



STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 59 – November 30, 2010



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-sixth Legislature

STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN AND CENTRAL AGENCIES

Mr. Delbert Kirsch, Chair
Batoche

Mr. Buckley Belanger, Deputy Chair
Athabasca

Mr. Denis Allchurch
Rosthern-Shellbrook

Mr. Fred Bradshaw
Carrot River Valley

Mr. Dan D'Autremont
Cannington

Mr. Warren McCall
Regina Elphinstone-Centre

Mr. Randy Weekes
Biggar

[The committee met at 17:14.]

The Chair: — I would now call this meeting to order of Crown and Central Agencies. First of all I'd like to thank the members for accommodating the revised meeting agenda. The committee was to meet in the Legislative Chamber tonight at 7; however, the agenda has been changed and here we are meeting in room 8 at 5:15. Thank you also to the ministers and their officials for accommodating the committee.

Supplementary estimates that were referred to the committee. I would like to advise committee members that pursuant to rule 146(1) the following supplementary estimates were deemed referred to the committee on November 25th, 2010: vote 74, Information Technology Office; vote 140, Saskatchewan Water Corporation; vote 150, Saskatchewan Energy Inc.; vote 176, Saskatchewan fund payments — government share; and vote 82, Growth and Financial Security Fund.

Tonight the agenda includes consideration of Information Technology Office, vote 74; the sinking fund payments — government share, vote 176; and Growth and Financial Security Fund, vote 82.

[17:15]

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — November
Information Technology Office
Vote 74**

Subvote (IT04)

The Chair: — We will begin with vote 74, Information Technology Office, subvote (IT04) interministerial services. We have with us Minister McMillan and his officials. Minister McMillan, would you please introduce your officials and if you would like to provide an opening statement.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Well good evening, and thank you very much for listening to our opening statement and discussing vote 74. With me today is Gerald Fiske, the deputy minister of ITO [Information Technology Office], Richard Murray, the executive director; Phil Lambert is the assistant deputy minister of operations; and Rebecca Sengmany is IT's [information technology] director of finance.

I'd like to provide some background for the members before we start the questioning if that is appropriate. The funding we are dealing with tonight is related to ITO's inter-ministry budget. It is separate from the core funding that ITO receives for base operations. This is the budget that is used to supply the executive government ministries and agencies with IT services they receive from ITO. ITO receives no direct funding for supplying these services; instead it charges ministries and agencies for the services they receive on a cost recovery basis.

During the 2009-10 fiscal year, the ITO invoiced \$75.9 million to other ministries and agencies. While the target for this subvote to balance to zero at the end of the year, there was a cost recovery shortfall of 5.114 million in 2009-10. The main reasons for this shortfall was \$1.7 million of unexpected

software licensing costs and licensing costs that were carried over from the previous fiscal year and 3.3 million the ITO was unable to collect because of disputes over work done without customer approvals and other billing disputes from customer ministries including hardware underutilization.

While no cost recovery system is perfect, I am pleased to say the ITO has introduced a number of measures for the current year to address these issues. Among these is a new funding model that is more transparent and accountable to all concerned. Other measures taken include: new budget processes with internal control mechanisms that require a business case and executive approval for all expenditures, new financial processes to ensure that customers sign off on all work before it begins, improved dispute processes, and a streamlined billing process that is resulting in fewer customer disputes. Because there was an unrecovery last fiscal year, this amount was frozen in the ITO budget for this fiscal year.

This is why we have come forward tonight seeking supplemental funding. We would be pleased to speak to any questions that the members have about vote no. 74.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Minister. And I see Mr. Yates has questions. You have the floor.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Well I want to start by saying I think we have what would appear to be a fairly irregular or unusual situation where in an account area or an area of a department where you charge back for services that we have a shortfall of \$5.1 million. If you in fact perform the services, the ministry should pay for them. That's the arrangement that I understand is in place.

And could the minister explain to us what steps were taken to collect these unpaid bills. Were they referred to a collection agency, or were they referred to some other method for collection? Or is it something that the government supports that ministries don't have to pay their bills?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — What we're looking at here tonight is certain areas which maybe I will ask my officials to speak to what the current system is. But I will highlight some of the challenges that we faced in the '09-10 budget year.

There was a situation where client ministries were looking for IT services outside of the ITO, not utilizing the ITO for potentially for their software and hardware solutions. When the ITO was formed — I believe it was about five years ago, supported by the opposition at the time — the view was it would provide a consistency through government, one stop where you could get a critical mass of IT talent. Where we got to on this is services which were meant to be spread broadly over government may not have been bought into by as many ministries as would've been required to capture the full costs. And ITO today, we're looking at some of those costs that weren't be able to be spread as broadly as was hoped.

I think that we've seen great successes in the last year to 18 months, that client ministries have largely come on and view ITO as their provider, and the ITO is in a far stronger position to take that leadership role. And in fact our last being Health

ministry, that had a lot of its IT services outside, is now come in as well.

Some of the changes in the billing procedure have simplified it. I will ask my officials to expound upon this. But some of the billing was done with up to hundreds of pages in the invoices which were very confusing, and they itemized everything in a manner that may not be rational, and that was part of the problem. That has been changed to a very rational, far more truncated billing procedure, and in the dispute resolution process has also been . . . You now have 30 days to dispute any bill you get, and it will be resolved within 30 days. That is going to be a major improvement as well. Would you care to expound upon any of those comments?

Mr. Fiske: — Yes. Certainly we tried to tighten up a lot of the processes. And before we start work for a ministry today, we get a sign-off that they in fact agree to . . . that we go ahead and do the work and that in fact they are responsible for the payment of that work. As we had, as the minister had said, we had invoices as much as 500 pages going out on a monthly basis. And it was just too onerous, and it caused a lot of disputes. So you have people going through those large invoices. I think it was the Department of Highways was 550 pages invoice. We've reduced that to 22 pages per month, which is still a long process.

So there's a number of things that we've done to put controls in place. We've asked for business cases for expenditures to make sure that the branches aren't proceeding with expenditures without a business case and approval from the executive team.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. This leads to a number of questions, particularly now we've opened up that a lot of the problem is in the '09-10 budget year. It leads to a number of questions. Why ministers didn't buy in. Who's in control of the government? Who's in charge? Either the program is that ITO is the central service provider for government, or it isn't. Who makes that determination? Is this not a decision made by the Executive Council, or is this something that wasn't supported by the Executive Council or the Premier?

And why are problems in the '09-10 budget year being rectified in the '10-11 budget year? The estimates we have before us are the '10-11 budget year. So what was . . . And where were these expenditures hidden in the last budget year? They're real.

So I guess the first question I have is, is this program and the service delivery design as put forward by the ITO approved by the Executive Council? Or are the ministries of government responsible to pay the bills for the work that's being provided? And if there is a dispute, who adjudicates who's right or wrong? Can a department just refuse to pay their bills? We'll start there.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — I guess to answer your first question, it being '10-11 budget year this year, and we're dealing with the '09-10 spending, statutorily that's . . . If funds get spent in a year that were not budgeted for, that amount of funds gets frozen in a ministry's budget the following year until we appear in estimates and explain what it is required for. And that is how the process works.

Where some of this comes from is underutilized software. One

example is a piece of software called Quest which, some of your members may know, was a piece of software bought under your administration which was never fully utilized. This year it was assessed; it was assessed that it was not an appropriate expenditure and we've terminated the contract with Quest. And there was a buyout fee for that amount and that is reflected in this as well. As well, there was some carry forward of licensing costs, again of the Quest software, from year over year that it was for last year's software, but it did not get brought forward until this year. And that is reflected in this as well.

An Hon. Member: — How much?

[17:30]

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — The question being put forward is, how much? I will confer with my officials.

What we are considering here on the Quest piece is a carry forward of 350 K which was not paid in the previous year, so it showed up in the '09-10. The '09-10, another 350 K, which a piece of software we didn't feel was being adequately . . .

Mr. Yates: — '09-10 or '10-11?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — In the '09-10. This is all '09-10 that is being froze in the '10-11 budget. So it is the year previous, '09-10, and then a buyout of that software that had been committed to previously of about \$500,000.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. So of the 5 million, we're talking \$850,000?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — There is 350 twice, a carryover that was not paid in the previous year. Then another 350 for this underutilized software in the '09-10 budget, plus 500,000 on top of that for a buyout of software that we didn't think was an appropriate expenditure for ITO.

Mr. Yates: — So of the \$5 million, you're saying 1.2 million of this is from Quest?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — That's right.

Mr. Yates: — All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Minister. Which departments didn't pay their bills? Could you identify which departments and how much?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — The question is I guess characterizing this as if it is departments that aren't paying their bills. I think it's probably more appropriate that costs that were meant to be spread far more broadly were not picked up by those ministries.

I think the process has been largely corrected that now there has to be a business plan. I guess there has to be a business plan for any major expenditure. There has to be sign-off from executives of ITO, and there has to be sign-off from the ministries that in fact that this is a piece of hardware or software that they're going to utilize and share in the pricing. I guess the processes are in place to ensure that this is not an ongoing problem.

Mr. Yates: — Well thank you, Mr. Chair, but that was an avoidance I guess of the answer. So I'll ask the question

differently. Which ministries didn't pay their share? And what service was provided that they didn't pay for? Or what software didn't they pay for?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — On your question, Mr. Member, I will put it to you this way. The example we had with Highways of a 500-page invoice with thousands and thousands of lines of, you know, itemized services and products offered. In one invoice there could be hundreds of disputes of, we don't feel we got this many mailboxes on your server, or we . . . And throughout all the ministries, I think that there were disputes. There are disputes in every ministry, and there was no timely method to resolve them.

At the end of the year, the services, the disputes were largely settled. Those that weren't were wrapped up and that is what we see here before you. So to answer your question, it was largely spread across all the ministries. And I think we've come a long way in our billing process and our dispute resolution process to ensure that we will not be back.

Mr. Yates: — So what methods did you use to try to collect the bills that may be disputed? Or did you just accept that if I don't want to pay it, that's the way it is?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Our officials tell me that we worked with every ministry on disputing line by line of what services were provided, how many mailboxes may have been provided, what server downtime there happened to be, on a line-by-line basis. For the most part, there isn't problems. But where there is, the dispute resolution mechanism wasn't as timely as it should have been, and that has now been corrected. You've got 30 days to a far simpler bill and you've got 30 days to dispute it, and after 30 days . . . or once it is disputed, there's a 30-day window to resolve it. And that's in place today.

Mr. Yates: — Well, Mr. Minister, what if somebody doesn't dispute it within 30 days and doesn't pay you? Because they didn't pay you now.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — What happens if they don't pay now? Today, starting in April, the new process where ministries sign off before services are rendered or products are bought, the dispute resolution process is the 30-day window to dispute it, and a 30-day to resolve it. My understanding is that that works very well when, at the front end, we get sign-off on all projects, and that a business plan is laid out as to what projects we're getting involved with. So solving a dispute after it starts is a lot more difficult than ensuring there isn't any. And we've . . . That's really the focus. But if there is a dispute, we now have a timely resolution mechanism in place as well.

Mr. Yates: — Well thank you, Mr. Minister. But you, I think, could appreciate that we may have some skepticism about the credibility of a process in which we're looking at \$5.1 million of unpaid bills.

And what's to prevent a department even after they've signed off from saying, well we didn't get exactly what we signed off on, and not . . . Like once you have a problem like this that's been brought forward or exposed, it always brings to the question about, how are we going to see that departments pay their way in the future? Or is it simply that there's nobody in

charge in government? Because it would seem rather unusual that a government would be coming forward and saying, I've got \$5.1 million worth of bills that the department should pay that they didn't pay.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, I guess the member has asked the credibility of the current process. I'm pleased to report that there is 95 per cent less disputes under the current process than there has been historically. And of those 5 per cent that are still in existence, all have been dealt with within the 30-day dispute, and there is zero outstanding at this point.

Mr. Yates: — Were they all paid?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Yes.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. Could we get a breakdown of year by year over the last number of years, the disputes in paying the bills, and how long this has been a problem?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, we can get a disputed amount for the last two, hopefully three, and possibly four years.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — And I apologize to the member, but we will provide that to the Chair, and you will distribute it to the members.

Mr. Yates: — Thank you very much. I have a number of colleagues who want to ask a few questions, and then I'll reserve the right to ask a few more at the end.

The Chair: — Ms. Atkinson, you have the floor.

Ms. Atkinson: — Yes. You mentioned earlier that there was a contract that had been entered into that wasn't favourable. Can you tell me who that contract . . . which ministry was going to use those services?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Is that the Quest contract?

Ms. Atkinson: — Yes.

[17:45]

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, the Quest software was . . . The business or the planned rollout of that, as I'd mentioned earlier, did happen under the previous administration. Apparently it was a multiple-piece rollout. The one piece that was implemented, and it was implemented across government, was when you log in every day, it was your pop-up, and it allowed you to change your password and do a few things. The remaining three or four pieces were never implemented across government. It's my understanding that the business case that was put forward wasn't adequate for the costs that were in place.

Ms. Atkinson: — And do you still have the same officials in place that were involved in this?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — No, we do not.

Ms. Atkinson: — You've got rid of those officials.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — We have different officials in place that have identified that the software contract did not meet the costs that we were required to pay for it.

Ms. Atkinson: — But there was a group of officials that obviously recommended this to the deputy minister who's been moved. He's now the Chair of the Public Service Commission I guess. So you're saying — what? — that that official was moved out because of the Quest contract?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — The people that had decided that this would be something that should be purchased by government has moved on to a private sector opportunity.

Ms. Atkinson: — And so was this signed off by the deputy minister of ITO? These things have sign-offs, so I'm just wondering, you know, ultimately over at ITO who signed off on it.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — You're asking me who under your administration signed off on this?

Ms. Atkinson: — Yes.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — I understand it would likely be the assistant deputy minister of operations that would have signed off on this.

Ms. Atkinson: — The assistant deputy minister. The deputy minister wasn't involved in this?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Again you're going back to a time when you're . . .

Ms. Atkinson: — You seem to know a lot about this so, you know . . . And you've got some officials that were around in those days, so perhaps they can answer the question.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — We can, if it's possible to find out who signed off on it beyond the . . . well, who signed off on it period. We can provide that to the Chair as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — And what year was this decision made?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, we will provide that as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — Thank you. Now in terms of the \$5 million that you're asking for a supplementary estimate for, you've identified some of this money to pay out Quest. I guess, are you saying that it's 1.2 million approximately?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Yes.

Ms. Atkinson: — Okay. And so the rest, can you go through that and give us a listing of what the rest is for?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, a portion of it, as we have discussed earlier, is to do with billing disputes with the

ministries. A portion of it is the Quest thing which we have recently spoken of. A portion of it is of hardware that was meant to be spread broadly over multiple ministries and was bought into by less than expected. And therefore those costs were left with ITO as opposed to being spread amongst the service receivers.

Ms. Atkinson: — Mr. Chair, can you be more precise? I know that you'll have a listing, so can you be more precise in that, please? That adds up to 5.144 million.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, and to the members of the committee, I don't want, in the technical jargon here, I don't want to seem like I'm knowledgeable on all of that, but some of my officials may be able to help.

In particular the database management packs were identified as something that were being underutilized, and those database management packs have been discontinued as well. That is approximately \$500,000 there. IT, the Oracle Real Application Clusters, servers or rack servers, it's a hardware and software package that was meant to be utilized by multiple ministries and didn't get as much of a buy-in as was hoped. That is a \$1.8 million of that. We've talked about the 1.2 with the Quest and 1.5 in disputed billing with the ministries; I believe that adds up to the 5.114.

Ms. Atkinson: — Was there any work that ITO did in 2009-10? Any technology that was purchased? Any work that was done by ITO that is in dispute?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, anything that was under dispute is currently before us today. Beyond what is before us today, there's nothing to my knowledge that is currently under dispute.

Ms. Atkinson: — You indicate that there is \$1.5 million in disputed billing, and so I'm asking you, I think it's a fairly straightforward question. Of the \$1.5 million, is there any technology that was purchased or software that was purchased that is in dispute with . . . by ITO that's in dispute with the ministry?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, of this 1.5 it apparently runs the gamut from amount of email addresses provided by the ITO to a ministry; to software that gets rolled out, number of word processing software on a number of computers that they're getting billed for; to what is being categorized as professional services. And the explanation I've just received is it may be estimated that writing a piece of software to do a specific task for a ministry is estimated at \$150,000.

After it's completed, it's actually \$400,000. And that's when the dispute that has resulted in us being here today would take place, that the estimate wasn't what was delivered and then the dispute happens. So it really runs the gamut from hardware, the number of mice that may have shown up, to writing of programs.

And I think again I'll reiterate that the new processes which have been put in place have, I won't say eliminated, but dramatically decreased the number of disputes from . . . down 95 per cent which I think is a positive sign.

Ms. Atkinson: — I don't ever recall there being this type of a supplementary estimate before; maybe there has but I don't recall it. Is this unusual that ITO is coming forward with problems that they incurred in '09-10 and asking for a remedy in '10-11?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — I think the way that a certain amount of this was handled in the past is somewhat in line with what we saw with the Quest software where the previous year's bill would be put off for a year. A certain amount of billing, I think, may have been put off until the following year from a ministry to ensure that they had enough cash flow not to end up in supplementary estimates. Under our new leadership we've decided that everything is going to be by the letter of accounting rules and we're going to just . . . We're here today to bring us to a rock-solid starting point. And from this point forward, that will be the practice.

Ms. Atkinson: — In terms of the Oracle situation, the servers that you talked about, the \$1.8 million, can you tell us what that is about?

[18:00]

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, the Oracle — and I'll use the term RAC [Real Application Clusters] as the acronym for the software — it is a very secure software. My understanding is that the auditor has requested a security increase in many of our ministries and this was an attempt of ITO and many ministries to comply with the auditor's request. This solution absolutely provides that. And when you come with a lot of security and fail-safes, it comes with cost and complexity, and a certain level of complexity that I think deterred some of our ministries that had been looking for a security solution, but weren't necessarily comfortable with the complexity that the system provided. And that's where we get the lack of buy-in, or I believe Education has bought in, but they may be the only one.

Ms. Atkinson: — And so as a result of the lack of a buy-in, there's a \$1.8 million problem. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — I will just correct my last comment. Also Advanced Education, Employment and Immigration as well is on that system at this point. And yes, those costs were meant to be spread or hoped obviously to be spread far more broadly than over the two ministries.

Ms. Atkinson: — So now what's going to happen to the \$1.8 million system? I suspect it was a little more expensive than that, so what's going to happen to it?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, this system is something that we are looking at moving our client ministries off of. We are looking at other solutions that provide the security and potentially a level of complexity and cost that encourage all our ministries or as many as are appropriate to join it.

In this current fiscal year, we're also paying what we think is a premium for this service, although I am happy to report to this committee that there's been cost savings in the ITO to a point where those costs are being internalized and will not require a supplementary estimate for them next year.

Ms. Atkinson: — So what are the implications if you move everybody off of this onto another system? Will there be further contract payouts and so on and so forth?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — From the customers' point of view we will . . . we are actively searching for a solution which provides us the cost savings and a security level which is appropriate and a complexity level that's appropriate to move them to on a contractual basis with the provider. There is no penalty for stopping that service. And that is something that we will be pursuing as soon as the alternative is identified.

Ms. Atkinson: — And how much does this service cost per year?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, we do not have the annual fee of what it is this year. Apparently we've trimmed back some of the services of what you see in this. And in this 1.8, some of that is the implementation costs as well. But we will endeavour to provide the committee with that information as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — So do I understand you correctly, Minister, that we have this RAC server that has been brought into government, that the hope by ITO was that all ministries were going to use this server in order to have security with their data and information, and that only two ministries, Education and Advanced Education, have bought into this particular solution? And as a result of that, the ministry is short or ITO is short 1.8 million for this year, and that's one of the reasons why we've got the request for 5.144 million is because of the 1.8 million for this Oracle RAC system. Is that correct? Do I have that correct?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Mr. Chair, I think that the intent was that many of the ministries would get on RAC. I don't know if it would be appropriate that they all get on the RAC level of security. But the intent was that, again, to comply with the auditor's request for security increases across our IT field, that this was something that was encouraged. I've again . . . I thought it was Education; I then corrected myself that it was Advanced Education, Employment and Labour. It's just Advanced Education, Employment and Labour, and Immigration.

Ms. Atkinson: — Sorry. When did you get the RAC server?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — That server we got in early 2008.

Ms. Atkinson: — And when did you begin? When was it implemented? Was it implemented in 2008?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — Shortly after that.

Ms. Atkinson: — Can you provide the committee with the cost of this, of all of this — the RAC server for 2008-09, '09-10, '10-11 obviously — because it looks as those you're moving away from RAC. So I'd be interested in knowing the total cost of this.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — To the member's question, we will endeavour to get that information as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — Okay. So just so I'm clear, Minister, you

indicated earlier that with Quest that the ADM [assistant deputy minister] is now gone. And so we've got another problem here, I guess, with this RAC system. What will be the consequence of that?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — The result of this software being replaced by new software, we will stop paying the service fee to Oracle, and we will either return the servers or utilize them in a different manner.

Ms. Atkinson: — So what you're telling me is there's no consequence for this? This is a system that the taxpayers obviously have paid money for. We're being asked for \$1.8 million in supplementary estimates for a server that only looks after one ministry at the moment. It's going to be replaced because it was seen to be too complex by various government ministries. And I'm just wondering, you know, someone made this decision along the way, and I'm just wondering are there consequences for this.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — It's my understanding that it would be the same individual that was in place for the Quest software. And the member is making a fairly aggressive . . . I guess I would just like to point out that we have just chatted whether the decision to purchase this software was in fact made under the previous administration or not. But due to the line of questioning by the member, I think it is possible. And we will endeavour to find that out as well.

Ms. Atkinson: — Okay. Well I was just curious. You made quite a production about this Quest, and I was just wondering what happened with Oracle. And obviously this has cost some money. You said it happened in early 2007. We're not . . . We know who was the government early 2008, I should say.

And so I mean the reality is, Minister, is that officials make decisions and sometimes they're signed off. And the politicians aren't necessarily . . . shouldn't be involved in these decisions. And you know, mistakes are made. Mistakes are made. And so it would be really useful at these, you know when we're having these kinds of discussions that we don't play the blame game because it can go several ways. But I think I've basically got, all of my questions have been answered. And I'm . . .

A Member: — Blaming people doesn't help.

Ms. Atkinson: — No, blaming doesn't help. I mean these are taxpayers' dollars and money, and sometimes officials make mistakes. And ministers aren't necessarily involved in it. And you know, the one gentleman is gone. I was wondering, is that going to be the way you are going to approach this. You make a mistake and people are gone. My sense is that sometimes there have been times when officials have made mistakes, but ultimately the minister is responsible. Ultimately.

Anyway I think I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair. I've asked all the questions I want to ask on this particular item. My assumption is that this won't be here next year because of your processes in place with the sign on.

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — That is absolutely correct. And in discussions earlier today, our current year's budget is in a positive situation in relation to our ministries and in relation to

our spending. So that is . . .

Ms. Atkinson: — I could of course ask you if you hire people on contract to supervise staff in ITO, but I'll leave that for another day, Minister. Thank you.

The Chair: — If there are no more questions. Before the vote we would like to say that we have a substitution. Mr. Kevin Yates is being substituted for Mr. Belanger. And if there are no more questions from committee members as we proceed to vote on the supplementary estimates for Information Technology Office. Vote 74, interministerial services, subvote (IT04) in the amount of 5,144,000. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

The Chair: — Carried. I will now ask a member to move the following resolution:

Be it resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the 12 months ending March 31, 2011, the following sums for Information Technology Office in the amount of 5,144,000.

Mr. D'Autremont moves. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: — Agreed.

[Vote 74 agreed to.]

The Chair: — I would like to thank the minister and his officials for attending our meeting tonight. Minister, do you have any closing remarks?

Hon. Mr. McMillan: — I would like to thank the members from both sides for a good round of questioning and for your time here tonight. I would also like thank my officials for their knowledge and expertise with putting together this information.

The Chair: — Thank you.

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — November
Sinking Fund Payments - Government Share
Vote 176**

The Chair: — Next on the agenda is consideration of Vote 176, sinking fund payments – government share, in the amount of 549,000. Are there any questions?

Seeing no questions, we will conclude consideration of vote 176. This is a statutory estimate, therefore, no vote is required.

[Vote 176 — Statutory.]

**General Revenue Fund
Supplementary Estimates — November
Growth and Financial Security Fund
Vote 82**

The Chair: — Our last item of business is consideration of vote 82, Growth and Financial Security Fund, in the amount of 68,496,000. Are there any questions? Seeing none, we will

conclude consideration of vote 82. This is a statutory estimate as well and no vote is required.

[Vote 82 – Statutory.]

The Chair: — Since we have concluded our business for this evening, I would ask a member to move a motion of adjournment. Mr. Bradshaw moves. This meeting is adjourned. Thank you one and all.

[The committee adjourned at 18:16.]