



Standing Committee on Communication

Hansard Verbatim Report

No. 4 – June 16, 2003



Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan

Twenty-fourth Legislature

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION
2003**

Hon. P. Myron Kowalsky, Chair
Prince Albert Carlton

Carolyn Jones, Vice-Chair
Saskatoon Meewasin

Graham Addley
Saskatoon Sutherland

Dan D'Autremont
Cannington

Doreen Eagles
Estevan

Rod Gantefoer
Melfort-Tisdale

Doreen Hamilton
Regina Wascana Plains

Peter Prebble
Saskatoon Greystone

Brad Wall
Swift Current

The committee met at 11:05.

The Chair: — I apologize for the attempts on changing the date. We had to do it a couple of times but I had to get a quorum as well. So now that we've got one I think we can proceed.

And you've got three items on the agenda: consideration and retention, disposal schedules; a review of the Legislative Library annual report; broadcasting legislative proceedings and related issues. I propose to go through them in that order and are we okay with the agenda, gentlemen, ladies, members?

Then I would like to call at this time, Adrienne Cottrell, archivist of government records branch and Anna Stoszek, archivist of government records branch as well. Welcome and what I'd like to do is ask you for a statement and your recommendations.

Ms. Cottrell: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I'd like to extend my apologies on behalf of Trevor Powell, the Provincial Archivist, who could not attend here today. He's called out of town on an urgent personal matter.

Before I get started with reviewing the actual schedules, I thought it might be helpful to briefly go through the process involved in developing these schedules before you and what's involved in bringing them forward from departments and agencies in government.

The Archives Act establishes a system of accountability of information created and maintained and disposed of. The Archives Act outlines the process of records disposal in the province, and how we do this is through the development of records retention schedules.

There are two types of records retention schedules, administrative and operational, and I believe you have examples of both of them before you today. The schedules provide a description of both the administrative and operational records created within government and they establish minimum retention periods. So all of the retention periods before you are suggested minimums. The departments can certainly keep their records for longer than we have outlined there.

I believe that the development of schedules speaks to the concept of accountability within government. It shows that departments and agencies are accountable for the information that they create. And that's particularly important right now because the public is very concerned about privacy and the government's role in protecting personal information. I also believe that schedules help the government themselves and the public to be confident that their information is being used and disposed of in an accountable manner.

The scheduling process begins when a department, Crown, or agency contacts the archives with the need to develop a schedule. Staff at the archives branch, at the government records branch of the archives, work closely with department officials to establish the retention periods listed before you. The retention periods that you see reflect administrative, fiscal, legal, and archival values of the records. A draft of the schedule

is then forwarded to legal counsel and then signed off by the deputy minister or permanent head of the department or agency. Schedules then go to the Public Documents Committee which consists of the Provincial Archivist as Chair, officials from the Department of Justice, Department of Finance, and the Legislative Librarian, as well as one other representative from another department.

Officials from the departments appear before the Public Documents Committee and provide information on the schedules that you see listed. The schedules, once they are approved by the Public Documents Committee, are then sent by our minister, the Hon. Joanne Crofford, who tables them in the House for review by this committee. Now following your review and, hopefully, approval of the schedules, they are then returned to the Assembly and given the authority under which the department, board, or agency may use the schedules that we propose.

Now having gone through this process, there is one further level of accountability and I'll just briefly touch on that because that's how the archives is intimately involved with collecting records. Once a department, board, or agency has decided that they wish to dispose of their records, they contact the Saskatchewan Archives Board.

The schedule . . . The information is listed on the schedules and then the archives plays a role in reviewing the information in the disposal request. Staff reviews them to ensure that all of the mandatory minimum requirements are met. Then they appraise the records in question and, if the records have enduring archival or historical value, they are then transferred to the archives for permanent retention. If they do not possess archival or historical significance, they may be destroyed by a department. The department is always given a letter authorizing this disposal, and that is the way they remain accountable to the public.

One final note on the schedules before you: 352 to 355 are operational schedules meaning that they have been worked on by people from the departments as well as the Archives Board. Schedule 356 is a revision of schedule 326 which is a common administrative records system which we've been using in government for the past 10 years. Now this is a revision of that schedule. It has included two years of work by the Saskatchewan Archives Board and I invite you to review it today. Thank you.

The Chair: — Thank you very much. Are there any questions at this time? If not, perhaps you could just proceed.

Ms. Cottrell: — Thank you. Schedule 352, if you have . . .

The Chair: — This would be a time for comments or questions with respect to 352. The recommended motion is:

That the retention and disposal schedule no. 352 of sessional paper no. 135 of the fourth session of the twenty-fourth legislature be adopted.

Moved by Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. Prebble: — Mr. Chairman, can I suggest an alternate way of dealing with this unless you need a motion on each one. Perhaps you do. But if not, like I have only have four . . . I have four items that I have concern about; everything else by me is fine.

Now members may not have had an opportunity to review this, in which case we should go through it one by one. But otherwise I just suggest that we turn to the ones we've got concerns about and then approve it all. Can we do it that way?

The Chair: — You've heard a suggestion by Mr. Prebble. Agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Prebble: — Are you sure? I don't want to run in . . .

A Member: — No, that's fine.

The Chair: — All right. Well perhaps you could just . . . And in order to save time, let's just . . . We can have a combined motion. Let's go ahead with the questions then on that.

Mr. Prebble: — The ones — just so that you have . . . can flag these — I've got a concern about 1485, 2455, 4580, and 5265.

Ms. Cottrell: — And they're all in schedule 356?

Mr. Prebble: — Where will I find that? Sorry, the schedule number isn't on the paper.

Ms. Cottrell: — Oh, then it is 356.

Mr. Prebble: — Yes, okay.

Ms. Cottrell: — The first one, please?

Mr. Prebble: — Well the first one I'm concerned about is 1485, Mr. Chair. And my concern there is under 1485-50, ministers' speeches, and 1485-30, deputy ministers' speeches, which I think should be retained for more than six years. Otherwise intent can only be checked through *Hansard* records or through going back to the archivist.

I think it's very useful for ministers to be able to sort of see what other ministers said. I would keep these for 20 years; I would not throw them away after six years. Because otherwise people are forced to go back into archives to find what, you know, was intended or meant. So that's my concern with respect to that one.

2455 and specifically 2455-02, which is disposal of hazardous materials. By the way, this has come up before. And I would just like to suggest that I think our . . . you and our other officials are doing an excellent job in terms of preparing these schedules.

But when it comes to materials, records of materials that future generations may need a record of, this is not something that the archivist will necessary think of in terms of historical value. I doubt it has any historical value. But it can be very useful for a future generation to know if material, for instance, is declared hazardous that is not considered hazardous now, or is banned 10 years from now but it wasn't banned now. Like to know where

the records of these materials are is very useful.

I think actually these things should be kept around for 50 years. They ought not to be thrown away lightly. And this will not be caught by the archivist, understandably, because the archivist will be asking, has this historic, historical merit. And clearly it doesn't. But it is very valuable information for a future generation that may have very different standards for how hazardous materials are handled than we will have. So I think these records should, as a matter of standard course, be retained.

Ms. Cottrell: — Well I'd like to speak to that, if I may.

Mr. Prebble: — Yes, of course.

Ms. Cottrell: — I just wanted to remind you that everything in schedule 356 are administrative records. So what we're discussing here are records that are commonly found in every government department. We're not discussing the records, for instance, of the . . . of Saskatchewan Environment department, who would contain . . . And certainly they handle the records dealing with hazardous waste and material, and those records are not disposed of after six years.

Mr. Prebble: — Okay. Because those I thought we dealt with last year.

Ms. Cottrell: — We did actually.

Mr. Prebble: — Okay so this . . . in that case I take that back and I don't have that concern. Thanks for clarifying that.

And I probably therefore don't need to worry about the concern I have around hazardous material information in schedule 5265-50 for the same reason. Is that the case?

Ms. Cottrell: — That would be.

Mr. Prebble: — Okay, great. And then, Mr. Chair, the only other concern I have then, apart from the one about ministers' speeches, deputy ministers' speeches which we obviously need to discuss, is I have a concern again about the disposal of Treasury Board minutes. And maybe this concern could be dealt with if the archivist perhaps is retaining these. But it seems to me that we don't really want to dispose of these after just six years, unless the Provincial Archivist is basically holding all these as a matter of historical record.

Ms. Cottrell: — And they are. Treasury Board minutes are.

Mr. Prebble: — And they are, okay.

Ms. Cottrell: — The other thing I should point out to you here is the fact that anything must meet its listed retention period before the archives can even collect that record. So in order for us to collect Treasury Board minutes, they have to exist within the department or within Treasury Board for six years before we even have a crack at it.

Mr. Prebble: — Right. And then . . . but these then as a matter of standard course, these would be retained, would they?

Ms. Cottrell: — Permanently within our collection.

Mr. Prebble: — Okay. And isn't that the same . . . is that also the case with ministers' speeches, deputy ministers' speeches?

Ms. Cottrell: — Generally that's a matter of appraisal, depending on the speech itself. But usually with ministers' speeches and deputy speeches, most material relating to those individuals are kept collected.

Mr. Prebble: — So I think, Mr. Chair, actually most of my concerns have been addressed. The only matter, I guess, for ongoing debate would be the retention of ministers' and deputy ministers' speeches, which I'd actually like to see kept on hand for a longer period of time. But other than that, you've addressed all my concerns and thank you so much for doing that. Thank you for the thorough work in preparing. Many hundreds of hours go into working all this through for us, so thank you.

Ms. Cottrell: — Thank you for your attention.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. I have one question and it relates to the report you have here, the administrative records management system for Saskatchewan government departments, boards, etc. A lot of the records and information is now being retained in a digital medium. I'm wondering what procedures you have in place to make sure that you can continue to read the various mediums. You know, we started off with the eight-inch disk, and then the five and a quarter and the three and a half and now we're on to CD (compact disc).

Do the archives either transfer the information to the new mediums as they become available or do they keep machines available to read the old mediums? How does that work?

Ms. Cottrell: — Well that's a good question. And it . . . that's a question that archival institutions are dealing with across the country right now. Within the departments themselves in order to keep a record, first of all you cannot dispose of anything without the authority of the Provincial Archivist. If you're keeping records on hand for longer than they are supposed to be retained for, we require that every time you upgrade a system, that you migrate that information to make sure that it's compatible with the information that you have.

In terms of the records that we are collecting, we are still struggling with that point itself because information does come to us on CDs and in various digital format, and we have to keep that information updated ourselves. So the information that we do collect, we migrate in order to read it; but within the departments themselves, we require that they do so.

Mr. D'Autremont: — You say you're struggling with it. Is it a question then of being able to continue to transfer them, the fact that you have machines available to transfer to any new medium or is it a question of time and money to be able to allocate to that kind of a procedure?

Ms. Cottrell: — I can't really speak to that. I would have to refer that to the Provincial Archivist, but I think it's a bit of both actually.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you.

The Chair: — So we have one motion then:

That retention disposal schedule nos. 352 to 356 of sessional paper no. 135 of the fourth session of the twenty-fourth legislature be adopted.

Moved by Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. Prebble, you're okay with your suggestions? Is that satisfactory?

Mr. Prebble: — I'm okay with all of them, except that I think I'd like to propose that deputy ministers' and ministers' speeches be kept for 15 years . . .

The Chair: — Okay.

Mr. Prebble: — . . . instead of six. And I'm fine with all other, all other provisions.

And that's . . . Just for easy reference, this is 1485-30, 1485-50. Those would be the only exceptions.

The Chair: — I will repeat the motion to clarify. What we'll do is go through two motions, one for items 352 to 355 and then a separate one for 356 which will deal with yours.

Mr. D'Autremont moves:

That the retention and disposal of schedules 352 to 355 of the sessional paper no. 135 of the fourth session of the twenty-fourth legislature be adopted.

Is it the pleasure of the group to adopt the motion? Motion is carried.

Moved by Mr. Prebble:

That the retention and disposal schedule for items 1485-30 and 1485-50 be amended to read 20 years.

Is everybody . . . Any discussion on that? All in favour? Carried.

Then the . . . I need a mover:

That the retention and disposal schedule for 356 of sessional paper no. 135 of the fourth session of the twenty-fourth legislature be adopted.

Mr. Prebble. Any discussion? All in favour? Motion is carried.

We need some signatures. Thank you. And could you ask Mr. Prebble to sign those for us, please?

Thank you very much, Adrienne Cottrell and Anna Stoszek for coming before this committee and presenting things so succinctly and for the efficient work that you do on behalf of the archives.

Ms. Cottrell: — Thank you.

The Chair: — I would now like to welcome Pat Kolesar to the

table.

The item before us is a review of the Legislative Library annual report ending March 31, 2002, and members will have received a copy of that report and this is the opportunity to ask any comments or questions you might have on that item.

Would you like to make a comment, Pat?

Ms. Kolesar: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to highlight a couple of the points that are raised in the letter of transmittal for the reports. Just to point out that we were very pleased to note again a continuing increase in the use of our reference services by MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly) and caucus staff, and also the progress we've made on the introduction of more timely MLA news clipping services based on electronic sources.

The introduction of the special edition service began in the year covered by the report which you have in hand, and in the next report year, 2002-2003, we will report that all members receiving profiled news clipping services were moved from the old manual clipping basis service to special edition.

And in the current fiscal year we began offering members private direct-access accounts to special edition. All members received a personal offer of this service and so far 11 members are currently availing themselves of it. Interestingly, most of those who have taken up the new service have also requested that we continue to provide them the weekly profiled service in hard copy as well.

You may also have noticed that we have been running a free trial of a news feed on the members' portal. The raw news feed has been filtered to include stories of particular interest to Saskatchewan MLAs, and if member response to this service is positive and if we are able to get a satisfactory price for it, we will be requesting funding to continue offering this feed in our next budget request.

With respect to the increase in the use of reference services and the increasing complexity of the types of questions we've been asked to deal with, this is good news that also introduces a disturbing trend that will become more apparent in the current year, and that is that demands for professional librarian services on the reference desk and to support the profiled members' services continue to increase, but the number of librarian hours available has actually declined by the equivalent of almost a full-time equivalent between the report year 2001-2002 and this current year.

This situation hampers our ability to make satisfactory progress on a number of strategically significant activities which affect our ability to maintain and improve the timeliness and quality of the services we provide to members. For example, developing additional content for the members' portal; refreshing the design and content of the library's pages on the Assembly's public Web site; adding value to the information we provide to members that would save them time, for example by summarizing or tabulating information from multiple sources; and ensuring that the library's collections meet members' needs through regular and systematic review and selection of new materials for purchase. And this is to name

only a few.

The Chair: — Thank you very much, Pat. Any comments or questions at this stage?

Mr. D'Autremont: — I'd just like to comment that I think that the library has done an excellent job in the services that they provide, and I'm especially pleased with the digital and the new portal system that's available. And I would encourage other members to utilize it as well.

Ms. Kolesar: — So would we. Thank you.

Mr. Wall: — Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I too think the portals project is very worthwhile. I wonder if you could give us an idea of how many MLAs, roughly or approximately, do you think are taking advantage of it?

Ms. Kolesar: — I'm not sure at this point. The last number I heard reported was 17 . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . About 20, Mr. Barnabe has just told me, so it's increasing slowly.

The Chair: — Well thank you. I too would like to express on behalf of the entire committee and all the members for the innovations and also the . . . and in addition to doing the innovations but you also have got to keep up with the old stuff too at the same time, so thank you very much.

Ms. Kolesar: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Chair: — And we don't need any motion on this. Do you have a comment you'd like to make?

Mr. Prebble: — No, the services that I've received are excellent, and I do use the library quite a bit so I'm most appreciative.

Ms. Kolesar: — Thank you.

The Chair: — So thank you very much for attending to the committee.

Ms. Kolesar: — Thank you.

The Chair: — The third item is broadcasting legislative proceedings and related issues, including the state of the broadcast equipment. And we've asked Gary to come, Gary Ward, to come here. Gary, would you come to the table please. Kerry Bond and Ihor Sywanyk are with him.

And particularly in view of the expert work that was done on behalf of the group about two weeks ago when we had a failure, and we thought it would be good at this time just to do a little review as to an assessment of where we are. So, Gary, I'll just turn it over to you.

Mr. Ward: — Okay, Mr. Speaker. I'm here in response to a request for a report on the state of the broadcast equipment. Everyone I think has a copy of that. And in the report . . . The main reason for my report is just to make clear that the audio system in the Chamber is in trouble if we don't do something about it within a fairly short period of time.

The system that we have is identical to the one that's used in Ottawa and they have had theirs one year longer than ours and they are replacing theirs as well for the same reasons that I want to replace ours. Fortunately they haven't had any breakdowns as we did and the one we had was the one and only one that has ever caused the adjournment of the House.

We've had a number of breakdowns over the period of years but they've always been easily solved without any interruption to the proceedings. But the type of problems we're experiencing now are more serious than that and require a fair amount of time and investigation to find the source of the problem.

Other than that the broadcast system, as indicated in my report, is in pretty good shape. There will be some things that will have to be replaced over the next number of years but the immediate items that I'm concerned about just is the audio system in the Chamber.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you. Thank you, Gary. Your crew certainly did an excellent job in getting us back up and operating after we were down for that one day and did it without it costing us really any money.

But it is an embarrassment when our House procedures cannot be carried on for the day because we have a technical problem in the equipment. And it's not because of the fault of the staff at all, it's because the equipment is so old. And I think probably this committee should be recommending that that equipment be upgraded so that we can have proper service in the Assembly.

And while the . . . When it works, it works well. You can certainly hear the member that's up speaking, even though there may be a bit of background noise, you might say, at the same time. The quality of the voice comes through very well and you can clearly hear what someone is saying.

But we can't have the House being shut down on an ongoing basis because of technical failures. And with the problem that arose earlier this spring we didn't know if it was going to be just the one day or if it was going to be more than one day. Because the availability of equipment is . . . This is 25-year-old equipment and there are no parts for it other than salvage parts from other operations. So I think we need to be seriously looking at replacing this as soon as possible. And a recommendation from this committee probably would go, hopefully, some way in encouraging those changes and making those funds available.

The other question I'm interested in: you have some figures here on if the approval is given to make a change to the broadcasting, the audio side of things and putting in new microphones at all the desks. Would it also be appropriate, if that was to happen, to make the changes to the wiring for Internet services and for plug-ins? Would that not be an appropriate time to do that as well?

Mr. Ward: — It would be appropriate. Other than the . . . The system that we're currently looking at — and it's only one of a few — doesn't require any rewiring on our part but it does require modification to the console on the desk because the microphones are different. They don't come out of the console like that. They're a gooseneck microphone that sticks up. More

like this type of thing.

But I agree that probably it would be a good idea if you're going to make any changes, do it. If you're going to have AC (alternating current) power there, computer connections, that type of thing will require some rewiring. Probably be a good idea to get it all done at the same time.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Thank you, Gary. So if you're changing the console, that would seem to be the time then to put those in, even if they weren't connected up at that particular point in time, rather than making changes to the console again at another year or so.

Mr. Ward: — Yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay.

Mr. Wall: — I'll probably defer to Ms. Jones. I have something probably on a different topic, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Jones: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a question of process, I guess. You and I and Mr. D'Autremont are all members of the Board of Internal Economy. And I'm wondering about the process of members of one committee recommending to themselves on another committee that something be done. And I think I find myself a little discomforted by that notion. It's kind of like petitioning yourself to do something.

So, you know, having been a member of the Board of Internal Economy for a number of years, I'm quite sure that Legislative Assembly broadcast services are quite capable of bringing their own report and their own recommendation to the Board of Internal Economy.

So I simply wanted to raise it as a matter of process. It seems a little strange to me.

The Chair: — The committee operates independently and it is well within the mandate of this committee to make recommendations with respect to communications, televising, Internet, and that.

The final decision of the board of course is based on factors in addition to recommendations received from other committees, the main factor being I would think consideration of the financial aspect of it. So I don't believe that a member would be compromised by being part of a recommendation coming out of a committee like this, and whereas you're taking it to a board, then you might have other factors to consider. And the most that this committee can do, I believe, is make recommendations.

I hope that clarifies it. I don't know if that does for you or not. The other option any member has of course is abstaining from any vote that takes place.

Back to Mr. D'Autremont then first.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay. Thank you. On another issue but in your report again, Gary, you mention that the equipment for room no. 10, this room, the upgrade for televising of committee hearings was approved by the Board of Internal Economy, to be

worked on this spring.

What is happening in that area? Have the funds been made available to you? Have you put out tenders for the equipment, and exactly what's happening there?

Mr. Ward: — Well as of now, nothing has happened. We'd decided to wait until after session to begin with, and pending approval of funding to proceed, we'll go ahead when session ends.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Well the Board of Internal Economy did approve the spending. I think the number was 190-some thousand, give or take. Is that funding then not in place?

The Chair: — Perhaps I'm in a better position to respond to that question than Gary. The funding is in place and what we're waiting for at this stage is to go through the design phase, then the purchase phase, and then the costing phase, pardon me.

When we get the costing then what we plan to do at the Legislative Assembly Office budget is to take a look to see just how much money, how much of that that was authorized that we're actually going to have to put our money in for, and submit it so it can all be delivered on time.

Mr. D'Autremont: — How do you mean, submit it for? If the Board of Internal Economy approved the money, is not the money then made available?

The Chair: — Well there's still, my understanding is that there's still some process that it has to go through in terms of it has to be submitted to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Assembly Office has not yet submitted that money, submitted for that until we . . . simply in an effort to be as frugal as possible.

We never do know exactly when the election is coming and whether we're going to be over budget or under budget, and there may be other items that we may have to submit for as well. So when the money is needed we have the authorization to submit for it and that's the time we plan to do it.

Mr. D'Autremont: — What kind of an impact will that have on the proceeding then to implement and complete this program. It's supposed to be happening following this session. Let's say sometime in July we get out, will the money then be available to start to get the tenders and make commitments at that time?

The Chair: — Yes.

Mr. D'Autremont: — Okay, thank you.

The Chair: — Any further questions? All right. If not then, thank you . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, sorry.

Mr. Wall: — On another matter. Now that we have Gary here, what's the current status with the ongoing — well maybe it's not ongoing — but the dealings with SCN (Saskatchewan Communications Network) in terms of the signal from the legislature?

I mean, I think the question period rebroadcast is still happening on SCN is it not, every morning? I guess, what's the status there?

It still is arguably the best vehicle to broaden coverage of the legislature to the rural areas of the province as the small dishes continue to proliferate, especially in rural Saskatchewan, and those small ones can access customers to SCN. So there's still the same opportunity and I wonder if you could just briefly update if there's any new developments there with respect to the . . .

Mr. Ward: — No new developments. We're rebroadcasting every morning throughout our system on any of the cable stations that will carry us.

Unfortunately the local cable station, Access, doesn't carry us in any of their locations. They have switches that switch us on for the live proceedings and off after that, immediately after that. So all of our rebroadcasts don't go out to Access customers, but they do get out to a fairly large portion of the others that aren't limiting, like they'll have a dedicated channel for our rebroadcasts.

SCN (Saskatchewan Communications Network) does do a rebroadcast at midnight, of the beginning of the day through the members' statements and question period.

Mr. Wall: — There's not one in the morning any more on SCN? Last year weren't they doing one at 8:30 or . . .

Mr. Ward: — I don't know if they actually still carry that one right before their opening of their daily show or not. I can't say for sure.

Mr. Wall: — And has there ever been any discussion, as far as you know, between yourselves or maybe someone else at the Legislative Assembly Office and SCN about why it would be that they wouldn't consider either live coverage for, you know, when routine proceedings begin or some other more viewable or viewer-friendly time for the rebroadcast? Again because this is a way for much more of Saskatchewan to access, should they want to do that, to access the proceedings.

Mr. Ward: — Well no, they've never considered us as part of their regular daily broadcasting, programming. It's never been something that they've, you know, that they've wanted to do. They seem to have a full schedule of programming. The rebroadcast was just something that they were doing for us at my request.

Mr. Wall: — Thank you.

Mr. Prebble: — Just a question, Mr. Chair. Sorry, Gary, I just wanted to give you a chance to focus here.

Will you be making a proposal to the Board of Internal Economy? I'm just conscious of the fact that this committee usually just meets once during the session. And I'm not sure if we're the committee to really deal with . . . I really appreciate getting the report. I'm assuming that you would make up a budget proposal to the Board of Internal Economy on a new audio system. Is that accurate? Is that the route you're

anticipating going?

Mr. Ward: — The budget that I have indicated in this is based on a quote of a company that installed our original system here, and they're probably the only ones qualified to make that kind of a guesstimation over the phone. Without coming here and spending time doing a you know, full workout, this is, I would say, a ballpark estimate but fairly close.

If the committee, if the Board of Internal Economy would like a detailed budget, I would have to get a pretty firm quote.

Mr. Prebble: — Sure. But what I'm trying to say is you'll be — rather than us making a decision about whether to recommend this or not — you'll be going to the Board of Internal Economy on this, right, and proposing to them a new audio system. You'll be recommending that?

Mr. Ward: — I am recommending that now and, if that is the process, then I'll be going to the Board of Internal Economy. As I said, my attendance here was by request.

Mr. Prebble: — Yes. Well it's very useful for us to have the update, but I'm just conscious of the fact that this committee won't meet again probably for another year. And as long as we know that this is . . . Mr. Chair, this will go before the Board of Internal Economy I assume, will it, as a matter of due course? Or will we . . .

The Chair: — Well I think what will happen is we . . .

Mr. Prebble: — . . . do we need to deal with this in the form of a recommendation or can we simply leave it with the Board of Internal Economy to deal with?

The Chair: — I believe that from the Legislative Assembly Office what we will be doing is assessing and making a recommendation for a budget for next year's budget on this.

But my feeling is that members, as many members as possible ought to be informed and it is within the mandate of this committee to kind of oversee and make recommendations on this. And that's why I brought it forward.

But it's up to committee members to decide exactly how it is that they want to handle it from here. We can use it as an information item or make a recommendation.

Mr. Wall: — Well thanks, Mr. Speaker. I mean I think this is exactly the right committee. I don't sit on the Board of Internal Economy and I think this is exactly the right committee that would speak to communications issues and recommend . . . make recommendations to other committees or to the government and just indicate support if we think it's something that's worthy of that support and affects the business of this committee. Mr. Prebble's right, we don't meet very often so we should take the chance to wade in on issues that . . . where this committee's opinion is warranted.

The Chair: — Thank you.

Mr. D'Autremont: — I'm prepared to move . . . make such a motion that we would:

That this committee recommend a review, replacement and update of the 25-year . . . review of and replacement of and update of the 25-year-old audio system for this Assembly.

A Member: — That's what it says?

Mr. D'Autremont: — That's what that sort of says.

The Chair: — All right you've heard the motion as proposed by Mr. D'Autremont.

Mr. Addley: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say I support the motion given that there was the broader discussion that more of the detailed information will be handled at the Board of Internal Economy. If it were not, then I'd be wanting to know things like comparison assemblies — what they've done, the costing, how long it will take to install, that sort of thing. But given that this is a recommendation for Board of Internal Economy to review and look at, I have no problems with this motion. I support it.

The Chair: — Thank you. Any others? Then the motion before the committee is:

That this committee recommend a review to replace and update the 25-year-old audio system in the Saskatchewan Assembly, Legislative Assembly.

Mr. D'Autremont: — If I can make a slight change. Perhaps that recommendation should say, recommend to the Board of Internal Economy. Would that be appropriate or just the motion itself as it stands is appropriate . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, well at least we made the recommendation to somebody then rather than just general.

The Chair: — Will the members accept that into the wording? Then the motion will read:

That this committee will recommend to the Board of Internal Economy a review to replace and update the 25-year-old audio system in the Saskatchewan Legislative Assembly.

All those in favour of the motion? Motion's carried.

The last item is a motion to present a report to the Legislative Assembly. Mr. Kaczkowski was distributing an amended version of . . . or a version of the proposed report. I'll give you a moment to go through it. And what we'd need to do is add to the last sentence, the committee also considered issues related to the broadcast of the legislative proceedings and recommended . . .

Mr. Kaczkowski: — . . . and recommended that this committee recommend to the Board of Internal Economy a review of . . . a review to replace and update the 25-year-old audio system.

Mr. D'Autremont's recommendation or the committee's recommendation now would just be included in the last paragraph of the report. And that's the way I'd present . . . it would be presented in the House.

The Chair: — Are members in favour of adopting this report? I

need a motion then. Would somebody move the motion? Mr. Addley. And the motion being:

That the draft report of the Standing Committee on Communication be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

All in favour of the motion? Okay.

And thank you very much, Gary, to you and Ihor and Kerry for attending; and Guy, for coming and being on standby.

Motion to adjourn? Motion to adjourn, Mr. Wall. All in favour? Motion is carried.

The committee adjourned at 11:49.

