

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

May 2, 1995

The Chairperson: — I call the committee meeting to order. As indicated by our agenda that's been circulated earlier this week, we have two items to deal with. The first is election of vice-chair of the committee. The second is the completion or the continuation of the estimates and supplementary estimates for the Legislative Assembly.

In order to deal with this first item, for the election of vice-chair, what I would do is open it up for discussion or for nominations for the position of vice-chair.

Mr. Goohsen: — I'll nominate Don Toth.

The Chairperson: — We have a nomination. Don Toth has been nominated as vice-chair for the committee. Are there any further nominations? If not, are there any further nominations?

Mr. Sonntag: — I move nominations cease.

The Chairperson: — We have a motion that nominations will cease. Those in favour of the motion? Anybody opposed? The motion is carried.

And congratulations, Mr. Toth. But in order to make this completely official, we need another motion, which I have here. And the motion would read:

That Don Toth be appointed to preside as vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Estimates.

Do I have a mover? Mr. Sonntag. All in favour of the motion? The motion's agreed. Anybody opposed? Nobody.

We'll proceed then to item two.

General Revenue Fund Legislation Vote 21

The Chairperson: — Good morning, Mr. Speaker. I see you have some officials with you. Would you like to take a moment to do some introductions?

The Speaker: — Yes, I certainly would, Mr. Chair, and ladies and gentlemen. To my immediate left of course is Gwenn Ronyk, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly, and to her left is Marilyn Borowski, director of financial

services. To my immediate right is Marian Powell, legislative librarian. Seated on the north wall is Linda Kaminski, director of personnel, administrative services. And right next to Linda is Judy Brennan, the assistant librarian. And next to Judy — of course you know her — is Meta, Clerk Assistant. And to Meta's right is Bob Cosman, Law Clerk. Those are the officials.

The Chairperson: — Good morning, everybody. And we have before us the estimates for Legislative Assembly. The reference is page 96 and 97 of the main *Estimates* book and the *Supplementary Estimates* booklet on page 6.

Item 1

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Chairman, I apologize, I forgot to bring my *Estimates* book down, but until we get it, what's the total budget for your office, Mr. Speaker?

I would take it, as we're debating here, we're debating your office and the whole operation of the Legislative Assembly, including the library and Clerk's office and what have you. Would you have a total expenditure for that amount?

The Speaker: — Mr. Toth, could I just ask for some clarification? Do you mean just for my office, for the Speaker's office, or for the whole Legislative Assembly?

Mr. Toth: — The Legislative Assembly.

The Speaker: — 14.785 million.

Mr. Toth: — And that's for the total Assembly?

The Speaker: — That's correct.

Mr. Toth: — Out of that, what would be considered costs for your office, the Speaker's office? And maybe when you're giving that, who would be covered under the Speaker's office? Is that the Clerks or just your office directly?

The Speaker: — Okay, if you go to item 1 on administration, it's 1.576 million. That includes the Speaker's office. It includes the Clerk's office . . . or the Clerk, just the Clerk, not the Clerk's office, just the Clerk and the financial services — that's Marilyn Borowski's office — and personnel, Linda Kaminski's office. That's 1.576 million. If you just . . . in the Speaker's

office, it is myself and my two staff.

Mr. Toth: — But is the Speaker responsible for the administration of the legislature itself? Like, I mean, all the expenditures here, does it come under the purview of the responsibility of the ...

The Speaker: — That's correct.

Mr. Toth: — Now I was going through some of the global questions we sent down. Now ...

The Speaker: — I should add one quick thing, Mr. Toth, before you go on. On administration also — I did not indicate that — but it also includes all the computers and hardware, you know; that's 679,000 you will note there. That includes all the equipment and computers and things of that nature. I think we had an additional \$150,000 this year for computers, is that correct? ... (inaudible interjection) ... Yes.

Mr. Toth: — In your globals that you sent down, Mr. Speaker, you give a list of employees. Last year there were 213 in total. This year there's 214 and 48 out-of-scope permanent, 166 out-of-scope non-permanent, a total of 17 ... Is this 17 million nine two three? Or is that that number that was showing here? Or is that 17,000 per month that we're looking at for salaries here? The salary would be 4.351 million; that's correct for all them?

The Speaker: — Yes, that's 4.351 million under salary. I believe that's for all the staff, plus constituency assistants.

Mr. Toth: — Okay, well that's what I was just going to ask it because I didn't find any place where the constituency assistants or secretaries were included. And then anyone who would be paid directly out of Legislative Assembly must be included in here some place.

The Speaker: — Yes, that's correct. The constituency assistants are paid by the Legislative Assembly, but they're employees of the MLAs (Member of the Legislative Assembly). It's simply a convenience to the MLA that they are paid out of Legislative Assembly, but they are the employee of the MLA. The MLA hires the person and fires the person and so on and sets the salary within the limits. And so we are simply a convenience to the MLA for paying the person.

Mr. Toth: — Okay, so those individuals don't

show up as being part of the ... Are they included in this 214 number here then? They must be.

The Speaker: — Yes they are.

Mr. Toth: — And I note that we've got a reduction of two in the out-of-scope permanent, an increase of three in the out-of-scope non-permanent, and a reduction of ... quick figures here which show about \$17,000. That would be a \$17,000 saving in your expenditures this year. Where would those reductions have come in as far as the out-of-scope permanent?

The Speaker: — Mr. Toth, those are downward classifications in various areas and also the hiring of new people. As you know, Don Vaive left our service and went to B.C. (British Columbia), and he was replaced by Meta, and that was a considerable ... (inaudible interjection) ... oh, by Greg, I'm sorry. Well maybe I'm not so sorry, but no ... by Greg. And also we had other ... the Sergeant-at-Arms has been downgraded.

There have been others. For example Joyce Rublee left, and Monique came in, and she's at the lower end of the scale. Also in the Speaker's office you will note later on, both positions have been downgraded, and that was a saving. In fact in the Speaker's office there was a saving I think in '94-95 of \$2,076 by the downgrading.

Mr. Toth: — Well you talk about out-of-scope non-permanent. Are these contractual positions?

The Speaker: — No, these are the sessional people that we bring in.

Mr. Toth: — Well there's 166 out-of-scope non-permanent there.

The Speaker: — Yes. If you turn to page ... employee counts, March 31, 1995, you will note the non-permanent positions. It's your third page I think on your ... no, it's on this one here. It will list all the non-permanent staff there — government caucus, seven; opposition caucus, two; Liberal caucus, one; independent and so on, all the way down. Constituency assistants, 92; security, 10; and so on. Okay?

Mr. Toth: — I note we have 18 government caucus members. What would be the total sum paid to the government caucus just in ... that

would be the salaried positions paid out of the Legislative Assembly, I take it . . . direct?

The Speaker: — I am instructed that all the caucus employees — although the numbers are here — their salaries are not included in the global salary that we indicated. If you want to find out . . . well you can't find out the individuals, but the global is indicated in your *Estimates* on page 97 for the government caucus it gives you 562, and so on. They don't give us those details. They're the responsibility of the various caucuses.

Mr. Toth: — So basically the different caucuses have lump sum funds that they receive based on the number of elected members. And while they have a number of employees who are listed as being paid out of Legislative Assembly, they're not directly paid out of the . . . they're paid out of this caucus lump sum amount.

The Speaker: — That's correct.

I am told that the members' secretaries, if you look at the non-permanent seven, they are paid out of the \$4.351 million. They are included in there. But the other research staff and personnel that are hired by caucuses, they come out of your caucus grants.

It's not a clean situation that way we, you know, the board has decided on how to do this, and we may have to have a look at making that a more definitive statement as to how they should be paid and who . . . I think in the future I would hope that the board would have a look at that as to whether they should all be paid directly out of the Legislative Assembly office or whether they should all be paid out of the caucus grants. I think that's a future decision that possibly the board has to look at because right now it's a mishmash, Don, on who pays for what.

Mr. Toth: — So what you're basically saying is these employees really aren't officially paid by the Legislative Assembly, so you're not . . . the Assembly or this account is not aware of which employees are paid, who the employees are, and the list. They're just . . . Like a caucus grant goes out, and then the caucus determines who they will pay out of the legislative accounts.

The Speaker: — If the caucus ask us to pay out of their grant for their staff, then we know. But for the most part it is totally up to the caucuses as to who they hire and what they pay. But we do, I mean, there are . . . from

time to time, they do ask us to pay for some of their staff, and we do that, and then we know.

Mr. Toth: — Well I was just going to ask . . . that was the next question. Are any of the staff paid officially by the Legislative Assembly out of the caucus grant direct? There must be some. I'm sure there are some in our office that are. It saves the hassle, and they fall under then the guidelines of the labour standards and of all the other, holiday pay and whatever.

The Speaker: — That's correct. Just give us a moment; I think they can get that for us here. I understand seven government, one official opposition, and two government research people . . . oh, third party.

Mr. Toth: — Would that list of individuals be available to the committee?

The Speaker: — In the past, Mr. Toth, it was decided that that should not be at our liberty, that that was the caucus prerogative whether or not they wanted to make that list public or not.

Mr. Toth: — Well I think, coming back to a comment you made just a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can concur with you that where funds are paid directly — and the availability is there for the Legislative Assembly to pay for caucus staff — that it's certainly, I think, a fairer and, if you will, cleaner way of administering that staffing component — paying for it in the end. They all then would . . . those employees would fall under all the guidelines of The Labour Standards Act and would qualify for the other benefits, and it might be a more convenient and more acceptable way of covering staff.

And at the same time, what's left based on that grant then, the caucus would have still available for them. But I'm sure that any caucus group would probably find it more convenient, as I've done in my constituency office, to have cheques coming to cover staff directly from the legislature as to me to be signing cheques all the time. It's certainly isn't something that appears a lot of times even though you can be doing it as above-board as you feel and as wide . . . in the open, the public perception many times is you're trying to conceal something. So it may be an avenue to pursue.

The Speaker: — I think, Mr. Toth, you may be aware that both the Provincial Auditor in his report and the McDowell committee have

recommended that we look at that area, and certainly I would encourage members to recommend to their members of the Board of Internal Economy to bring forward something for . . . I mean it can't be done in the very near future, but certainly in the future . . . to have a look at that to see if there are ways in making that more definitive, more clear-cut so everybody knows exactly who is paid by whom and what their duties and functions are.

Mr. Toth: — Well I think, Mr. Speaker, and I guess it's something that certainly I've raised with our caucus, that sometimes when rules are set and changed or changes are made, probably the most appropriate time is prior to an election so that any time a group of individuals are elected or re-elected, you're basically starting with a new slate.

And if it's impossible today . . . it's unfortunate the board is unable to sit down and really hash some of this out and come up with some clearer definitions as to the understanding of the rules prior to the next provincial election so that it clarifies everything, and everyone knows they're starting with a clean bill, and they know that they're starting on a level playing-field. So if you have . . .

The Speaker: — You would get no objections from . . .

Mr. Toth: — If you have any influence there, Mr. Speaker . . .

The Speaker: — Pardon me.

Mr. Toth: — I said, if you have any influence on the board, Mr. Speaker, maybe you could relay those comments from the committee.

The Speaker: — Okay, I will do that.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, I also noticed . . . I was going through the list here, and I'm wondering where . . . a number of names of individuals that we work with quite regularly are omitted from this list of people being paid by the Assembly, and I'm wondering where they would show up. Individuals like Marilyn Borowski, Janis Patrick, Debbie Sentes, Gwenn Ronyk — are they in a different . . . under the Public Accounts, or where would a person find out about those individuals as far as salary and how they're paid?

The Speaker: — It's my understanding, Mr. Toth, that what we have on this list are the people who . . . oh yes, it's people who have

changed positions and people who have been terminated. You can find the salaries of the others in *Public Accounts*. They're all listed in *Public Accounts*. And the board members, the Board of Internal Economy members have them in their documents as well.

Mr. Toth: — The list of individuals I have given to you are then covered in the *Public Accounts* versus the list that you've forwarded to us.

The Speaker: — That's correct.

Mr. Toth: — This past year, Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Assembly and your office put together a bit of a video entitled, Lisa goes to the legislature. What was the final cost of that production?

The Speaker: — We were on budget at 40,000, I believe. But our share was only 15,000. As you know, there were a number of other departments and agencies that were also involved. The Legislative Assembly's share was 15,000, but we did come in on budget at around 40,000.

Mr. Toth: — And today, who have received all the videos or — I mean — copies of the videos besides MLAs? Would schools across the province have received a copy of the video, or how are you looking at distributing the . . .

The Speaker: — The Department of Education is handling the schools as to how they service the schools. And it could well be that it's done out of the central library; as you know, it's listed. And I think that's the way it probably works. It's listed on the central library, and schools that want it can simply ask for it.

But my understanding is that some MLAs have ordered a fair number. And the other thing is that I think there is some duplicating being done, or whatever you call it. Because people can't get a hold of it very quickly, they are making copies for their use before the end of the school term.

Let me just make a brief comment on this. It's one of my highlights, I suppose, in my political career is to get that film made. I've been trying now for a number of years to get something like that, and those of us who are in the school system know how valuable that particular video will be. And those who have seen it and have already made use of it have paid very high compliments on that particular video.

So it was well done. I think it portrays the

process very well, and it'll be a long time before I think it will be outdated.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you made a comment about computers and their costs, and I'm just trying to find . . . I think you mentioned it under administration. I would take . . . that's an update of the computer system within the Legislative Assembly you're talking about? And maybe you could give me a breakdown of cost again, of cost associated with it.

The Speaker: — Yes. Okay. I think before we find the details of it, I just want to make a comment. We've been very, very fortunate, in *Hansard* particularly. As you know, we've had I think two or three breakdowns last year while the session was on, and we were very, very fortunate in order to have it get back to work. And I think there was only a few hours delay before . . . but we had another breakdown, I think this year, but it occurred on the weekend. It occurred on Friday, I believe, so again we were fortunate. And then we were very fortunate last year to be able to — I think from the Workers' Compensation — to pick up some old, outdated equipment that they couldn't use but we could use — for \$500. So we were fortunate that way.

But Treasury Board was more than generous . . . No, I shouldn't say more than generous. They met our requirements this year, and we will be able to, I think, update our computer system in the Legislative Assembly office and *Hansard* to the extent that I think we will be probably on par with many of the others now. But I'll get that detail for you.

The Chairperson: — Mr. Speaker, in your remarks, I believe you used the words, Treasury Board. You were referring I think to the Board of Internal Economy.

The Speaker: — Oh, did I say Treasury Board? I meant Board of Internal Economy.

The Chairperson: — Thank you.

The Speaker: — My mind went back 20 years. Sorry about that.

Mr. Toth, last year's budget was \$305,920 for computers. This year it's 555,000, so it's a \$250,000 increase. And the increase is mainly due to equipment purchases. It goes from 94,000 to 280,000 — almost a \$200,000 increase; software purchases, an increase of 67,000. Systems consulting — if we're bringing

in a new system, we have to have somebody . . . we don't have the expertise in our system, so we have to bring someone in — an increase of 40,000 there; telecommunications, an increase of about 5,000. Equipment maintenance, that's down, of course you expect if you buy new equipment. So we're down almost 47,000 there. Training — we have to train our people — \$15,000 increase. And that gives you about the \$250,000 increase.

Mr. Toth: — Thank you.

The Speaker: — It's a replacement of most of the terminals. And when it comes to computers, I'm not the person to ask. I know nothing about computers. I don't seem to be able to understand them, and they don't understand me either.

Mr. Toth: — I was going to add, Mr. Speaker, I could have saved you some money; I could have offered you a computer. It may not have much value, but . . .

The Speaker: — Oh I have one of those too in my MLA office, I'm told, with a printer you could have with it.

Mr. Toth: — The unfortunate part is it created quite a controversy.

The Speaker: — Yes, they have.

Mr. Toth: — Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about computers and updating computers, is the Legislative Assembly on or looking at getting on the Internet?

The Speaker: — Could I ask just Marian to comment on that. Again that is just so foreign to me that, if you don't mind, I'll let Marian the librarian, just answer that. Okay?

Mr. Toth: — We'd prefer.

The Speaker: — I know you would. You are so kind.

Ms. Powell: — Well the library has a number of accounts that have access to the Internet, and one of the areas where the new improved computer equipment will help us quite a bit will be to extend the capability of our equipment to handle more accounts. It is new, but yes indeed we do have access to the Internet, and we're exploring ways that we can extend this to the MLAs with the new equipment.

Mr. Toth: — Well there's no doubt that computers can certainly open up the doors to a wealth of information. And maybe not all of it is good. I just . . . was it last week on the radio I caught the comments of a 14-year-old who had picked up through the Internet an idea of how to put a bomb together. So while we talk about the educational advantages, in some ways it certainly has opened the door for individuals, whether it's accidentally or whatever, to come across some other methods or ways of using the Internet. But I think in the long run, Internet is going to be a very beneficial tool too in our society.

One of the things that . . . or questions we would have is also regarding the transmission of the session by the Legislative Assembly and its access or the access that people across the province would have. And in view of the fact that we do have cable arriving in more and more communities — and now I believe that cable will even be accessible or available to the rural community and rural landowners — what is the Legislative Assembly doing to date in attempting to have the transmission of the session expanded to include more and more people, and how is the Assembly going about achieving this?

The Speaker: — We have been in discussions with SaskTel and have been pretty well assured that at the next session, meaning 1996, that they can have us on satellite, and we could probably double the number of viewers — I believe that's correct — double the number of viewers that will be able to see the . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, pardon me, no, double the number of locations, not necessarily people. So hopefully our discussions will be fruitful to that extent.

I'm given to understand that we've also been in consultations with Expressvu, which is that 18-inch dish, but there's still some negotiations with the federal government going on. And until they get it settled, there isn't too much more that we can report. But if they do get it settled, we should be able to cover the whole province.

Mr. Toth: — How many areas are covered to date as far as transmission of session?

The Speaker: — Eight.

Mr. Toth: — So you're just basically talking of larger urban centres then as far as . . . a lot of the small urban centres wouldn't have that capability then.

The Speaker: — Yes, just the larger centres that have cable right now.

Mr. Toth: — Why would a centre like Kipling or Moosomin not have access when they do have — I forget which cable service — Image Cable, I believe, is providing the service. Doesn't Image Cable have access to the sessional transmit?

The Speaker: — They don't have fibre optics though . . . do they? Cable?

Mr. Toth: — I'm not sure.

The Speaker: — No, well we'd have to run the fibre optic cable.

Mr. Toth: — Oh, I see.

The Speaker: — That's where the cost comes in. Once we can go by satellite, then of course . . . which hopefully will be in a few years.

Mr. Toth: — One of the questions that was picked up on through the global questions was the fact that we've gone from 35 staffers in *Hansard* to 27, I understand. Is that correct?

The Speaker: — It is my understanding that we are down to 27, and the reason for that is we just haven't had the opportunity to interview and hire new people and train them. They have to also be trained. So what's happening is the day staff now is also working the night shift. But we hope to correct that, I suppose, once the session is over and that people get more time to interview people and also to train them. They have to also be trained.

Mr. Toth: — So if I take it from your response then, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that 27 staffers just isn't sufficient to really cover it appropriately. We're probably short some staffers. Why did we have this significant reduction and not have individuals ready to fill in, or what was the purpose?

The Speaker: — Two reasons for that — fewer committee meetings so we don't to cover those, and we've only had one night sitting, so that has accommodated us. The night sitting is where we really need the staff, the extra staff; and since we sit very few nights now, that has certainly assisted us.

Mr. Toth: — So how do you achieve the reduction? Where did the reduction come in in staff members?

The Speaker: — We haven't eliminated anybody. People have simply resigned and gone on to . . . well wherever they've gone, and I know some have gone on to different positions. I know one is presently working in the Speaker's office, and the ones who are there now are working more hours.

Mr. Toth: — So the individuals that have . . . you mentioned some have retired or moved . . . I would take it they've moved right out of the Legislative Assembly to other positions of employments. Would these individuals have qualified for any severance from their positions or . . .

The Speaker: — No, no.

Mr. Toth: — As far as the reductions that we do see here in the staffers, have there been any concerns regarding the accuracy or the time limits of *Hansard* as in its availability, or have there any complaints that have been raised, or is the feeling that it's at least covering the job adequately?

The Speaker: — No, I don't think so, Mr. Toth. The only problem we've had was with equipment, and I think that will probably be corrected this year. No, that's the only real problem we've had, and we're just really sitting on pins and needles for the last few years on that one. But that should be corrected this year.

Mr. Toth: — So in other words we can have all the mechanical advantages and yet mechanical . . . our equipment doesn't necessarily mean we may not run into some problems or quirks. We can have as much mechanical error as human error.

The Speaker: — Oh yes.

Mr. Toth: — So the possibility is there.

The Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Toth: — I've got a question here. I understand there were as last . . . last year there were four contract positions. Are these attached to the operations of the Assembly or to one or more of the caucus offices, and I wonder if you could give us the nature and value of these contracts?

The Speaker: — I'm given to understand they are our two security people — that would be Iris Lang and Gerry Gamracy, and our two television technicians.

Mr. Toth: — In the area of staffing, I'm wondering how you could explain how your secretary -- and I'm not sure, it's a D. Saum -- warranted a 20 per cent raise from 2,579 a month to 3,079 a month.

The Speaker: — Mr. Toth, that was when Mr. Burgess resigned and went on to another position, I had a look at my office and I thought that I would like to reorganize it. And I was looking at how I should replace those two positions, and I came to the conclusion that I wanted to have one administrative assistant and one secretary to the Speaker.

And also there had been some concern in the past about calling one of my people an executive assistant. And that was in this . . . if you read the verbatim, that was mentioned several times in my estimates.

So I thought, well, to me it really doesn't make any difference whether you call them executive assistant or whether you call them administrative assistant. So I've reorganized the office a bit and have downgraded both positions. Debbie Saum is basically taking over the position held by Mr. Burgess, and Margaret Kleisinger has taken over Debbie Saum's position.

And they have both been downgraded or reclassified. And Debbie is now basically doing what Mr. Burgess was doing, except that there isn't nearly as much research that has to be done at this particular time. When I became Speaker, there was a fair amount of research that had to be done. The committees — we had the Rules and Procedures Committees and they were looking at a number of things that had to be done there. And Mr. Burgess was in constant consultation with other jurisdictions to see what they were doing as far as rules and procedures were concerned.

The Board of Internal Economy is also an area where we had to do a lot of work because they were revamping a number of things, and so was the Speaker making a number of recommendations to the board. And here again we were in consultation with other jurisdictions to see what they were doing.

Thirdly was the area of greening of the Legislative Buildings and areas, and here Mr. Burgess again was in consultation with Ottawa and other jurisdictions to see what they were doing so we could have a more friendly environment.

These have basically, I think, now been completed. And so in my reorganization I felt that Debbie Saum had proven herself well. I am quite confident in her abilities in running the Speaker's office, the administration part of it, and I think she's been very well received by all caucuses in dealing with the various caucuses, and when it comes to Board of Internal Economy and other areas. So she has been moved up from secretary to administrative assistant, and her replacement, Margaret Kleisinger, has been moved into secretary.

I wanted to find some area that I could put her salary scale at, and Debbie Saum's has been put at a senior secretary level, and Margaret Kleisinger's at a junior secretary level. And they, at the board meeting on Thursday morning next, the board, I hope, will approve those two positions and make them both permanent.

I have a commitment from board members — because we couldn't get a board meeting — I have a commitment from the board members that they will approve those two positions and make them permanent. So they will simply confirm them.

Let me say that it is a significant downgrade. Had the two positions remained the way they were the cost to the Legislative Assembly would have been 77,000; it will now be 63,000. So a significant downgrade of \$14,000 in the two positions over an annual basis.

Mr. Toth: — What do you mean when you say permanent positions?

The Speaker: — Well they are now non-permanent. And Margaret Kleisinger was hired I believe February 20 — I think that was the date — and so she's been a non-permanent. And as of May 1, I would like to make her position permanent. And Debbie in her position, the new position was non-permanent; she's permanent in the old position. But I want the board to make both of those permanent as of May 1.

Mr. Toth: — When you indicate ... by permanent, does that mean then that those positions and those individuals, when an election is held and a new Speaker is elected, that the new Speaker automatically receives ... those employees work for that member, rather than that Speaker having the ability to rehire their own staffing?

The Speaker: — Those positions have always been permanent. Those positions have always been permanent, it's simply two positions in the Speaker's office have always been there — I shouldn't say always, but they've been there for as long as I can remember. It's simply the individual in that particular position may for a time period be non-permanent while they're on a trial basis, and then you make it permanent. The position is permanent. The individual may not be permanent at that particular time.

Mr. Toth: — So what you're saying then, say after the next election with a new Speaker, the Speaker could still choose to bring his own ... his or her own employee or individual to fill those positions.

The Speaker: — That's correct.

Mr. Toth: — Be permanent, but the person may not necessarily be permanent there.

The Speaker: — That's the chance you take, I guess.

Mr. Toth: — Well I noticed you mentioned about — is it Darwin ...

The Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Toth: — ... transferred to the Minister of Environment. I'm wondering what you mean by transferred.

The Speaker: — He left my position. He left my office, and I know he went over to the Minister of Environment. That's all that's meant by it.

Mr. Toth: — Because I would take it that if he left your office he would have been offered a position, and you wouldn't actually transfer him out of your ...

The Speaker: — No, that's not meant that way.

Mr. Toth: — Because when you use the word transfer, it's like, well I've decided to move him into ... a better position has arisen. And I think we all view the Speaker's office as basically being a non-partisan, although the reality is it may not be as reflected as non-partisan as the position would be viewed to be seen. And to use the word transfer, it's almost like it's a means of accessing another position within government and it consists of ... maybe from your comments, it's just a poor

terminology.

The Speaker: — Yes, well, Mr. Toth, that certainly was. I had, I think, virtually very little time. I mean the opportunity came. He came to me, said, look, I had this opportunity. He wanted new experience, and I mean I wasn't going to stand in his way. I mean I was very satisfied with the work he did for me. He wanted new experience and so I said, fine. And he left, and he went over to the Minister of the Environment.

But I can assure you that two people that we — and I think I'm correct in saying this — the two people that I have hired are as non-political as they can be. They were hired out of the Legislative Assembly Office. They were working somewhere in the branches of the Legislative Assembly. And they are as non-political as they can be. I don't think . . . well I know they don't belong to any political party; they are not connected with any political party. And I think that's the way it should be. So I'm very pleased with the two people that I have at present in the office.

Mr. Toth: — You're talking about the present employees?

The Speaker: — That's correct.

Mr. Toth: — Okay. On your personal report, you talked about reclassification conversions. You've got reclassification for '94 of four individuals. And then you've got aggregate net cost, and you've stroked out the cost and mentioned savings of \$5,300. And I'm wondering where these reclassifications were and how the savings were achieved.

The Speaker: — We have in the Clerk's office — I think I mentioned this earlier — secretary to the Clerk, Joyce Rublee left, and Monique Lovatt came in, and there was a saving there of twenty-five ninety fourteen. And secretary to the Clerks at the Table, Pam Scott, took over from Monique Lovatt and there was a saving there of seven zero eight sixty-eight. And the two positions in the Speaker's office, two thousand seventy-six ninety-two, and that makes a total of fifty-three seventy-five seventy-four savings.

Mr. Toth: — What was that for the Speaker's office again?

The Speaker: — Two thousand seventy-six ninety-two.

Mr. Toth: — So basically what you're saying then is these individuals have come in. When Joyce retired, Monique came in and started at a lower level.

The Speaker: — Lower, that's correct.

Mr. Toth: — And Pam Scott would be basically coming in starting at, if you will, the bottom. I'm not sure where she can come from.

The Speaker: — She's at the bottom of the range.

Mr. Toth: — But she would be starting at a range which would be lower than what Monique would have left. And the same with your office staff.

The Speaker: — Same with . . . yes.

Mr. Toth: — That's fine. There's a line in here talking about costs for the Standing Committee on Crown Corporations. It appears to have gone up significantly. Last year we had a total cost report of thirty-five seven twenty-two. And this figure appears . . . figure this year looks to be in the neighbourhood of 76. I've got a notation, by adding support and members' costs. So was there an additional cost that was added to this that hadn't been included in previous years that would have raised that figure? Or what's part of the reasons for the substantial increase in Crown Corporations Committee?

The Speaker: — There were significant increases in the intersessional meetings, also more intersessional meetings, if you look on the . . . well, simply down the line at the top where it says, meetings, you will note that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts had 12 meetings. The Standing Committee on Crown Corporations had 21 meetings, intersessional meetings.

Mr. Toth: — These are all the intersessional meetings.

The Speaker: — Last year they only had 14 meetings. This year they had 21. Last year is also the 35,000 I believe or . . . 35,000 only included the members' cost, did not include - *Hansard* support cost.

Mr. Toth: — Oh I see, so . . . The understanding I had it was the other way around -- that last year it only included the support cost, not members' cost. So in reality, it would be much closer than what it appears

then by including both costs, members' and support costs.

The Speaker: — Yes, it would be closer. But I don't think the *Hansard* support cost would be that much.

Mr. Toth: — In the area of advertising versus last year, I see some increases in the number of areas: media replacement rising from 205 to 704; other placement from sixty-seven nineteen to eighty-one fifty-four; career placement from 379 to 1,700. I wonder if you could give us an explanation as to the reasons for these costs, why were they undertaken, and how they have risen?

The Speaker: — Mr. Toth, if I could just . . . we don't have the details here, and we'd have to get you the details, but we think that they are basically for advertising for staff positions. For example, the assistant Clerk, I think, was advertised right across Canada. I'd have to get you the details; we just don't have those details here. But they tell me that they can get you the details and we'll forward them to you. And I don't know why they would be under two different codes . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Oh, okay.

The media placement, I'm told, is not . . . That's for tours, the advertising of the Legislative Building. You know, there's some advertising that takes place as far as the Legislative Building is concerned, and tours of the Legislative Building and so on. But let us get the details for you on those two. I can't quite give you the details on them right now. Okay?

Mr. Toth: — Yes, that's fine. It can be sent in writing as you respond to the . . . (inaudible) . . . questions.

The Speaker: — We'll get you the details.

Mr. Toth: — In regards to that.

We talked a minute earlier or a few moments ago about the legislative video of Lisa going to the legislature. Do you anticipate that there will be any . . .

The Speaker: — *Lisa Visits the Legislature.*

Mr. Toth: — Right. Do you anticipate any further costs? Or is the production or the distribution of that video now totally in the hands of the Department of Education, and the costs associated with distributing that will be done following their purview and there will be

no further costs associated with that coming out of the Legislative Assembly?

The Speaker: — The only other cost that we have budgeted for is for additional copies of it for MLAs and for our own use here. We have some demand from other legislatures who would like to have a copy, and we do make those available.

And it's very . . . We don't want to charge them because so often we are also requesting stuff from them, so I think overall it works out fairly evenly. So when they do something in their legislature and it's of great advantage and we think we can use it, so we request from them. So we are making some copies available to other legislatures, and I think it's also good advertising for Saskatchewan.

Mr. Toth: — What kind of costs would be associated with that? Have you anticipated what you might view as . . .

The Speaker: — It's about \$7.50 per copy, but I can't tell you just what.

Mr. Toth: — So it just depends on how many copies you produce a year.

The Speaker: — Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Toth: — I believe we talked about purchasing new computers. And I'm not sure, in the globals you talk about 28 new computers? Where would these be located? Would most of these computers be in the Legislative Library, or are they throughout the Assembly — some in *Hansard*, some in the Assembly office?

The Speaker: — I'm told that they're primarily — we're talking about last year, right? — they're primarily in the library, some in the Clerk's office, and some in financial services. And this year, this coming year, hopefully we'll do the rest.

Mr. Toth: — I understand as well, last year you bought out the lease on 34 computers to the tune of 20,000. Are these old computers that you're now replacing? And when you're talking about buying out a lease, I would take it then that a lot of these computers were on a lease agreement versus an owning or purchase to own agreement.

The Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Toth: — Why would you enter into a lease rather than purchasing? Or is it possible to

lease and then update computers and continue to lease? And is the Assembly still leasing the eight computers?

The Speaker: — It's my understanding that in 1989 it was the going thing to lease rather than purchase. We entered into a five-year agreement with Digital at that time, and that lease has come to an end. And so we simply bought out the . . . I think it cost \$20,000 to buy it out.

Mr. Toth: — And I guess that comes to the other question. At the end of the day, and in view of the fact that computers and computer technology changes so rapidly, would it be much simpler to just continue to lease and have the updates continually flowing into your system as to purchase and own, and then have to turn around and basically what you'd be doing is dumping a pile of computer equipment that in a matter of two or three years has very little value versus the replacement cost of that computer.

The Speaker: — Two reasons for that. Two reasons why we're not pursuing that avenue any longer is, one, we found it cost us more to lease than to actually purchase. And secondly, with the accrual accounting system now, your total lease has to be upfront in the first year. You can't average over the term. So it would be just a big outlay for the Legislative Assembly in its first year because you have to . . . everything's got to be right upfront.

Mr. Toth: — I believe there's one comment, moving away from the . . . or maybe one further question regarding computer equipment. When computer equipment is I guess retired, if you will, does that go to Property Management; they then sell it off? Or how does the Legislative Assembly turn around and dispose of computer equipment?

The Speaker: — Yes, you are correct. It goes to salvage. I said to her, did you say garbage? That's where it probably should go.

Mr. Toth: — Well then when you look at it, it's amazing what type of value a computer has even after two years. It's worse than a car for depreciation, isn't it?

The Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Toth: — Just one other question, a note that the Clerk gave up her CVA (Central Vehicle Agency) vehicle. What would be the reasons for the Clerk giving up a CVA vehicle? Or maybe I should put it this way -- I wasn't

aware of the fact that the Clerk had a CVA vehicle.

The Speaker: — Yes she does have a CVA vehicle, as other deputy ministers have access to a CVA vehicle. That was a personal choice on her part to give it up and . . .

Mr. Toth: — So does the office then still have access to two CVA vehicles? Or the Speaker just has one vehicle available to him now?

The Speaker: — Just the Speaker. Yes, the two that you have left now are the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Toth: — And would there be a list of all manuals, reports, or any other publications put out by your office in the past year? Would that be available, or is that something that you'd have to make available to us?

The Speaker: — Yes, it just wasn't provided because it wasn't asked for this year, I guess. But they are available, and they're basically the same as last year, right? Yes. I can read them to you if you want.

Mr. Toth: — Well maybe you could just do a copy after and send them to us, and we'll just put it together with these global questions you sent before.

The Speaker: — Oh, well, okay. I have to take that back a bit because these are more general. We don't give the . . . I mean, some, for example, the last one on here is Government of Saskatchewan financial and payroll manuals. They are used by financial services. I mean you don't want copies of each one of those, I assume.

Mr. Toth: — What was provided last year?

The Speaker: — Just the list.

Mr. Toth: — Yes, that's fine. We can always pursue that. Once we've got the list, we can pursue any further information we would need from the list.

The Speaker: — Yes, okay.

Mr. Toth: — This time I think those are the questions I have.

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you. I just want to follow up on a question that Mr. Toth had, actually with respect to the equipment that goes to SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation). Is that list made

available? I'm thinking in practical terms. I know we've had discussions about this in the past. Is there lists made available for MLAs once they are at that central location?

So I guess what I'm asking is, how can we practically use some of that equipment? I know in my office I have one computer, and I'm looking for a new one. And to me, it would seem logical this would be an easy way, and I don't need a high-tech machine. I'm looking for something used, and yet somehow we've developed a system that hardly allows for us to take advantage of a situation like that.

The Speaker: — I think that question has to be directed to SPMC. We don't know exactly. We do know they advertise it to the public and the MLA have same. Whether or not you could phone SPMC and say, well look, I'm looking for such and such a computer, would you have something like that available so I could purchase it for my MLA office? I think you have to go through SPMC. We just don't know whether they would do that. We don't know that.

But let me . . . I think MLAs after dissolution certainly would have access to . . . because there are going to be eight fewer constituencies. There's going to be some stuff available. I suppose you could inquire of the Legislative Assembly Office as to what equipment is surplus equipment.

Should you be re-elected, you could I think, come to the LAO (Legislative Assembly Office) and say okay, I know there are eight fewer MLAs; what equipment is surplus and do I have an opportunity to purchase some of that for my office through the MLA allowances? And I think that . . . but that's all turned over to SPMC. But we would know what surplus equipment there would be and then you'd have to go to SPMC and deal with them.

Those things have not been worked out. I'm hoping — I hope I'm not speaking out of line here — but I'm hoping on Thursday that the board will deal with some of that because I have an item like that on the agenda as to how to deal with dissolution, you know, and that has to be dealt with by the board. Now if the board doesn't deal with it, then I suppose the Speaker will just have to make some decisions.

Mr. Sonntag: — Yes, I don't again . . . on this one I don't ask you for a comment but just say that it seems to me that we put ourselves in a

position where we almost force ourselves to spend more money on equipment than is necessary. And it would just seem logical somehow . . . and I mean I understand the public perception, but it would seem logical somehow that we should be able to transfer some of this used equipment from one office to another and use it.

The Speaker: — Well we're hoping that we can facilitate the MLAs on that after Thursday's meeting. I don't want to prejudice what the board is going to do but hopefully we'll have some information for MLAs after Thursday's meeting — maybe next week or so.

The Chairperson: — Thank you, Mr. Sonntag.

Mr. Goohsen: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was away just for a minute so maybe you've covered this, but I just wanted to refer to page 6 on the *Supplementary Estimates*. And under the Legislation, vote 21, it starts off with a requirement for 74,000 additional dollars for the Legislative Assembly service under (subvote LG03) Legislative Assembly Office. And in the explanatory notes it goes on to say that the "Additional funding was required to provide for the increased number of days the Legislative Assembly will be in session . . ." And I would like to know what rationale was used to determine this assumption.

The Speaker: — Yes, Mr. Goohsen, because the budget has to be written in the fall we have to do some guesswork as to how many days we think we will be sitting in the old year, and the fiscal year ends on March 31. So we have to try and anticipate the best we can as to how many days it will be sitting in February and March before the end of the fiscal year.

And we budget for 76, but in this particular case we felt that there would be more sitting days than the 76, and we were correct. We sat for 82, and that's where the additional sums come in.

Mr. Goohsen: — Now that was all of the sitting days during the fiscal year — two actual sessions were included in those numbers, or parts of it.

The Speaker: — That's correct. It overlaps, parts of it.

Mr. Goohsen: — That's okay; I understand. So if you have the inside track a little bit with whoever's calling the session to order, you could have a better chance of being on

budget?

The Speaker: — That's correct. But we don't always have that inside track.

Mr. Goohsen: — Well, I guess it would help, though.

The Speaker: — Yes.

Mr. Goohsen: — Okay. The second item that is mentioned here, of course, is the \$126,000 for committee support services. Now I think you might have answered that but I'm not sure. The two new legislative committee members in the explanatory notes, were they alluded to, or who are they?

The Speaker: — These are the driver safety and the independent committee on MLA pay.

Mr. Goohsen: — Okay. Those are the two. And that was pretty well a cost that was budgeted for by each committee and then you could determine how much to budget for. Were they within budget, pretty much?

The Speaker: — Pardon me.

Mr. Goohsen: — Are they pretty much within budget?

The Speaker: — Yes, I think so. The independent committee is under budget and the driving safety is almost right on.

Mr. Goohsen: — I had anticipated that we might have been a little under, being on the driving committee, so I thought we were keeping it under a little bit . . . but anyway. That's all the questions I had, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

The Chairperson: — Thank you very much. Are the members ready for the question? Item 1.

The Speaker: — By the way, if I could just make one further comment. On that 200,000, because we cannot anticipate some of the cost, we ask for a warrant to cover that, and we may not need any of the 200,000. We may be able to do it without the 200,000, and we think we won't need very much of it.

But we have to make sure that we cover it, so we have to ask for a warrant and some of these costs are . . . we just don't know exactly what they're going to be. So that 200,000, very little of that probably will be used.

Item 1 agreed to.

Items 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

The Chairperson: — We now have a motion which would read as follows:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 1996, the following sums, General Revenue Fund budgetary expenses:

For Legislation..... \$4,610,000

Do I have a mover for that motion? Mr. Carlson.

All in favour of the motion? Motion is carried.

Then we have another motion. It's a ways and means motion minus two interim supplies, and the motion reads as follows:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996, the sum of \$3,458,000 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

Do I have mover for the motion? Mr. Sonntag has moved the motion.

Those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? Motion is carried.

Supplementary Estimates 1994-95

General Revenue Fund Legislation Vote 21

Items 1 and 2 agreed to.

Vote 21 agreed to.

The Chairperson: — Now we have two corresponding motions again for the supplementary estimates. The first motion being:

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 1995, the following sums from the General Revenue Fund:

For Legislation..... \$200,000.

I have to have a mover for the motion. I have a motion by Ms. Hamilton. All in favour of the motion? Motion is carried.

And the follow-up motion:

Be it resolved that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1995, the sum of \$200,000 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

A mover for the motion? Motion is moved by Mr. Toth. Those in favour of the motion? Anybody opposed? Motion is carried.

Before we proceed to the adopting of the report, members will recall that when we passed the ways and means motion for the Provincial Auditor, that at that time the interim supply had not yet been passed.

In the intervening time the interim supply motion has been passed, and unless members would like to see the Provincial Auditor receive money twice — a twelfth through interim supply and also a portion through here — we should really have a motion, which has been prepared by the Clerk's office, to make an adjustment to that number. So I would ask that this motion be passed by the committee.

I'll read the motion first:

That the ways and means motion for vote 28, the Provincial Auditor, which was adopted by this committee on April 27, 1995, be rescinded; and further, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses to the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1995, the sum of \$3,282,000 be granted out of the General Revenue Fund.

I don't want to rush through this. I want it to be clear why we're doing this, and if members have a question or two about it, I think this would be an appropriate time to ask.

Mr. Upshall: — We just passed two-twelfths. We passed one-twelfth a month or so ago and we just passed two-twelfths now. How does that fit in with your motion? Are we granting nine-twelfths . . . or eight-twelfths rather . . . nine-twelfths, or are we granting eleven-twelfths here?

The Chairperson: — This motion is to reduce

the amount to be granted through this *Estimates* by the amount that was granted instead through the last interim supply.

Now in terms of twelfths, I think this would now come down to seven . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . So this would grant nine-twelfths.

Mr. Upshall: — Good. Thank you.

The Chairperson: — Because the other three-twelfths have been granted through interim supply.

Ms. Hamilton: — Would we be contacting the auditor's office? Because I know that while the auditor was here we had made the original motion, and just so that it's clear with their office and they're not concerned about what the change is and the rescinding of the motion.

The Chairperson: — Yes, I believe that the Department of Finance will be in contact with him on this; they're the ones that gave us the figures for it. So this is for our own housekeeping purposes to keep the records of this committee accurate.

Do I have a mover for the motion then? Mr. Upshall. All in favour of the motion? Anybody opposed? The motion is carried. We have a couple more procedural motions. Next one that I'll read out is:

That this committee recommend that upon concurrence in the committee's report, the sums as reported and approved shall be included in the appropriation Bill for consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

Do I have a mover? Moved by Ms. Hamilton. And those in favour of the motion? Opposed? The motion is carried.

The last motion will be:

That the draft report be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

That's this draft report. Do you want to take a minute and peruse it? Done. Do I have a mover? Mr. Toth. Those in favour of the motion? Those opposed? The motion is carried.

Mr. Toth: — I'd like to take a moment to thank the Speaker and the staff of the Assembly, library, and legislative accounts for coming and joining with us this morning and responding to

a number of the questions we've had. Thank you very much.

The Speaker: — Mr. Chair, may I just respond also. I certainly want to thank the committee in the manner in which they have dealt with not only the Provincial Auditor's estimates but the Legislative Assembly estimates. I certainly appreciate the questions that were asked and the manner in which you have dealt with it.

And secondly, I do want to, since this is probably . . . not probably . . . well probably is my last estimates that I will be dealing with in this Legislative Assembly, I would like to thank the staff who . . . you couldn't really ask for a better staff to deal with. They deal with their work in a very professional manner, from the library, financial services, personnel, and Legislative Assembly; it's been my pleasure to work with them.

So I want to thank them personally also for the work that they have done and preparing the budget and helping me in preparing for my estimates. So thank you very much. And thank you, the committee again, for the manner in which you've dealt with the Legislative Assembly estimates. Thanks.

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess I as well, on behalf of the government committee members, want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and your staff as well. We appreciated your direct and complete answers. So thank you very much.

Mr. Upshall: — I'd like to add my words of thanks too. I happen to, I don't know how it is, sit on a number of committees that deal with Legislative Assembly, from the budget . . . (inaudible) . . . to this committee in the last two or three years. I really want to say thank you to Mr. Speaker for your handlings, and to the staff. We really appreciate all that you've done. Thanks.

The Chairperson: — Well thank you very much, members of the committee and staff, for your diligence and your homework that you've been doing in getting through this. And with that, I'll take a motion of adjournment. Moved by Mr. Upshall. Those in favour? The motion is carried. The meeting is adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 10 a.m.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES

May 2, 1995

MINUTE NO. 10

8:30 a.m. in Room 10

1. **PRESENT:** Mr. Kowalsky in the Chair and Members Carlson, Goohsen, Hamilton, Sonntag, Toth, Trew, and Upshall

Officials Present:

Honourable Herman Rolfes, Speaker
Gwenn Ronyk, Clerk
Marilyn Borowski, Director, Financial Services
Linda Kaminski, Director, Personnel and Administrative Services
Marian Powell, Legislative Librarian
Judy Brennan, Assistant Legislative Librarian
Robert Cosman, Legislative Counsel and Law Clerk

2. The position of Vice-chair having become vacant Mr. Goohsen nominated Mr. Toth.

It was moved by Mr. Sonntag:

That nominations for the position of Vice-chair cease.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

3. It was moved by Mr. Sonntag:

That Don Toth be appointed to preside as Vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Estimates.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

4. The Committee adopted the following resolutions:

Main Estimates, 1995-96:

- i) Resolved, that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ending March 31, 1996, the following sums:

For Legislation \$ 4,610,000
(Mr. Carlson)

- ii) Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996, the sum of three million, four hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars be granted out of the General Revenue Fund. (Mr. Sonntag)

Supplementary Estimates, 1994-95:

- i) Resolved, that there be granted to Her Majesty for the twelve months ended March 31, 1995 the following sum:

For Legislation\$ 200,000
(Ms. Hamilton)

- ii) Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1995, the sum of two hundred thousand dollars be granted out of the General Revenue Fund. (Mr. Toth)

5. The Committee reconsidered Vote 28 for the Office of the Provincial Auditor in consequence to the Interim Supply Appropriation Bill which was Assented to by the Assembly on Friday, April 28.

It was moved by Mr. Upshall:

That the Ways and Means motion for Vote 28 (Provincial Auditor), which was adopted by this Committee on April 27, 1995 be rescinded and further;

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1996, the sum of three million, two hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars be granted out of the general revenue fund.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

6. It was moved by Ms. Hamilton:

That this Committee recommend that upon concurrence in the Committee's report, the sums as reported and approved shall be included in the Appropriation Bill for consideration by the Legislative Assembly.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

7. The Committee considered a draft report to the Assembly.

It was moved by Mr. Toth:

That the draft report be adopted and presented to the Assembly.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

8. It was moved by Mr. Upshall that:

That this Committee do now adjourn.

The question being put, the motion was agreed to.

9. The Committee adjourned at 10 a.m.

Gregory A. Putz
Committee Clerk

Myron Kowalsky
Chair