



Standing Committee on Crown Corporations

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 31 – April 8, 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: — Good morning, everyone. The special meeting of the Crown Corporations Committee to hear the . . . to inquire into the acquisition, management, and sale of Channel Lake and the payment to Mr. John R. Messer when he ceased being CEO (chief executive officer) and president of SaskPower will now reconvene.

I would like to report to the committee that the steering committee met yesterday and have several recommendations to make to the larger committee with respect to documents, the procedure for handling them, the question of the need to issue a subpoena in the . . . through the legislature, the question of witnesses, and then the matter of a report to the Legislative Assembly. So those are the items that I propose to deal with today and in that order.

Committee members will note that several documents were wheeled into the room. I understand there are over a thousand documents. These are, I understand, the documents that were requested by the various opposition parties to assist all members in their deliberations of the terms of reference.

Ms. Woods, you have a motion for me?

Are there any questions or comments on the matter of the documents that have been tabled with the committee now? I understand that all three caucuses have been provided with a copy as well as a copy to the Law Counsel and Clerk. There will be need for additional photocopying as time goes on, but we will work on those procedures.

Fine. Then I would ask Ms. Woods to distribute a draft of a report from the subcommittee on the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations that deals with the procedure for handling those documents. And the report reads as follows:

That the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations recommends to the full committee the following:

1. That a full set of documents requested by the committee will be provided to each caucus and to the Clerk on Wednesday, April 7, 1998;
2. That upon receipt by the Clerk on Wednesday, April 7, 1998, the documents will be deemed to have been tabled in the committee;
3. That the Clerk's copy of the full set of documents will be available for public viewing in the office of the Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk; and finally
4. That the Office of the Clerk will reproduce and distribute copies of documents to committee members and to those members of the public, including witnesses and their counsel, who so request, within reason.

Are there any questions or comments on that?

Mr. Bjornerud: — A few comments on the meeting that we

had last night and some of the recommendations that come out of there, and I think we would like a couple of things to be noted, and the one with regards to adding of additional witnesses to the list.

The Chair: — Mr. Bjornerud, we'll be dealing with that separately.

Mr. Bjornerud: — Okay.

The Chair: — So as I indicated at the start, I plan to go through documents, tabling procedure, and so forth. So could you hold your comments on that for a moment?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Chair, this seems to be a perfectly adequate proposal that has been brought forward. I just maybe want to point out, I think I'm right here, but should it be April 8 as opposed to April 9 . . . April 7? Today being the 8th, should we make that correction?

The Chair: — This is Tuesday, it must be Brussels. If it's Wednesday it must be the 8th. Yes, would committee members please . . .

Mr. Tchorzewski: — It is Wednesday.

The Chair: — . . . change the date on your copy. I apologize. We were working rather late at night and early this morning.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Fully understood.

The Chair: — If there are no other questions or comments about this report, I will officially then table the draft report of the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations dealing with procedures on handling documents. I would ask at this point for a motion to concur in it.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I'll move.

The Chair: — All those in favour please indicate. Mr. Gantefer, Mr. Bjornerud, Mr. Hillson, Mr. Trew, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Shillington, Mr. Tchorzewski, Mr. Thomson, and Ms. Stanger. That motion is passed.

We will now then deal with the matter of the need, as discussed by the committee, the subcommittee, to subpoena certain witnesses.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Just for clarification of procedure, since this is a recommendation of the steering committee, like the one we just dealt with, it is necessary then to have a motion or is it automatically moved because the steering committee brings it forward?

The Chair: — It is necessary to have a motion; that's why I asked that we would have a motion to concur in. I will be tabling the reports from the steering committee and then I will be asking for a motion to concur in them.

Your committee yesterday when it met, also heard various legal opinions from . . . including Mr. Don McKillop of the Department of Justice of the Government of Saskatchewan. Mr.

McKillop is present here today, seated on the south side of the gallery. And we also heard opinions from Mr. Ted Priel, our legal adviser.

And I would now present to the committee the following report. Again I will, for the benefit of the audience here today, I will read the draft report. I will be adding one thing for clarification and that will be the date at which we would expect Mr. McKillop to appear before the standing committee. So if members would add to your draft a few words when I get to them, please.

The report reads as follows:

The subcommittee on the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations recommends to the full committee the following:

That the committee recommend to the Assembly that the Assembly do order the Speaker to issue a subpoena to summon the attendance of Mr. Don McKillop of the Department of Justice, Government of Saskatchewan, before the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations — please add — at its meeting on April 15, 1998, and that he do produce the following documents at that time:

1. All written legal opinions in the possession of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Crown Investments Corporation, and the Government of Saskatchewan touching upon the terms of reference of the Channel Lake Petroleum Ltd. investigation in the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations; and
2. The long-term gas supply agreement between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Direct Energy Marketing Ltd. and its three ancillary documents.

I would note just for the committee's information that once the subpoena is issued, if Mr. McKillop chooses to produce the documents before April 15, he certainly may. But the Clerk has advised me that it is important to insert a date into this.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — I had a different understanding than the Chair about how this was going to be handled. I had understood that Mr. McKillop was going to provide the documents as soon as possible — and one would expect that to be this afternoon — to the Clerk. Once they were given to the Clerk, they would be deemed to be tabled and all members would have access to them.

The difficulty with the amendment as I understand it, as it is now before the committee is, members of the committee are not going to have access to these documents until the 15th. And I understood that last night we had agreed that they would be given to the Clerk, and once given to the Clerk, deemed to have been tabled. And I in fact was going to suggest that be added to the report.

I'd perhaps hear members opposite on the issue.

Mr. Gantefer: — That was exactly my point, Madam Chair.

The Chair: — And I realize that. The addition is at the

suggestion of the Clerk of the Assembly in order to have a specific date. Mr. McKillop can produce them at any time. If committee members would feel more comfortable, we could say, "produce the documents on or before its meeting of April 15."

Mr. Gantefer: — Madam Chair, I guess a question through you to the Clerk or to the legal counsel: would it be possible to use today's date? If we're doing this for the sake of a date, could we use today's date and suggest that it be tabled with the Clerk and that that would then effectively deal with the issue of the date.

The Chair: — Just a moment; I'll just consult with my advisers on this.

I will attempt to summarize the advice that I'm getting. This is, committee members will appreciate, a legal nicety that is required because we are in many ways breaking ground and asking the legislature to issue a subpoena. So out of a sense of abundant caution, the Clerk and the special adviser are informing me that we have to have a date on this. A subpoena has to be returnable. It is a legal instrument.

The process is that we are calling a witness and we are asking the witness to produce certain documents. Mr. McKillop has made an undertaking that he will produce those documents as soon as the subpoena is issued. I understand that the House leaders from the three parties have agreed that I will present a report today in the House and the Speaker will then be able to issue the subpoena this afternoon. So Mr. McKillop will indeed produce those documents this afternoon, but technically he must come to the committee. We're calling the witness, not the documents.

So the date of April 15 is the date that we expect Mr. McKillop to actually obey the subpoena. He may table the documents, and I have assurances that Mr. Priel has discussed with Mr. McKillop, and he will produce those documents this afternoon. Do I have comments on that?

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — A question. When will they be available to everyone then? There may be a . . . we may want . . . we want to be sure we don't violate the subpoena, yes, by making it available too soon. This may be a legal problem here.

I think from the government's point of view, we want to make these available today if we can.

The Chair: — The Clerk and the special adviser will consult with Mr. McKillop and we'll have an answer in just a second.

I would like to inform committee members that Mr. McKillop has indeed given a formal undertaking to provide the documents to the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly as soon as he is issued with the subpoena. The Clerk has given a formal undertaking that she will distribute copies of those documents to all members of the Crown Corporations Committee as soon as they are in her possession. So this afternoon you will have them, and you will all have them at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Thank you very much for that clarification.

The Chair: — Is that satisfactory? Does anyone have any questions about that? Then with the addition of the date “at its meeting on April 15,” I will now table the report of the subcommittee on Standing Committee on Crown Corporations dealing with the subpoena of witnesses.

I would ask for a motion now to concur in that. Mr. Shillington? Are committee members ready for the vote? Question? Thank you. All those in favour? Mr. Tchorzewski?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — What’s the subpoena of witnesses? You said subpoena of witnesses. Oh this is the same. Okay. I’m sorry. Okay.

The Chair: — We subpoena a witness and summon him to appear before the committee with certain documents. Again this is a legal nicety for us to get our hands on the documents. The documents come carried by a human being.

All those in favour of this, please indicate. Thank you. Mr. Gantefer, Mr. Bjornerud, Mr. Hillson, Mr. Trew, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Shillington, Mr. Tchorzewski, Mr. Thomson, and Ms. Stanger.

I will now ask the Clerk to distribute a draft report that I am proposing to present to the House this afternoon under routine proceedings. This is the report that will ask the Speaker to issue the subpoena. I will now read the report. This is a draft of The Standing Committee on Crown Corporations fourth report:

The Chair of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations presents the committee’s fourth report of the twenty-third legislature which is as follows:

Your committee, in examining the matters of the acquisition, management, and sale of Channel Lake Petroleum Ltd. by SaskPower and the payments to Mr. John R. Messer when he ceased to serve as president of SaskPower, has concluded that certain documents in the possession of the government are required in order for this committee to fully carry out its terms of reference.

Your committee recommends therefore, that the Assembly do order the Speaker to issue a subpoena to summon the attendance of Mr. Don McKillop of the Department of Justice of the Government of Saskatchewan before the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations at its — please add — at its meeting on April 15, 1998 at 9 a.m., and that he do produce the following documents at that time:

1. All written legal opinions in the possession of Saskatchewan Power Corporation, the Crown Investments Corporation, and the Government of Saskatchewan touching upon the terms of reference of the Channel Lake Petroleum Ltd. investigation in the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations; and
2. The long-term gas supply agreement between Saskatchewan Power Corporation and Direct Energy Marketing Ltd. and its three ancillary documents.

I table that draft report that I’m proposing to make to the House

with the committee. Are there questions or comments on that? Hearing none, could I have a motion to concur in the draft report. Mr. Shillington. All those in favour, please indicate. That’s passed unanimously with all members voting.

I just point out for committee members that this is an historic second in terms of having the Speaker issue a subpoena. Apparently in 1916 there was an indication that a subpoena was issued. But the records are a little hoary and we’re not really certain if it was actually issued. But there was a similar request in 1916.

We will now move on then to the final matter today in terms of the report from the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations, and I will ask the Clerk to distribute that. That is with respect to the calling of witnesses.

I will now read the report from the subcommittee on the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations:

The subcommittee recommends to the full committee the following:

That the following persons be added to the primary list of witnesses in the Channel Lake Petroleum investigation and that they be called as witnesses on a date to be decided by this committee:

1. Premier Roy Romanow
2. Deputy Premier Dwain Lingenfelter
3. Hon. Keith Goulet
4. Hon. John Nilson
5. Hon. Berny Wiens
6. Hon. Lorne Calvert
7. Rupert James, Ernst & Young
8. Barry Munro, Ernst & Young
9. Richard Patrick, SaskPower
10. Louis Dufresne, Direct Energy Marketing Ltd.
11. Nino Silvestri, Direct Energy Marketing Ltd.
12. Jullian Olenick, past president of SaskEnergy
13. Colleen Bailey, director of SaskPower
14. Ron Bruce, SaskPower internal audit, employee
15. S.D. Manson, SaskPower internal audit, employee
16. Daryl Kuchinka, director of SaskPower and member of internal audit and finance committee
17. Robert Stobbs, SaskPower internal audit, employee)
18. Betty Wiegel, former corporate secretary to SaskPower

I will now table this report and I would ask for a motion to concur in it. Mr. Bjornerud moves the motion. I would ask then for any questions or comments from committee members.

Mr. Bjornerud: — I so move the motion.

The Chair: — Okay. Are there any questions or comments by committee members? Hearing none, I will call the question. All those in favour of the report please indicate: Mr. Gantefer, Mr. Bjornerud, Mr. Hillson. All those opposed please indicate: Mr. Trew, Ms. Hamilton, Mr. Shillington, Mr. Tchorzewski, Mr. Thomson, and Ms. Stanger. Thank you. That motion is not passed.

Are there any other matters before the committee? If not, I will entertain a motion . . .

Mr. Bjornerud: — Madam Chair, could I just make a few comments? And I think if the steering committee is going to work, and I think we had some mention of it last night, I'd just like to make few comments. Because I think we feel a steering committee has a real valuable purpose here but it will only work if we really accept the recommendations that come out of it.

And I think it should be noted that last night, comments were made that if we didn't actually work only by consensus that the longevity of the steering committee might be in question. And I guess we have a real problem with that because we would hope it would work by consensus but there're times that that isn't possible. And I feel we saw that last night with the government member voting against adding these names to the witness list.

But having said that, the recommendation came out of that committee and came to this point, and we're still blocking what we really need to be open and accountable with adding the Premier's name and others to the list. And I guess it's our wish that the steering committee keeps going and keeps functioning, but I'm not sure there's any use to it if we aren't going to accept the recommendations that come out of it at this level.

I guess what we're saying, that the steering committee was set up for a purpose and when we get to this point and the majority of the government members block what comes out of there, I'm not sure it's really doing anything positive at all. And I would wish that government members would reconsider and add these names to the list.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Bjornerud.

Mr. Hillson: — My understanding from the discussions we have had is that government members took the view that they were not prepared to concur with this list at this time. However, their blocking of this list was not a final answer and that we did have indication from the government members that if in the work of the committee it becomes clear that some or all of these proposed additions are necessary to the work of the committee, that the government members will accede to their addition.

And I think it is important before we leave this matter, Madam Chair, if that can be clarified, whether my understanding is correct on that point, or whether this is a final answer from the New Democratic members of the committee.

The Chair: — I have Mr. Shillington on the speaking list and, Mr. Shillington, perhaps you could answer Mr. Hillson's question.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — Let me say with respect to the witnesses, it is as I stated last night. We're prepared to be flexible as we go along. We think the list is complete and will provide a complete rendition of the facts but we're prepared to be flexible.

With respect to the standing committee itself, it certainly did some good work. We're prepared to work with the standing committee . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Sorry, the steering committee. We're prepared to work with the steering

committee; it did some good work. I think much of its work will now be behind it but it seems to have worked well.

Mr. Heppner: — Yes, this is rather interesting. I think we've reached a fairly critical juncture in this whole process, and I guess the juncture is whether this whole thing is going to be credible and whether it's going to be open and accountable. Saying that it's going to be flexible down the road is pretty scary, because who's going to decide how flexible it's going to be. And this committee at this point this morning should have decided exactly what's going to be happening.

To go further down the road and say we're not sure who's going to show up and who's not going to show up, makes the whole thing a bit of a travesty. Now that we know that these people are not going to be allowed to come, and probably never be allowed to come — if not, they should have been left on the list today — we know that's it's not going to be credible. We know that it's going to be a whitewash, it's going to be a cover-up. And the government side is going to pick and choose very carefully exactly what they're going to allow. And it's just going to keep this whole thing shut down fairly tight.

The top four or five, six people on that list are very critical to this whole process. They're critical because they are individuals that are responsible for what was happening with SaskPower. They should have known. And if they didn't know, then why didn't they know? Those two questions need to be answered, and only they can answer those questions. And we need to know whether they're coming.

Madam Chair, you dreamt this idea up at 5 o'clock in the morning. We can see now that you should have probably just pulled the blankets over your head and just kept on sleeping on that one because it's not working out very well.

I guess my question is, why is the Premier being protected? Why are some of those other cabinet ministers being protected? That's interesting. Usually when people have nothing to say and are innocent, they're quite prepared to go ahead and talk about it. It's when they run and hide that you wonder exactly what they know.

It's too bad that the people from the government side here this morning felt their strings pulled to the extent that they had to obey the Premier specifically and not allow him to come out and testify on that.

It's Easter time and these individuals will be going home and talking to their constituency, the people of Saskatchewan, about how they feel about it. And I'm sure they're going to tell you very specifically they're unhappy with the fact that the people who are ultimately responsible for SaskPower are not going to be here.

You voted against this. So I suggest when you go home, one, your Easter basket is probably going to be empty, and your Easter Bunny is going to be DOA (dead on arrival).

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Heppner. Mr. Shillington. Oh I'm sorry. Mr. Tchorzewski.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Glad you didn't say Ms.

The Chair: — I think that's a worn joke.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Chair, very briefly, I want to make two points: one, I think it really serves the committee no purpose if any members of the committee continue to make disparaging comments about the Chair. And I think the Speaker of the House has been very clear on the procedure about that not being appropriate, an appropriate thing to do.

If we are going to work as a committee, we have to work as a committee under the direction of the Chair with the advice of the staff of the Legislative Assembly. And I think that the sooner we begin to recognize that, the better is going to be the functioning of the committee.

I remind you, Madam Chair, and committee members, that the recommendations that were brought to us here today, were recommendations of the steering committee and not recommendations of the Chair. The Chair only reports what the steering committee has decided and has recommended. And we have appropriately dealt with those recommendations.

We have before us over a thousand, or about a thousand I am told — I haven't looked at them, haven't seen them yet — over a thousand documents which have been requested by members of this committee and members of the opposition. And I think that that's a pretty sincere and solid indication by the Power Corporation, by the government, and others involved that they are determined to provide information that is required for the committee to do the work that is necessary to be done.

There is a list of witnesses who are the key people in the issue before us. It may be when we hear the evidence from these witnesses that it will be necessary to call additional witnesses. And in our earlier decision which constructed the witness list, it was made very clear that this list is not exclusive and that depending on the evidence, we may want to call other witnesses. We may want to call witnesses who are not even on the list that members of the opposition provided today because we don't know what we're going to find totally in this inquiry. And I think it's important to keep that in mind so that we know where we're heading.

I think that answers Mr. Hillson's question, as Mr. Shillington had mentioned earlier. And now that we have got this procedural business out of the way I think we should get ready to question the witnesses and do the work that we were mandated to do.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Tchorzewski. Mr. Hillson?

Mr. Hillson: — Thank you. I think it is important for the record to show that every single document requested by the opposition is now being produced. And yes, that is a start. I also certainly was interested to hear Mr. Tchorzewski say that we don't know what we're going to find when we get into all of this. And I think those sentiments reflect my own, Madam Chair. However, regarding the witness list there is one specific item I think should be brought up for the reaction of the government members today — no. 2, the Deputy Premier. Now it is said that as we get into this we may find particular witnesses on this list or even others are required, and I appreciate government members saying that.

Already in our work to date we appear to have a very stark contradiction between what has been said by the Deputy Premier and what has been said by the former CEO of SaskPower. So there is a clear example of where our work to date has already, I think, necessitated the calling of at least one member on this list.

If the list is indeed flexible and open, as has been indicated by Mr. Shillington and Mr. Tchorzewski, then I think they really should respond to the fact that already at this point there does seem to me to be a need to call the Deputy Premier to explain what appears to be a very direct and stark contradiction.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Chair, I'd be pleased to respond to Mr. Hillson and I should have included it in my earlier comments but I just took it as understood. Yes, as we hear the witnesses, the committee may need to decide to call further witnesses, based on the evidence that's provided. It may not, but that's something that the committee will have to judge as we continue with our work.

Secondly, Mr. Lingenfelter has made it very clear in the House and to the media that he is prepared to appear. And I see no reason, having . . . I'm prepared to take him at his word and I think other members ought to be able to do that, and I'm sure he will be able to appear when we question other ministers.

Secondly, since we are already calling the Saskatchewan Power Corporation before us, I would assume that all officials at the Saskatchewan Power Corporation needs to have . . . including Mr. Patrick, I think his name is referred to, should appear at that time. So I think that should pretty well clarify where we're going and we should get on with it.

The Chair: — I want to avoid us getting into unnecessary debate right now, and yet I want to make sure that everybody has a clear idea of the direction that we're heading as a result of the recommendations from the steering committee and so forth. I would recognize first of all Mr. Hillson in follow-up to this.

Mr. Hillson: — Yes. I'll not prolong debate, but in view of the comments we've just heard from Mr. Tchorzewski, do I take it then that there is agreement to add the names of the Deputy Premier and of Mr. Patrick to the witness list at this time?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I think they've indicated that they will appear, and I think we should take it at that, and just understand that they will come.

Mr. Hillson: — Then I respectfully submit that ought to be done, Madam Chair, and I'm prepared to move that.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — We should take it as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Hillson: — Yes.

The Chair: — We don't . . . we can't take anything as a friendly amendment, Mr. Shillington, in this committee because there's no motion before the committee. But we will eventually have some friendliness in the committee.

Hon. Mr. Shillington: — It's on the record.

The Chair: — Excuse me, could I have some order, please.

Mr. Tchorzewski: — I think the comments that have been made here are on the record and I don't . . . In order to simplify procedures, let's understand that we can take each other at our word and it'll be done.

The Chair: — I will, as Chair, take it as read then that I am being asked, when I schedule the witnesses, to include Mr. Patrick when I ask the SaskPower officials to attend on the committee. And right now that will be after we finish the questioning of Mr. Messer. And that I will also include Mr. Lingenfelter in the calling of witnesses, and right now I have scheduled Mr. Lautermilch to appear before the committee, and I will ask Mr. Lingenfelter to attend at the same time.

Is that agreed by committee members? I'm making that undertaking. Thank you.

Mr. Bjornerud: — One comment though, Madam Chair, because I still believe that we should have had that whole list. And Friday last the Premier admitted that he would come before this committee and testify and at the very end the last words he said: but only if asked.

Well he also admitted a few days earlier that he stepped in and saved Jack Messer's job. If he hadn't have done that at that point, Mr. Messer may not be here today because he wouldn't have had his job. And I believe it may have happened again in '96.

These are the things that we would like to have the Premier here to testify, and maybe there's other things at that point. All we are asking, that he was on the list and should we see the need to call him, that we would have that available . . . ability at that time.

What we're seeing here this morning is the government majority is ruling that out of order. And I'm sure what's going to happen down the road; we're not going to have the opportunity. They say, well we can add names down the road but that isn't going to happen. It didn't happen here this morning and it's not going to happen then.

And I think if the government is so willing to be open and accountable, that they should have gone along with this this morning and maybe the public out there could have believed them. That is not going to happen. It didn't happen now and I don't believe it's ever going to happen later.

The Chair: — Thank you, Mr. Bjornerud. I would simply, for the committee's information, point out to you that at our Standing Committee on Crown Corporations on March 31, last week, we did pass a motion dealing with the scheduling and calling of witnesses, and included in that motion was the statement:

And further, that it is agreed that this list is not exclusive . . .

So I will at this point rule that we are ploughing old ground. We've debated and discussed the question of witnesses. We've heard opinions from all parties on this matter. It is my opinion that the motion of March 30 stands. The list is not exclusive.

I've already made an undertaking to add two witnesses and I believe the discussion can now be considered closed for this morning.

Are there any other matters that committee members wish to raise?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Madam Chair, with that clarification and with passing of a very important motion which will make it possible for all of this vast amount of documentation to be officially tabled, I move that we adjourn.

The Chair: — Before I accept your motion, Mr. Tchorzewski, I would announce then that this committee will meet again on Wednesday, April 15, at 9 a.m. The matters of business will be the hearing of the witnesses; Mr. Don McKillop first, and secondly, Mr. John R. Messer.

And finally some members of the legislature and various members of the public have been asking me about the availability of transcripts of our proceedings. They are available as soon as they are typed in by *Hansard* and they are available on the Internet. I will once again give everyone the address so that you can find it. It is www.legassembly.sk.ca. From there you click on the committee's button and follow the trail down to the *Hansard* transcripts of this committee.

Mr. Tchorzewski, will you put your adjournment motion?

Mr. Tchorzewski: — Certainly, would like to move that we adjourn, Madam Chair.

The Chair: — All in favour? This meeting is now adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 9:52 a.m.