



# **Standing Committee on Crown Corporations**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 30 – April 7, 1998**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-third Legislature**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON CROWN CORPORATIONS  
1998**

Pat Lorje, Chair  
Saskatoon Southeast

Kim Trew, Vice-Chair  
Regina Coronation Park

Bob Bjornerud  
Saltcoats

Doreen Hamilton  
Regina Wascana Plains

Ben Heppner  
Rosthern

Lloyd Johnson  
Shellbrook-Spiritwood

Lindy Kasperski  
Regina Sherwood

Myron Kowalsky  
Prince Albert Carlton

Glen McPherson  
Wood River

Andy Renaud  
Carrot River Valley

**Channel Lake Petroleum Ltd.**

**The Chair:** — The hour now being 9 o'clock we will commence the hearings of the special meetings of the Crown Corporations Committee. Last week we dealt with various procedural matters and then we began questioning of our first witness, Mr. Jack Messer.

The official opposition, the Saskatchewan Party, questioned Mr. Messer for 30 minutes, as we had agreed on our procedure. Then the Liberal Party questioned Mr. Messer for 30 minutes. It is now time in our rotational scheme of things to have the New Democratic Party question Mr. Messer for 30 minutes.

Before I open the floor for questioning though, I have an indication that Mr. Messer wanted to say something.

**Mr. Messer:** — That is correct, Madam Chairperson. I would like to make a statement to the committee.

**The Chair:** — What's the committee's wish with respect to that? That's agreed. Thank you.

**Mr. Messer:** — Thank you, Madam Chairperson. At the last sitting of this committee on April 1, I was asked whether the legal counsel that appeared with me was being paid for by the people of Saskatchewan. I advised the committee that SaskPower and I were being represented by the same counsel, paid for by SaskPower.

I first wish to clarify my answer. The lawyer who appeared with me on April 1 was Michael Milani of McDougall, Ready. McDougall, Ready has been engaged by SaskPower to assist SaskPower in this inquiry. As part of that retainer, SaskPower made McDougall, Ready available to certain people who were employees of SaskPower during the time period which is the subject of this inquiry. I was one of those employees and I accepted that offer. I did not retain McDougall, Ready, and they did not appear as my counsel. They appeared as SaskPower's counsel, just as I expect they will appear for other former employees or directors, and existing employees and directors of SaskPower.

Also, it was agreed that McDougall, Ready would not appear with me when the committee dealt with the matter of my severance.

I have with me correspondence from McDougall, Ready which confirms these arrangements, which I will table with this committee. I believe these arrangements were entirely proper. However, the questions about my legal representation led to government concern, and as a result, I was advised that Mr. Milani would no longer be available to me as he is for other former employees.

I was accordingly obliged to find other counsel. I'm now represented by Mr. Brian Barrington-Foote, who sits to my right. However, I was unable to confirm his retainer until yesterday afternoon.

As the committee knows, this is a complex matter. There are many relevant documents. Neither I nor my counsel, nor the

committee itself for that matter, have those documents. It is impossible, in my view, to prepare properly without them.

There are also complex legal issues that I and my counsel must discuss. The committee's terms of reference include the consideration of potential civil actions. Its conclusions will affect not only important matters of public policy, but my rights and those of others who will appear before you. This inquiry has a political meaning but it must also be fair.

As such, I need time to enable my counsel to prepare and to advise me. The committee itself has decided that it needs counsel. It has also decided that the witnesses have the right to appear with counsel. That right, in my view, has little meaning if I do not have time to give instructions and to get advice.

I therefore ask that the committee adjourn my testimony until it has determined what documents will be tabled and until I have received these documents and have had a reasonable period of time to review them and instruct my counsel.

I thank you, Madam Chairperson.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Messer. Do I have any comments from committee members. Comments or questions?

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you.

**Mr. Messer:** — I can certainly leave this statement if they . . .

**The Chair:** — Would you please, and we would like to receive that as an official document of the committee.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Madam Chairperson. If I could direct some questions to Mr. Messer perhaps, and it's specifically about this, your legal situation, Mr. Messer. I understand that the circumstances of McDougall, Ready were retained by SaskPower Corporation. Your current counsel, is that retained by yourself or is it retained by anyone else on your behalf?

**Mr. Messer:** — Retained by myself.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you. In terms of asking for what you feel is reasonable time after documents are tabled, have you and your solicitor determined what that reasonable time may be? Is it a day or two, a week or two, or what time frame do you find or feel would be perhaps reasonable in order to have the kind of dialogue with your solicitor that would be appropriate?

**Mr. Messer:** — That's a somewhat difficult question to answer in that we don't know when the documents will be made available. But it is not my intention to in any way delay these deliberations. I simply think that given my circumstance, with counsel being retained only yesterday afternoon, that in itself is I think a reasonable request for a delay. The documents are obviously a concern to not only myself but I believe all committee members, to facilitate that the process is one that is complete and fair.

If the documents are made available in a reasonable period of time . . . I would think that we can't sit tomorrow. I don't think

that that . . . Quite frankly, the answer to your question is tomorrow would be too soon if the committee continues to sit only on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. My understand is that they will not sit next Tuesday because of the Easter weekend, Wednesday being the next appropriate day for sitting. If the documents were available in the very near future, I would think that we would want to be available for you at that time.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Mr. Messer. I certainly respect Mr. Messer's concern and his request, and personally I do understand it and I think there's some empathy.

What I am just a little bit concerned about is the way this whole process is going and the fact that this committee, and with all respect under your direction, Madam Chair, has really sort of been floundering around here in terms of a clear direction. We ended up and seemed to be in a great haste to try to have witnesses come forward with no documents.

Now we're in a situation where not only committee members have very little documents, other than what the minister tabled when he did his great *mea culpa* in the House three or four weeks ago, we're now waiting for documents that we have requested, and certainly all the witnesses are awaiting those documents as well, Madam Chair.

We end up with a situation where instead of us proceeding in timely fashion, we've had to go through a whole lot of difficult discussions and motions trying to get this agenda on the rails in an appropriate fashion and we're most anxious to move forward, and here we've got another delay. And quite frankly I'm quite dismayed by the lack of organization and direction in this whole inquiry. And I know that the comment is made that it's a work in progress, but it seems to be that we're making a mud shack instead of building a decent building here and moving it forward with some logic and common sense.

I certainly agree with Mr. Messer's request. And I would think that what we have to do then is to move our steering committee meeting, to move forward early this morning to consider the issues we have in front of it. Now we have the issue outstanding of the witness list that has been on the table, that we requested — a primary witness list — and we would like a discussion about that. We understand that there's some discussions going to happen about a reluctance of the government to table some documents we've asked for. We want to have a discussion about that.

And then tomorrow morning, to reconvene the committee to discuss and make decisions about the recommendations of the steering committee so that the documents . . . it's clarified what documents are going to be released and it's clarified what witnesses are going to be made available to committee members to request at an appropriate time; so not only ourselves but witnesses and people that are asked to come and testify will know where they're going.

Because I think what Mr. Messer is asking for is completely reasonable, and I'm dismayed that we've been floundering around under your direction, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Gantefer.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Madam Chair, under the circumstances the request by Mr. Messer certainly is a reasonable one. And I do not think that the committee can do other than recess this morning in order that Mr. Messer can consult with counsel, as is clearly quite appropriate, so that the work of the committee can continue.

And certainly it is appreciated that Mr. Messer is indicating that he would very much like to be prepared for next Wednesday. I think that's a good comment on his part and I appreciate it. And I think since the steering committee is already meeting today, it should proceed with that meeting, do its deliberations, come forward with its recommendation, decide what documents are going to be made available and make them available. And the steering committee can, I hope, decide whether those documents can be made available through the steering committee by being tabled with the Clerk or whether they have to be made available through this bigger committee. But I refer that to the steering committee to deliberate on and make a decision on. But I think under the circumstances, the request is certainly reasonable.

**Mr. Hillson:** — Yes, Madam Chair. I think that it is common ground by everyone around this table that Mr. Messer's request is reasonable under the circumstances. I do think it's worth noting though, that even if this were a judicial inquiry or a public inquiry, the fact is a last-minute switch in counsel would almost certainly result in a request such as we have this morning and would still result in an adjournment. So the forum that we're in today really has nothing to do with the fact that when there has to be a last-minute change in counsel, the trial or inquiry or whatever is almost inevitably adjourned for a period of time.

I think it's also common ground that the steering committee certainly has important work to do in the next week, so this need not be wasted time, and I look forward to the steering committee doing its job so we can proceed in a more orderly fashion. However, I think that the committee and Mr. Messer will have to keep in mind that while the steering committee will try and do a better job of disclosure of documents and a witness list, these will not be closed and it still remains open that during the course of the inquiry, we will find out that other materials or other persons have material evidence to bring forward and that will have to be investigated. So while we will do as thorough a job as we can, the fact is the classification of the material evidence can never be closed. Thanks.

**The Chair:** — I noted heads nodding all around the table as you mentioned that, Mr. Hillson, and I think it's worth emphasizing for committee members and members viewing the proceedings that the list of documents of course is not closed.

It would appear then, Mr. Messer, that there is consensus that your request is reasonable. Before we proceed any further, I would ask Mr. Gantefer if he had another comment?

**Mr. Gantefer:** — I'm not sure of two things. One is, is that I understood from Mr. Tchorzewski, is that you're indicating that the steering committee would be empowered by this committee to make decisions about documents or if there is a . . . My understanding is that the steering committee had to make recommendations to this committee and the final decision was

here. I would like clarification on that issue just to see how that is, if we're empowered to make those decisions as a steering committee and table them with the Clerk, or what the process is there.

And second of all I would like to understand, I believe in Mr. Messer's last day of testimony there were some documents requested of Mr. Messer that he undertook to provide. And I, just for the record and to clarify with Mr. Messer, were they your severance contract and your employment contract? And if that is clarified and that that undertaking is going to be brought forward in terms of documents for Mr. Messer, that's sufficient. If not, I have a motion asking for those documents, but that may not be required depending on Mr. Messer's answer, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** — I'll deal with the items in the order that you put them.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you.

**The Chair:** — First of all, Mr. Tchorzewski . . .

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, just sorry if I was not clear in my comments. But what I was saying is that the steering committee should go ahead with its meeting, deal with the issues that it has before it, consult with the Clerk as to the appropriate procedure on how those documents become available, and then decide. And if it has to recommend . . . if the steering committee has to come back here again to present a document, thus it should. If the Clerk has other advice, then I think the steering committee should consider that advice.

**The Chair:** — All right. I'll leave the question of the steering committee for a moment now. And then, Mr. Messer, I would ask you to respond to Mr. Gantefer's questions regarding severance and employment contracts.

**Mr. Messer:** — Madam Chairperson, in respect of the issue Mr. Gantefer raises, I will undertake to bring forward what it is I said I would bring forward when I was last before the committee. I think that there is some confusion in respect of an employment contract in the form of a written contract. I don't believe such a contract exists, but we'll review the transcript and I will provide to you the information that I said I would at that time, to the committee.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Madam Chair, if I may. That's why I asked for the clarification. Perhaps I should move the motion so that we're clear about what I'm asking for. The motion is:

That Mr. Jack Messer be requested to provide the following documents to the committee at his next appearance: (1) his employment contract with SaskPower; and (2) his severance contract with SaskPower.

I so move.

**The Chair:** — All right. I have a motion. Any discussion?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, Mister . . . Madam . . . Mister, sorry. Now . . .

**The Chair:** — It's a disease that strikes the Crown Corporations Committee sporadically.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Well, Freudian slip. My apologies, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** — That's quite all right.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I think that should be referred to the steering committee as well since the steering committee is dealing with documents and determining which are appropriate documents to be tabled. I don't see why this should be different.

Mr. Messer has indicated his willingness to provide them, but I really think it should be provided to the steering committee and the steering committee should make a determination on the basis of what's before it, so we're consistent.

**The Chair:** — Are there any other comments on the motion on the table?

**Mr. Gantefer:** — I think what Mr. Messer said is that he would bring what undertakings he had made at the last meeting. It was not clear to me what that undertaking was and that's why I moved it by way of a motion so it clarified exactly what two documents we were very interested in moving.

In terms of the committee or in terms of the steering committee, it has no authority on its own to request from Mr. Messer that these documents be tabled. This committee is where the authority and force of the proper requesting would occur. And it would be my opinion that the steering committee can only make recommendations to this full standing committee and consequently that that's where the authority is ultimately vested. So I think it's quite in order that this be considered here.

**The Chair:** — I would just point out, procedurally if there is a desire to refer this motion to the steering committee, I would require an amendment to Mr. Gantefer's motion referring it to a steering committee.

**Mr. Heppner:** — This particular motion needs to be dealt with here because all the things that the steering committee does, comes back to this particular committee. And we need to have that on the public record with the cameras right here to see if the NDP (New Democratic Party) people over there are going to be voting for or against having those contracts made public as taxpayers' responsibility, taxpayers' money. And we need to see where people are going to vote on that particular issue. It has to be done this morning.

**The Chair:** — Are there any further comments?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, Madam Chair. I'm not interested in political debate here. I'm interested in the facts, Madam Chair, and I think it is clear that Mr. Messer has indicated that he is willing and prepared to provide the documents asked for.

This committee has determined prior to this that documents will be considered by the steering committee; the steering committee is doing its job as requested and directed by this committee. And I think the appropriate thing with this motion . . . I see nothing wrong with the motion as it is here, other than

it also should have a reference that those documents should go to the steering committee and that they be considered in the same context as all other documents.

**The Chair:** — All right. I'm having some debate now about your comment, Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Just very briefly, I think we've got the exercise backward. The steering committee is a subcommittee of this body. Any authority it has is only that authority that is vested in it from this body. Ultimately what the steering can do is only make recommendations to this committee. The final authority and say as to what will be referred to the Clerk comes from this committee. It's not the other way around. And ultimately all the steering committee can do is make recommendations that this committee has to then authorize.

So if we at the end of our meeting today make recommendations that certain documents be tabled with this committee, this committee then has to make that a motion that these documents do indeed be tabled. And so Mr. Tchorzewski has got the argument backwards. This indeed is the only committee that can make those determinations.

Secondly, as I indicated, is that I am not sure that the severance contract was part of what was requested during the hearings at day past. That's why I asked the question and that's why I wanted it very much clarified by way of motion that both the employment contract and the severance contract be tabled. If that already is on the record then there's no harm in passing the motion because it then just simply clarifies the issue.

**The Chair:** — Thank you, Mr. Gantefer.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I'm not terribly sure that these procedural wrangles reflect well on the committee. Having said that, let me get into the procedural wrangle. I think it's appropriate to refer it to the committee for a couple of reasons. One is the committee is all that's going to be functioning between now and next Wednesday. This committee, I understand that Mr. Messer's asked for an adjournment.

So it's the steering committee that's going to be functioning. It seems to be, to be . . . it seems to me that it makes sense to refer it to the steering committee because there may have to be some discretion exercised here. Mr. Messer said that there is no employment contract; that is my understanding as well. And therefore the motion may be in part impossible to fulfil.

Moreover, the second document, the severance document, it's my understanding that the severance contract is part of the documents already being provided by SaskPower. So that may be fulfilled as well.

For all those reasons, it seems to be it makes sense to refer this to the steering committee where the matter can be dealt with promptly this afternoon, rather than leave it in the hands of the committee which won't be functioning, I assume, will not meet again till next Wednesday.

So it seems to me Mr. Tchorzewski's motion makes eminent good sense, so that the matter can be dealt with promptly and that all the members can have copies of these documents

forthwith.

**Mr. Heppner:** — This committee right here is meeting right now, right this minute. The motion is right in front of us right now. Why would we push it off to a meeting that's behind closed doors unless someone's planning a whitewash they don't want to have on public record. I think that has to be done here.

We are meeting right now, we can demand those kinds of documents, and in two or three minutes everyone in Saskatchewan knows whether this government's going to support that or if they're not going to support it. And that's what the people of Saskatchewan want to see.

If this is going to be an open and a fair kind of a committee, this is the way it has to be done.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. I have two other people on the speaking list. Mr. Messer and then Mr. Hillson. I think I would ask Mr. Hillson to speak first and then I will ask committee members if they wish to hear from Mr. Messer, since technically what we're doing is having a discussion about a motion and it is committee business not the witness's business.

**Mr. Hillson:** — I'll defer to Mr. Messer, thank you, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Does the committee wish to hear from Mr. Messer on this?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Only if he wishes to . . . I mean he's . . . I don't think we should . . .

**The Chair:** — He's indicated he wishes to speak, Mr. Tchorzewski.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Okay.

**The Chair:** — But because we are dealing with a procedural matter, it seemed to me I should ask the committee members' permission first.

**Mr. Messer:** — Madam Chairperson, I simply want to state, if it will facilitate the deliberations of the committee, I will reiterate that I do not believe there is a written contract between myself and SaskPower. I was somewhat confused in the questioning of last week when one was suggested that was in existence. I believe there is not. I will be prepared to be more definite about that next Wednesday.

In respect of the severance contract, if it will facilitate the committee, I will make available the letter of severance, because it's already been stated publicly in respect of its content. So if this will facilitate the deliberations and move it on, I will make that available at the next sitting, and I don't believe there's any problem with that.

**The Chair:** — All right. Mr. Hillson, did you now wish to speak?

**Mr. Hillson:** — I think Mr. Messer has certainly tried to cooperate with us. I understand there is certainly something in writing in terms of his engagement. I'm surprised to learn there

isn't a comprehensive contract of employment. I think he's undertaken to provide them.

I would say however, in regards to members opposite of this committee, the steering committee as I understand it is to review the proposed document list to decide what is relevant and what is not. So there may be some things that have been proposed that turn out really not to bear on the work of this committee. But in terms of the contract with the chief executive officer of SaskPower and the terms of his termination, I don't think there can be anything to decide. I think that its relevance goes without saying, so I'm really not sure why we've had to take up time with this committee this morning on this issue. Thank you.

**The Chair:** — Thank you. Still speaking to the motion, Mr. Tchorzewski?

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — Yes, really, Madam Chair, I always assume that we're here to seriously consider the issue that's before this committee and we have no other interest but to do that, and I don't think any member on this committee has any other interest. And to use up the time of the committee debating something which the committee already . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Excuse me, I think I have the chair . . . which the committee has already heard from Mr. Messer on, and which everybody in this committee has agreed that it is important to have the documents to which we are speaking, I don't know why we need a debate on this.

I don't know why we needed a resolution, but if it's a . . . or a motion, if that will make some people happier, since nothing turns on that motion, we should get on with the motion and get on with the work of this committee, which I think the public expects nothing less from us, and we should get on with the public's work.

**The Chair:** — I hear the question being called. I will remind committee members that your option is to approve or to negative the motion by Mr. Gantefer or to put an amendment to refer it. I do not have at this time an amendment. So the motion by Mr. Gantefer is:

That Jack Messer be requested to provide the following documents to the committee at his next appearance: (1) his employment contract with SaskPower; (2) his severance contract with SaskPower.

The question has been called. All those in favour of the motion, please indicate. Thank you. Just a moment, I want to read into the record. It's Mr. Gantefer, Mr. Bjornerud — you're here today rather than Mr. Heppner . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I'll deal with that matter in a moment — Mr. Hillson, Mr. Trew, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Shillington, Mr. Tchorzewski, Mr. Thomson, and Mr. Kowalsky. That motion is carried.

Before we move on to some procedural items then, are there any other comments or questions that people need to direct to Mr. Messer?

**Mr. Hillson:** — Madam Chair, pardon me for interrupting but this is actually Mr. Gantefer's point. He's just mentioned to me that of course the steering committee's only function is to

recommend what documents ought to be disclosed and filed with us. And so the question is, is it appropriate to release those to Mr. Messer until this whole committee has ruled on the list? So is there not perhaps a need for this committee to meet to approve whatever work comes out of the steering committee? Because really the steering committee, as I understand it, makes no final decisions.

**The Chair:** — That's right. Yes, Mr. Hillson, that was exactly a matter that I wish to bring up, because I don't want us to be in a position procedurally where we would ask Mr. Messer and his counsel to come back to the committee next Wednesday and then not be able to commence our work right away. And it does seem to me that once the steering committee decides upon an initial set of documents that they wish to have tabled, that that will have to be approved by the larger committee. And as well we would want to be in a position to give Mr. Messer time to review those documents, if he found it necessary, on Wednesday.

So I think what I'm going to suggest to committee members, and again I would ask for guidance from the committee on this, is that since the House is not meeting next Tuesday but the steering committee has already agreed to meet next Tuesday and will be meeting again later today, that we will deal with those procedural issues with respect to the tabling of the documents and everything and all the other matters that have been referred . . . that the steering committee wishes to report on first thing on Wednesday morning. We will then ask Mr. Messer if he needs some time before we begin his questioning.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I was going to make a suggestion in this regard. I wonder if it might facilitate the work of everyone and particularly the staff who are working on these documents if the steering committee met much earlier. I was going to suggest perhaps 11 o'clock. That would, I think it . . . pardon me? Today, yes. I think that would facilitate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . All right. I won't make an argument.

**The Chair:** — I had planned to ask all members of the steering committee to remain behind after we adjourned the hearings for today so that we could seek an earlier meeting rather than 2:30 this afternoon. So is 11 o'clock an agreeable time for all steering committee members? All right. The steering committee then will meet this morning at 11 o'clock and we already have a certain amount of business before us. Yes, and we will meet in this room, at 11 o'clock, the members of the steering committee.

So we will cancel the meeting for the 14th, the meeting of the whole committee. We will meet again on the 15th and 16th tentatively.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — May I ask a question of you?

**The Chair:** — Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I am not . . . I seek clarification, I think from the Clerk here. If the steering committee agrees upon the documents, the documents are then delivered to the Clerk's office. Are they then available for anyone who wishes to make copies or do they have to come back to the committee?

If they have to come back to the committee — and I think that's what I see the Clerk trying to signal me — then I think the committee may have to meet tomorrow morning, I guess would be the time. I think the committee has to meet tomorrow morning to formally receive the documents so that Mr. Barrington-Foote and his client can get copies.

**The Chair:** — That's fine by me. I didn't . . .

**Hon. Mr. Shillington:** — I thought we might be able to deliver them to the Clerk and then they'd be public, but I see that's not the case.

**The Chair:** — I just would mention for the benefit of all committee members, there are some technical staffing problems with respect to the production of the documents. There's been a very lengthy list of documents requested. I understand it amounts to some 10 feet of paper and the steering committee will have to go through those and decide which documents are relevant and which ones are irrelevant. So there may be some sheer logistical problems that the steering committee members will face.

But I have no problem with us meeting tomorrow and at that point the steering committee can report on its progress in terms of reviewing the documents.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Thank you, Madam Chair. As I understand . . . Like, I think we're getting ourselves into a problem here again. It's my understanding that the meeting that we would schedule later today, and I'm glad is going to be early, was to review what documents were going to be presented as part of that 10-foot groups of documents. That's the first thing.

The second thing, as I understood it, we were then going to take, over the Easter season, until next Tuesday to review that in a group-of-documents entirety by the steering committee individuals and working groups, to then make a recommendation to the committee as to what of those 10 feet at this stage — it didn't exclude further tabling of documents — but what of that 10 feet might be distilled down to 1 foot, if you like, into working documents that would be available, and then the recommendation would be made at that time as to what would be brought forward to the committee.

If that is how it was supposed to happen, it will be impossible to do that tomorrow because the documents are only going to be made available sometime tomorrow; so we couldn't make a final determination of what documents would be relevant for Mr. Messer and his solicitor to review.

So my concern is, are we saying that if we go with that initial process whereby on next Tuesday we make the determination what documents are recommended to the committee to review — that that is then decided by the committee next Wednesday — it would seem to me it would be unreasonable to have those documents only decided next Wednesday and expect Mr. Messer to testify that same day. So I don't think we should build a false expectation, the way this is going, and that's why my concern is this has all gone sort of backwards.

**The Chair:** — I have a speaking order on this: Mr. Tchorzewski, then Mr. Hillson.

**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — I think, Madam Chair, we are unnecessarily making this process more confused than it needs to be. I think there is a process in place. Steering committee is the process, and I'm not arguing with Mr. Gantefer because . . . But there are . . . the government is going to table all the documents, I would assume. And the . . . whether there is a long volumes, a lot of volumes, of documents and out of that comes a shorter version, depending on what members feel is relevant — of this committee, members feel is relevant — the fact of the matter is that all of the documents that are provided will be tabled and so they should be.

I don't think that that's a debatable point at all. And I think what we should be doing now, Madam Chair, is adjourning this meeting, let the steering committee go and prepare its work, and reconvene tomorrow if necessary or whenever time is necessary to receive the tabled documents.

**Mr. Hillson:** — I would only say that that's my understanding as well, that I was under the impression that whatever the government was prepared to release, that this steering committee and the larger group believes to be relevant, will be released before next week. It's all out. Now we may or may not refer to each and every document in our examination of witnesses. Most of them probably will never be referred to again. But the entire volume of documents that the government agrees ought to be released, and this committee believes is relevant, will be released at that time.

**The Chair:** — Now I just . . . You're not saying, Mr. Hillson, the entire volume of documents that have been requested, but the entire volume of documents that the committee believes are relevant. You see, this is . . .

There are two or three key words that people are sliding through and I don't want us to get into a wrangle tomorrow if, technically, the photocopying of the 10 feet of documents has not been done completely, or if there is a question of relevancy of documents and so forth. But I will refer this matter to the steering committee.

It seems to me there is a desire by committee members — and I ask for guidance on this — there is a desire by committee members for me to call a meeting tomorrow of the Crown Corporations Committee. Is that correct? Agreed. All right. Our next meeting then will be at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. In the meantime the steering committee will meet in this room at 11 o'clock this morning.

I would mention finally, for committee members' agenda purposes, that right now it would appear we will be cancelling the Tuesday, April 14 meeting and meeting instead on Wednesday, April 15 and Thursday, April 16. The following week . . . no, a week after that, on Wednesday, April 29 there is an Honours Recognition Ceremony being held in this legislature. I think five committee members have commitments to attend that Honours Recognition Ceremony, which occurs Wednesday morning. So I am suggesting we will cancel the meeting of the 29th and for that week we will meet Tuesday, the 28th, and Thursday, the 30th. The other Tuesday, Wednesday schedules will remain intact.

I will now entertain a motion for adjournment.



**Mr. Tchorzewski:** — So moved.

**The Chair:** — Thank you.

The committee adjourned at 9:50 a.m.