



# **Standing Committee on Public Accounts**

## **Hansard Verbatim Report**

**No. 29 – June 20, 2002**



**Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan**

**Twenty-fourth Legislature**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
2002**

Ken Krawetz, Chair  
Canora-Pelly

Ron Harper, Vice-Chair  
Regina Northeast

Pat Atkinson  
Saskatoon Nutana

Rod Gantefoer  
Melfort-Tisdale

Keith Goulet  
Cumberland

Judy Junor  
Saskatoon Eastview

Carl Kwiatkowski  
Carrot River Valley

Warren McCall  
Regina Elphinstone

Lyle Stewart  
Thunder Creek

Milton Wakefield  
Lloydminster

The committee met at 09:00.

**The Chair:** — Good morning, everybody. We'll start with our meeting for this morning. And we'll await Ms. Junor's arrival as well, noting that of course we have nine members present.

We circulated a copy of the first draft of the activities of the Public Accounts Committee since our last report. And that was given to each of the members, as well as circulated to the comptroller's office and through to the auditor's office.

A few comments have come back regarding some changes, and Margaret has worked on a number of the changes to change the report. And what you see before you as well now is draft no. 2, which will contain some of what I would call the housekeeping changes — reference to numbers and to any other grammatical things that have been changed.

A sheet is before you as well that are edits that were suggested from the auditor's office or they were notes raised that we should discuss to determine whether or not we want the current report to remain as is or whether there was some intent to do something different in some of the comments. And as you can see by the page we have references to page 1 to 29 and not all pages.

So I think we'll spend some time on each page as we move through. If someone has flagged a concern with any page or any item on a page that has not been identified, please raise that, okay, so if there's something that you've noticed. Because we want this report of course to be number one, factually correct; and number two, to be accurate in all aspects.

So, Margaret, maybe . . . before I begin, I'm sorry, I should ask for introductions since we have some people that were unable to be here and we have stand-ins. So, Brian, begin with you.

**Mr. Atkinson:** — Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. My name is Brian Atkinson. I'm with the Provincial Auditor's office. And it's also my pleasure to introduce to you Rodd Jersak, a principal with our office, and also one of his major duties is to help coordinate our activities with this committee.

**The Chair:** — Good. Thanks. Brian and Rodd, welcome.

**Mr. Bayda:** — Okay, and Terry's in Toronto this morning so I'm here — Chris Bayda. And with me is Larry Boys, also with the comptroller's office. Larry's a manager in our office.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Good morning and welcome, Larry and Chris.

Okay. Let's start with the draft no. 2 and refer to your page no. 1. And we have two suggestions on that page. And I'll just quickly highlight the first one that's noted on our page of edits. It says you could say the Fall Report, Fall 2000 Report, Volume 3, is completed because the only chapter outstanding is the Board of Internal Economy which will be repeated in a subsequent report.

Is that . . . that's not incorporated in . . .

**Ms. Woods:** — That is in draft no. 2.

**The Chair:** — Okay. Oh, the word "done." Sorry. Okay.

Second one, on page 1 as well, refers to two instances of deferrals when there were more instances, that is: Board of Internal Economy; Chief Electoral Officer; Agriculture and Food, three recommendations; understanding the finances of the government; Municipal Affairs, Culture and Housing, two recommendations; as well as the SLGA (Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority) and SIGA (Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority) issues that you refer to as postponed due to an RCMP investigation.

Paragraph reworded. Any questions?

**Ms. Woods:** — What was done in that case was, instead of the word "two" in the first line we put in "several," and then at the start of the second sentence there was another change there. No, maybe that one was the same actually.

**The Chair:** — Is there any problem with that rewording? Agreed? Okay. Then there's no problem then. Let's move on to page no. 2.

Page no. 2, a short comment there. It says in the first paragraph of section II, it would be best to remove the phrases "for the Province of Saskatchewan" and "the accountability of" to better reflect the role of the Audit Committee. And you can see that first paragraph on page no. 2 with its . . .

Removal of "Province of Saskatchewan" in that first sentence and then also the removal of "the accountability of," to strengthen the accountability of the standing committee.

So it's . . . is the suggestion that we would still use the words, "This new Audit Committee was designed to strengthen the Standing Committee on Public Accounts"? Is that the . . . Any problem with that?

Okay. Then we'll incorporate that . . . those suggestions by removing those two phrases.

Page 3, done. Right? Thank you, Mr. Gantfoer, for pointing that out. We won't spend any time.

Page 4, a letter from Deputy Clerk previously distributed. Does PAC (Public Accounts Committee) wish to address this issue? I need an explanation there.

**Ms. Woods:** — I've got copies of that letter if the members are new to the committee or they didn't receive one at the last instant. It was actually sent out on April 3 of 2001. It wasn't brought back before the committee, because we didn't have the Board of Internal Economy chapter in front of the committee. So it was never actually dealt with.

The suggestion was that since we've got the letter, did the committee want to read it and then make a decision on that particular chapter 13 of the '99 Fall Report, or do you just want to leave the statement as it is in the report, because that's what the committee did decide when we did deal with this back in

early . . . I think it was December 2000.

**The Chair:** — 2000, right, yes. Okay, so if you note the paragraph that is in there right now, it says:

Your committee chose to defer considering this chapter pending a report by the clerk on the Standing Committee on Public Accounts' practice regarding the review of (the Public) . . . Auditor's reports on the Board of Internal Economy.

On April 3, 2001, our committee received a letter from the Clerk's Office . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I think so. There are new members, so I know new members wouldn't have that copy . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . We're on page 4. Sorry, the page 3 one was done. Okay, there's that little word, "done," there. I missed that one. Technicality — sorry. Yes, it's . . . the page 4 suggests a change.

Now what happened was our committee did receive a letter but we have not dealt with it, so the suggestion there is, do we want to address this issue and have it incorporated in our report? Do we want to deal with this issue at a later PAC meeting which would then mean in a later report? The information would be contained in a later report, and this is a letter of well over a year ago because it's April 3, 2001.

I'll just give you a minute to read the letter.

Okay, everybody through it?

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Well I'll make a comment that maybe putting at risk this letter and this issue become stale-dated, the report that we're looking at is a report of what we've done to date so far and I think we should just indicate that this paragraph then is still appropriate.

**The Chair:** — Mr. Wakefield's suggestion is that the letter that we received will be dealt with at another date and therefore the report would stay as is. Consensus? Consensus, okay.

Ms. Woods is making a suggestion that we include in that paragraph that a report was received from the Clerk's office which is factually accurate. Is there a problem with that? That the letter . . . that a letter was received from the Clerk's office? No problem with that? Okay so we'll include just that. No decision on it because it will be . . . we have made no decision.

All right, our next suggested edit is on page no. 6, and it's section X, Department of Education, and we're going to recommendation no. 2 which is in the middle of the page. It uses the word "wishes" and does not include a recommendation. Okay, it's at the very last part of that recommendation. It says:

. . . and further that the Committee wishes to allow these steps to be implemented before deciding upon the issue.

Do we want to have any recommendation there? Basically we were saying until the department moves forward, we weren't making a decision on the issue.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Mr. Chair, I would suggest that the

committee recommends these steps be implemented before deciding upon the issue. Instead of a wish, make it a recommendation.

**The Chair:** — Okay, we have that . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Delete "wishes to allow" and put "recommend."

**The Chair:** — Comments about that? Does it change . . . does it change our intent as a committee when we dealt with it at that time?

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Well I think the committee's intent was to allow this to go through the process. And that was our . . . the word is wish. But I think that could be just as easily made as a recommendation because it doesn't change the fact that we want this period of time to occur.

**The Chair:** — Okay.

**Mr. Harper:** — I don't think it's . . . (inaudible) . . . if you drop the words "wishes to allow" and replace that with "recommend." I don't think it changes the intent.

**The Chair:** — It doesn't change the intent. Okay, as long as there's consensus that that doesn't. So we'll be removing those words "wishes to allow" and replacing them with "recommended that these steps," or whatever correct terminology will be used there. Yes, yes, it'll have to be grammatically correct, right.

Okay, page no. 9. On page 9, which is the Department of Finance section, Section XIV, recommendation no. 4. And that's also contained in the middle of the page. It uses the word "notes" and does not include a recommendation as well. It says:

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts also notes that this issue will no longer exist in the 2000-2001 . . .

Consensus that this is fine as is? Leave as is? Okay. No problem.

Now we have no problem off the . . . unless there are any pages in between 9 and 20 that anybody wishes to make reference to?

We'll go to page no. 20. This is dealing with recommendation no. 10. It says, does this need to be a separate recommendation since it repeats the decision made regarding recommendation 9-1 of the 2000 Spring Report.

Its reference . . . 9-1 is being referred to on the previous page at the very bottom where, the committee has decided to defer a decision on this recommendation until a future meeting of the committee to allow members the opportunity to review the Lloydminster Housing Authority audit and that will be December 31, '99.

And then we're saying that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts defer its decision on this recommendation as well.

**Mr. Harper:** — Well, Mr. Chair, in light of Rod's comments in regards to consistency, perhaps we want to retain this so we can

have some evidence of consistency.

**The Chair:** — I don't see anyone raising too much of a problem on that one. Leave as is? Consensus? Agreed.

All right. Page no. 24. On page 24 which is section XXII, dealing with the improving accountability, we have recommendation no. 12 uses the word "notes" and again does not include a recommendation. Just to go through that, "the committee notes the progress achieved thus far between the Department of Finance . . ." and its implementation on the recommendation the committee . . . And I'm recalling discussion. We were actually saying that we weren't making a recommendation; we note progress. Yes, we've done that a number of times by saying note progress. So no problem? Keep as is.

Page 25, recommendation 13 and same situation, noting progress I would imagine is . . . Well this is a little bit different. It's:

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts also notes the Public Sector Accounting Board (PSAB) may report on this issue.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — There's also in the first paragraph, "notes that the province currently provides financial accountability . . ."

**The Chair:** — So I guess it's the use of "notes" is twice . . . I'm not sure which one was being referred to, or both maybe . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . probably both, okay.

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Mr. Chair, do we get some of these out of where we concur and note progress, or did we not even concur? Because quite often in our decision we will concur with the recommendation and note progress.

Now I wonder, did we lose the concurrence part of this or . . .

**The Chair:** — Does anyone recall our discussions on this?

I know that the last "notes" would not refer to concurrence. It's just saying that we're recognizing the fact the PSAB is going to be making a report on the issue. That's just . . . "notes" is just a different way of saying that we recognize that . . .

**A Member:** — Acknowledges.

**The Chair:** — Acknowledges, yes. Thanks. But I don't know. In the first one, were we talking about the recommendation as being concurred in?

You don't think so? Brian says he doesn't think so. It's just that we were noting that the government provides financial accountability. So I'm not sure then that "notes" is an inappropriate word. It probably would . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Well it doesn't speak to the recommendation at all though. I mean we don't either concur or disagree; we just sort of leave it hanging and make those notes.

And I wonder, in the past we generally have either concurred

with or not concurred with and noted some reasons why we would take that position. And I'm wondering why we just sort of left these things hanging. I don't recall the specifics of the discussion but it sort of is unusual that we just would leave things hanging there and not either concur or disagree.

**Mr. Harper:** — It's out of character for the committee to do that.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — And it is a recommendation.

**The Chair:** — Right.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — But it's not clear what it's recommending.

**The Chair:** — If you look at the wording of it, it almost implies that we did not concur with the recommendation being made, whereas . . . Because if you look at the middle of that same page under "Key processes to plan," it says, your committee concurs with the recommendation. It's very explicit, where we don't concur or do concur.

Here we either . . . In the expression of not concurring, it didn't come out that way. Or did we do . . . or did we mean something else? That's the thing we have to decide on this morning.

Since it's the financial section, Chris, any comment there? Can you recall from your notes?

**Mr. Bayda:** — No I can't recall . . . (inaudible) . . . my notes yet.

**Mr. McCall:** — . . . deferral in terms of, you know, consideration once the PSAB has reported and in terms of being able to consider the work being done by the project team, working with the government to develop goals, objectives. So deferral of consideration may be what we need to . . .

**The Chair:** — I think you're right to . . . By reading the entire three paragraphs it says that there are things that are happening, and whether we did not concur or whether we just said we'll defer it to later and see how all this stuff comes into play, I don't think there's . . . Definitely there isn't a concurrence. I think that's clear. But . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Then we should say that we don't concur. Does the auditor's office recall if we didn't concur or if we . . . It strikes me the wording of when you note all these "notes," that there isn't . . . there's kind of the implication of not concurring with the complete recommendation as proposed, and that we were asking for or noting these further things that would be reasons why we didn't completely concur with the auditor's recommendation.

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Would recommendation 12 be the same reasoning . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Well that's sort of been my experience, has been the habit is that we can either concur and note progress, because we sort of agree in the principle of what the auditor's saying, but note that substantial work has been done to comply with the recommendation of the auditor. That's sort of the concurrence and noting progress, because there's substantial

work been done and we recognize that.

So it hasn't completely . . . We agree with the substance of what the auditor is saying but we have to also make note of the fact that, while it isn't completely complied with, there is a lot of progress been made. So that's our concurrence and noting progress.

If we don't agree with the Provincial Auditor, quite often we will note and cite instances whereby this work is either being done to our satisfaction or things of that nature and therefore we think that the point of the auditor and the recommendation isn't well taken.

So I kind of think that maybe in 13 we're noting reasons why we may not have concurred. And I . . . But I don't recall the conversation.

**Mr. McCall:** — I'm just wondering, concurrence or non-concurrence is different from deferral. And certainly, you know, the jury still being out is different from a guilty or innocent or, you know. So in this case I think it's . . . there is a desire to collect further information before a decision is actually taken so it would seem to be deferral is the appropriate course in this regard.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Mr. Chair, given that I'm a new arrival to the committee I'm not sure what 1D-1 recommends. Is it recommending that the government study the merits of preparing governmental sector financial statements? And does it appear as though the government . . . from the recommendation it appears as though the government has completed a study on performance management and accountability reporting. So has the government responded to this particular recommendation of the auditor but there's still much work that needs to be done? Can someone answer that question?

**The Chair:** — I think you're right, Pat, in that it . . . the report if I remember correctly, we were talking about what the . . . And I think Terry was the one that expounded on this by saying that the province had already done some things that were moving it along, that the Public Sector Accounting Board was going to be studying the issue and make a report as indicated by that last statement. And there were things that were happening, not necessarily was everything complete.

So that's why I don't think we concurred with the recommendation or, you know, did not concur. I think it was just said that we note that these are the things that are happening, these are the things that may happen still as work progresses, and we made no formal recommendation or formal resolution that said nay or yea.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Well in keeping with what appears to be previous practice, is it possible that the . . . we delete "In consideration of this recommendation," and we just say "the Standing Committee on Public Accounts notes" because I see that's in other recommendations.

For instance in recommendation no. 15, we don't really make a recommendation. We just note something. And so would it be advisable just to note that the province is currently providing financial accountability to the public and so on and so forth.

That the province has completed a study and that the Public Sector Accounting Board may report on this issue.

**The Chair:** — Yes.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — Does that do it? Given that . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Mr. Chair, on page 20, recommendation 10 is very much what Mr. McCall is talking about, I think. And it seems to have been acceptable in that wording. And basically implying that we're deferring making a decision on this pending further information and the tabling of these kinds of reports. And I wonder if we could incorporate similar wording from recommendation 10 to imply that we're awaiting further information.

**The Chair:** — I do agree with Ms. Atkinson in that it says, "In consideration of this recommendation . . ." Those are redundant words. They don't mean anything because it's in consideration of recommendation 1D-1 I think is really what it's referring to, not the recommendation that we're looking at.

Chris, were you going to make a comment?

**Mr. Bayda:** — Just some of this is coming back to me, Mr. Chairman. I do recall that the committee you know hadn't concurred with this at all. It wasn't a concur and note situation. It was a notes . . . they were just noting that some information is provided right now and also noting that there may be some work done by the Public Sector Accounting Board.

And then I think had Terry . . . you're right, Terry has kind of tied this . . . some of the work that the Department of Finance is doing on accountability and performance reporting into the recommendation.

**The Chair:** — In light of what Ms. Atkinson said and Mr. Gantefer said, do we want to have something that says either that we're deferring our decision or that the PAC will monitor as these things occur or as these are reported on? Which direction do you want to go?

**Ms. Atkinson:** — I think that we should defer the decision and note the work that's being done. Does that work for people?

**The Chair:** — Yes, I think that's a good solution. Okay, so the change will be that we'll be removing of course, "In consideration of this recommendation," and we'll be then indicating that the standing committee is deferring its decision and noting that or acknowledging — maybe instead of using that word, "note," we'll use that word "acknowledges" — that things are happening.

Twenty-six, next page. Recommendation no. 14, I would imagine, must be very similar:

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts agrees in principle with this recommendation and notes that the Government should work towards the adoption of consistent estimates . . .

**Mr. Gantefer:** — Agree in principle. Was that concurring or not?

**The Chair:** — And noting that the government is working on the option.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — It's like the concur, no progress.

**The Chair:** — Yes. Do we need to make it more succinct or more clarity if we have to change the word "notes"?

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — No. I would say instead of "agrees in principle" say "concur with this recommendation and notes that." I mean we always quite regularly note progress.

**The Chair:** — Any problem there? Because of that sort of consistent language, rather than "agrees in principle," we will actually be in noting — not noting, we will be concurring. Agreed?

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Just before you do that, it notes that "the Government should work towards," you know. It's semantics but if we say the government should work, that's actually a recommendation, not a observation.

**The Chair:** — So you're saying concurs in principle with this recommendation and recommends that the government?

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Well that's the way it's worded now.

**The Chair:** — No, it says "notes."

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Well I know it says "notes." But following that, we're saying that . . . we're suggesting the government should work toward the adoption. The assumption is that they're not.

**The Chair:** — So what wording bothers you, Mr. Wakefield?

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Well I'm suggesting that one is an . . . There's a suggestion here that the government isn't working in that direction and we suggest it should.

So maybe the semantics is correct. I don't know.

**The Chair:** — If I recall the definition . . . or the discussion on that liability portion, it was . . . the concern was that the estimates that the government uses should remain . . . the adoption of a consistent estimates is what was . . . was, I think, the point of discussion here with Mr. Smith and others.

It wasn't the fact that it wasn't being done. It is definitely being done. It is definitely being done. It was a matter of whether or not this is . . . because I think Brian was referring to different sets, different actuarial accounts that occur to determine liability and those can vary.

And I think we were just, as a committee, we were noting that the government should work, which implies that there's still some room to move towards the adoption of consistent estimates of inflation by all government pension plans. I think that's the . . . because I remember this one . . .

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Well if it is working, then we should say "should continue to work toward."

**The Chair:** — Margaret is suggesting that if we remove the word "notes," and says, "and recommends that the government continue to work." Okay? In other words, it is happening but continue to work towards that. Is that acceptable then? So we would have changes there but would remove the uncertainty as to the fact that we agreed with this, it would be concurring with this recommendation and then recommending that the government will continue to work towards it. I see consistent . . . Agreed.

Now where are we? Page . . . that was 26. Still another one on 26. Regarding recommendation 8-6, which is the second one from the bottom, it would be helpful if the report indicated where the public can access the report referred to in the recommendation.

That was from the auditor's office as well.

Your committee concurs with recommendation 8-6, that the Department of Finance should provide a report . . . showing how the Government plans to address its future cash requirements for the pensions promised.

And the auditor's suggestion is that we should indicate where the public can access the report.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — The last point says the committee notes the department has complied with this recommendation and this report is available at blank, whatever.

**The Chair:** — So do we know where it's available? Do we know . . . That was the question. Rodd or . . . do we know where . . . but how can the . . . do we know what the answer to this question is? Where is the report accessed by the public?

**Mr. Bayda:** — I think the report was tabled with the committee. Would it not be available through the Clerk's office?

**The Chair:** — If it's tabled with the committee, then the Clerk's office would be a . . .

**Mr. Bayda:** — And it was certainly, I think, read in, read into the verbatims, so would be available through the verbatims.

**Ms. Woods:** — We didn't know if it was a written report or was it just the verbal report made during the course of the committee meeting that day? And I think that's where some of the uncertainty was and we weren't able to clarify it yesterday. But we could certainly look into that.

**Ms. Atkinson:** — May I suggest that if it's available verbatim, we indicate that. If it's available in written form, we indicate that and that it's available through the Clerk's office. And if it's not available, then it's not available.

**The Chair:** — Yes. If it was, if it was oral presentations to our committee, well then there is no written report. See what you think.

Okay, we'll take Ms. Atkinson's suggestion that there may be a written report from the documentation that Ms. Woods has, and it's dated and we'll acknowledge if it is a tabled document;

within the Clerk's office we will note that the public can access it from the Clerk's office. If it's not, then it will say that.

Page no. 27, recommendation 15.

**Mr. Wakefield:** — Does anybody remember if we had a recommendation suggesting that this information should be included?

**The Chair:** — Well I think that we were not concurring with the recommendation and that we were noting that there is no accounting requirement. I think that should be said. Rather than saying, "notes that there is no accounting," we would say, that the Standing Committee on Public Accounts does not concur and notes that no accounting requirement to include or acknowledges . . . and acknowledges that no accounting requirement to include this information in the pension plan. Okay? Consensus? Agreed.

Twenty-nine. Two more things on the page 29. First one dealing with recommendation 1-1 is the same as that on page 24, recommendation 1A-1.

Okay, Margaret has pointed out that one is the 2000 Fall Report and the other one was the 2000 Spring Report. And they were the same recommendations. Have we dealt with them accordingly? I think it accurately reflects what we did in both instances. So as is?

Do you want to indicate that there is a cross-reference or not? Not? Okay. Thank you.

And on same page, the section no. 30, understanding the finances of government, recommendation no. 16 uses the word "believes." So let's look at that one — "committee believes this is an appropriate budgeting process."

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — . . . recognizes.

**The Chair:** — Well we've got "recognizes" above.

Secondly, that the committee also recognizes there is an appropriate separation between CIC budgeting and Executive Council . . . and further recognizes that these budgets are linked through the CIC dividend.

And the committee . . . What words were you suggesting, Ms. Atkinson?

**Ms. Atkinson:** — We opine. We are of the opinion. It is the committee's opinion . . .

**Mr. Harper:** — Opinion that this is . . .

**The Chair:** — Okay so before we look at that word, the other conclusion here or the suggestion is that we don't have a recommendation. We're not concurring; we're not, not concurring.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — It seems to be implied in my reading of 16 is that we didn't concur. And we should say it. And we've listed the reasons why. It seems to me the wording is, is listing the reasons why we didn't concur.

**The Chair:** — So in your last statement where you said "The committee believes," if we're now going to change that wording and then after the appropriate budgeting and thus . . . or therefore does not concur with recommendation? Or the . . .

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Right at the beginning . . .

**The Chair:** — Or right at the . . . Do you want it before the two . . .

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Almost like your committee does not concur with this recommendation and notes considerable progress in the matter of government reporting and . . .

**The Chair:** — Where do you want that? And I think . . . I'm hearing that you all agree that we should have it noted that the committee did not concur. And it should be noted somewhere. At the beginning or at the end?

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Front.

**The Chair:** — Front. Okay we'll leave that up to Margaret.

**Mr. Wakefield:** — What are we saying? We're not concurring . . .

**The Chair:** — With the recommendation . . .

**Mr. Wakefield:** — . . . but progress is still being made.

**Mr. Gantefoer:** — Yes, we note that progress has been made.

**The Chair:** — I hope that we're in the right direction there. We'll get Brian and Chris to check into their notes on this one, okay? Before this actually becomes . . . because there's some . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . You don't think we concurred? Okay. So then we're on the right track.

All right. That was the changes that we needed to have discussed. All of the changes that were suggested about you know, maybe some typo things, and numbered changes, those have already been incorporated into this draft.

Now the plan, today being Thursday, do you wish that this report be presented to the Legislative Assembly today, this afternoon, with the changes that you have suggested this morning?

**A Member:** — Can it be ready?

**The Chair:** — Okay. So that's our plan? We'll try to get it in today, if things come together between now and noon.

There's two things that I'd like to just spend two minutes on, if we could. One is the conference, the CCPAC (Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees) conference is in St. John's, August 25 to 27, I believe. And we had designated four members — Chair and Vice-Chair plus one each. I'm not sure . . . I believe Mr. Wakefield, you're going as the additional member and Ms. Junor is going. And you're dealing with the Clerk's office. Sandra is the person that you have to deal with in terms of your forms. Okay.



What about blocking off a time in September to actually get back to work on the recommendations of the auditor's report? We've spent a lot of time dealing with the hiring of the new Provincial Auditor and we haven't really designated any morning times because most of you felt that that was going to be rather cumbersome during the sitting of the House.

Mr. Harper, what would you suggest?

**Mr. Harper:** — Well, Mr. Chair, I can't speak for all the members of the committee, but I can certainly speak for the government members of the committee that we have a number of other responsibilities during the month of September. So I'm wondering if the committee would consider reconvening in October.

**The Chair:** — I'm flexible on that. I mean, we need to get some work done and October is no different . . . I mean, it will mean that things are just delayed a month.

**Mr. Wakefield:** — . . . We could do it now.

**Mr. Harper:** — We could. Or even if we stay until the middle of August, we could get even more done.

**The Chair:** —With the committee's approval, discussion between the Chair and Vice-Chair would take place about blocking a time in October. Is that acceptable? Okay. That's where we'll stand.

Committee adjourned. Thank you very much. Have a good summer.

The committee adjourned at 09:50.