *Hansard* will be available, copies of *Hansard* will be available on request by photocopying them, but we felt we could save nearly \$10,000 by not printing the actual *Hansard*. We've had a couple of requests for the *Hansard* so far, and we've copied those and sent those out. However we will publish the report, and that's \$1,500.

So it gives us a grand total then that we're requesting — and this includes everything including the *Hansard* then obviously — a grand total expense of \$97,398, which was less than the budgeted amount for the Environment Committee. However, to be fair, it is higher than the actual for the Environment Committee came out for a number of reasons. I also do think that we will be able to live within our budget and then not . . . I'm not at all anticipating that we will be coming back at a later time, asking for something to be stretched.

And all members are . . . we've discussed very clearly in our meetings the significance of being cost effective, and all members are prepared to do everything we can to keep our cost down.

The Chairperson: — All right.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, Mr. Speaker, just briefly I guess I would want to thank the chair and the members of the committee for the way they've put this budget together. I think they've been very diligent in terms of attempting to keep the cost of the committee to a reasonable level. These are expensive items that we deal with; \$100,000 is certainly not a small amount of money, taxpayers' money. But I think that people are expecting consultation on this issue. I think it impacts on many young people and many first-time drivers, the decisions that may be made. And I think it's important that they've included stops at some of the high school in terms of part of their initiative.

So having looked through the budget, I think it's clear that the committee members have given a lot of thought to their budget, and I would want to say that I commend them for that. And certainly I can support this budget.

Mr. Swenson: — Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I too would just like to commend Glenn for the

presentation; it was very well done. But I'd like to say for the record that I like the process. This is getting a long ways down the road to what I think a lot of us would like to see with the Legislative Assembly. We had a piece of legislation brought to the House; it then died on the order paper. The public process goes ahead. It's an all-party committee that designs the program and the budget. And now they go out on the road and they actually get some meaningful input.

And as Eldon said, there's a lot of young people in the province, I think, who have a great deal of interest in how the thing turns out. Their futures are directly tied to it.

This is the way that I think you get good legislation. And I just hope that this committee has the opportunity to deal with a lot more budgets and a lot more initiatives, as it should, this way. And legislation this way becomes part of the people rather than sort of over their heads. So I commend the committee for the work they've done so far.

The Chairperson: — Any further discussion on the budget? If there's no further discussion, could I have someone move:

That the proposed budget for the Select Committee on Driving Safety for the 1994-95 fiscal year be approved as attached.

Could I have someone move that? Moved by Mr. Upshall. Seconded by Mr. Swenson. Is there any further discussion? All those in favour, please signify. All those opposed? Carried unanimously.

Mr. Hagel: — Mr. Chairman, I think I would like the record just to show that I abstained from voting.

The Chairperson: — Sorry, I should have noted that. Ladies and gentlemen, that takes care of the item . . . No, I'm sorry, we have one further item that is a report by Mr. Lautermilch on the independent commission. But before we do that, I would like to table, according to minute #1291 of the Board of Internal Economy, I would like to table the audited opinions for the three caucuses, which we have received.

And I would like members to note that the

documents of the board are private documents, not public documents, unless the board stipulates otherwise. That was a decision made by the board some time ago. So the documents are tabled and we should treat them in that manner.

I have one other item on the agenda, and that is a report from Mr. Lautermilch on the independent commission.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to be brief today. Just to give a brief update as to the meetings that have taken place between Ms. Haverstock, Mr. Swenson, and myself with respect to the independent commission. And I can report today that pending final consultation with members who we have agreed we would ask to sit on the independent commission, that I would indicate that we have agreed to the make-up of the commission, the members who we would recommend be asked to sit on the commission.

We have agreed to the mandate that the commission will act under, to the time frame for reporting to the Board of Internal Economy, and as well a tentative budget. Once we have finalized the make-up of the board and had them have a look at the proposed budget, I would then suggest that the final budget would be brought to the Board of Internal Economy for its approval.

I think it's fair that the members of the board who are not aware of — although they have been asked individually to sit on the commission — are not aware of the make-up of the board; And I think it would be prudent to take some time to let them know who they may be working with if they so choose to work with them.

So I think we've had three meetings. I would want to thank both members of the board for their cooperation. I think we came at this for a while, in terms of the size of the commission, from some different angles, but we've been able to agree on that. And I think that the people we will be recommending to sit on the commission will in fact serve the members of the legislature well.

The Chairperson: — This is a report item; it's not a decision item. But I don't know if you wish to allow others to speak to it or ask

questions on it. I'm in the hands of the board on this. Or is it simply a report for . . .

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It's just simply an update and a report in that the members of the commission have not . . . although they have been spoken to individually, I think it's only appropriate that we would inform them of who their fellow commission members would be, and then prepare with them a formal announcement.

The Chairperson: — Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, that is . . . Yes, Ms. Haverstock.

Ms. Haverstock: — I do want to just ask a question, if I may. I was under the understanding that today we would have some discussion of this. I can understand if you didn't want to bring forward the names of those who will be on the commission, but I did send you a letter on November 23. And I'm wondering if I can either get a response from you today . . . it's really just clarification that I'm asking for.

And I don't know if it's necessary to even go into depth here, but we did talk about terms of reference, budget and timing as well as the names of individuals who would make up that committee. And one of the things that had been discussed under budget was the secondment of staff. And I'm just wondering if you could clarify that for me now so we don't have to exchange letters.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — Yes, we were talking about seconding staff from existing arms of government as opposed to hiring by contract, in order to keep the costs down. And I think your question was whether or not they would be paid for by the department or arm of government that they would be seconded from, or whether it would be part of this budget. I think that was your question?

Ms. Haverstock: — Yes. I just wanted it consistent with what had been indicated as appropriate from the Provincial Auditor. And I didn't actually have that clarification when we met this past week, whether or not the support staff would be seconded from the Legislative Assembly staff.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — It really hasn't been determined because, as I had indicated, I thought it was only fair that the commissioners

would have the opportunity, you know, to be part of selection of the staff as opposed to just putting staff to them.

I think that it would be . . . and the staffing costs would be charged as part of the budget that would be allocated through the Board of Internal Economy, part of the Legislative Assembly budget as opposed to if, say, perhaps a support person came from the Department of Health and was paid from the Department of Health.

Ms. Haverstock: — My confusion came as a result of part of our conversation that transpired when you gave an example of who one of these individuals might be.

And then in rereading the information that day, when I said that I'd get back to you, I realized that that really would not be consistent with what had been suggested as a directive from the Provincial Auditor, unless we were prepared to change the budget.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — I think the budget was drafted as a tentative budget, subject to approval by the board. The budget would come before the board and we would have the discussion here, as we've done with the standing committee in the budget that we just passed. So that option will be available to the board — to peruse the budget to ensure that we comply with the auditor, and to ensure that it is an appropriate amount that we would budget.

Ms. Haverstock: — My only concern was that we had a number. And I wondered if, given what we had had transpiring around secondments before, if in fact that was something that was included in that number — if we had been thinking along the same lines or not.

What I'm quite prepared to do is just wait until you have all the numbers on the page, and I will assume then that if in fact people will be seconded from somewhere other than the Legislative Assembly staff, that it would be indicated what the cost would be.

Hon. Mr. Lautermilch: — That would be clearly indicated.

Ms. Haverstock: — Good.

The Chairperson: — Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to request of the board to stay for a little while for an in camera meeting for future planning of board meetings. As you know, you people are very, very busy people. And we need to schedule some meetings in the very near future, and because of your participation in the driver safety committee meeting, we might have some difficulties in coming to some agreement.

So I would like to have . . . and I have a few other items I want to discuss with the board. So if I could have an in camera meeting.

First of all, could we have a motion of adjournment of this meeting. Moved by Mr. Hagel. Seconded by Mr. Upshall. All in favour of adjournment of this meeting? Agreed.

And we'll have just a brief in camera meeting.

The meeting continued in camera.

The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.