

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
December 6, 1984

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We don't have the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg here. I guess we don't need to. We'll leave that item for last, I guess. We can start with the budget.

Any problems with dealing with the agenda in the order in which it is there?

A MEMBER: — We don't . . . Do we have an agenda?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, it was in the notice of meeting. Research attachment report and motion; committee budget; Public Accounts Committee follow-up report; actuarial report; teacher's superannuation plan; Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committee; travel motion and reports; any other business, which I guess will be a follow-up to the PEI thing.

MR. GLAUSER: — Same agenda we had the last time.

Okay. You would all yesterday have got Craig's report. I want to righteously claim that I read it, and then I think I forgot it in my office. I don't know if you've got any more copies.

A MEMBER: — Here it is, here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No. There is two. One is David Mitchell's, and the other is Craig James'.

MR. GLAUSER: — You're talking about the one on the interns?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Have you gentlemen had a chance to look at this? We'll open the subject for discussion, then.

MR. GLAUSER: — Okay, I'll start off then, and I would thank him very much — thank Craig very much for the extent that he put this together in such short order. And while it looks very good for Alberta, Ontario, B.C. and, of course, the House of Commons, I still maintain what I said here last week. And I would like to draw your attention to the example of Mr. Young this past year, how he was able to do his research, and I think that that applies to all of us, and I do not see the necessity for inaugurating this facility to this committee.

I think we got through everything very well. I think things went smoothly. We were — not only Mr. Young, but we were all prepared when we came in here. And we certainly have a full-time job to do on this, and we're doing it. That is my feelings on the issue, and I stand by what by what I, the same as I did last week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Other comments?

MR. YOUNG: — I can't see, Ned, in my experience on this committee, and I just came back to it, that we have ever felt ourselves to be lacking in any sort of research. I've never seen a situation where we came to a grinding stop because we felt we didn't have sufficient facts on a situation.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, just adding some history — I think I suggested it the other day as well. This was handled by a special committee on library, I think. My memory's not perfect here, but Mr. Lingenfelter is the only existing member of your caucus that might have been on it, besides myself from our caucus — Mr. Taylor, Mr. Pickering. It was Mr. McArthur that chaired the committee.

MR. ENGEL: — I was on that committee for two years.

MR. KATZMAN: — I thought you were on it. I wasn't sure. And that committee decided that the research staff be in the caucus rather, because it was sort of brought up to us in one or two places where we saw the attachment to the library. And the final decision on that one was to

leave it in the caucus.

So that committee had dealt with it; didn't go against the intern program. I know that because they didn't handle that discussion, but it did handle the research allotted to caucuses versus allotted to library like we saw in Ontario and Ottawa. And the decision of the caucuses on that committee were to enrich the caucus function rather than the library. And that was . . . I guess I got to live with that committee's decision. I was part of it.

MR. ENGEL: — If I could just comment on that aspect of it, I believe that the decision of the library committee at that time was to do our political research and writing out of our caucuses, but that if the library prepared material for us, it would be just straight factual material. It wouldn't be in a speech-type form. And they were gearing up to do more work for us in the library, and I know a number of papers that the library has prepared for me on various topics, and I still use that service. And I'm not sure how limited they are. But I think the committee felt that that role should be separated as far as the work that was of a political nature would be handled by caucuses, and research that was of a technical nature could be conducted by the library because the caucus didn't have the facilities and the research backing to do that.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think, Allen, that's correct. What they called it, I think, was document reveal — getting you documents and stuff — rather than research as is done in the caucus research. There was a fine line, if I remember, in the explanation. They'd pull you documents if you wanted them. If you said uranium in Toronto, they'll get you that document — or Ottawa, or whatever the topic was. Am I correct on that? That's the kind of things that they were doing. When they went on the computer, they'll even be able to do it better.

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, just four points regarding that. First of all, I want to thank Mr. James for the interesting report that he put together on relatively short notice. The four points I want to make is that on many occasions that I've sat here in Public Accounts Committee, the chairman, definitely, as well as all members, have indicated many times at how well this committee functions in comparison to other committees in the legislature; that we are doing a very good job — not a relatively good job — a very good job. We seem to get our work done when it has to be done. We come to agreements as quickly and as amiably as possible. Also, when you take into consideration point two, the system that I came into, that was developed here, of the lead-off system of presentation, where each individual member was given a topic to go at and to lead off a presentation, has worked remarkably well, and that ties in to the concept of personal research because obviously — and Mr. Glauser alluded to Mr. Young's presentation — that we're all capable of doing that thing, and we do have research facilities available to us and research help available to us.

Point three, I truly believe that being a member of the Public Accounts Committee that it is my responsibility, as a full member, to dig out that research and find it wherever available whether that means coming to discuss issues with members of other caucuses, going to the library, going to the Clerk's office, maybe indicating I may have to go to line departments here to get information. But that's my responsibility as I see it for wanting to be on this committee.

And the last point is an item that Mr. James had indicated in his report on page 2, where we do have some facility also available to us outside of the ones that I've already indicated. He says the Provincial Auditor provides specialist research to all Public Accounts Committee members. That, in itself, helps to reinforce our research skills. For those four reasons, I don't think it would be appropriate at this time for us to get involved in the internship program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any other views? Well, I . . . Pardon me? No. Mr. James points out that he was not promoting a particular program; he was asked to describe how such a program might work, and he was doing so. Nor was he promoting an intern program.

MR. WEIMAN: — No, of course. I hope didn't give that indication that he was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I won't go through the formality of my views on this issue or otherwise. I believe that while the committee has functioned well, we could improve the work we do if we had better research. While it is true we all can do some of that ourselves, limitations of our time, and the fact that doing research is a specialized skill that not everyone does well, I think, I would suggest that, as I say, our work could be improved if we had research staff. I take it, I work with a few of government caucuses otherwise, and I move the motion — I should go through the formality of having a vote.

The motion, moved by myself, was:

That this committee request, for fiscal year '85-'86, research staff to be attached to the legislative library and define the function as a part-time position from March 1st through May 1st each year.

NEGATIVED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, committee budget. We have now had an opportunity to look at the budget. Well, let's go through it item by item, I guess.

The intersessional committee meetings — we haven't actually managed to have any intersessional committee meetings. I would like to see them left in, though. In fairness to the committee, last summer was a federal election which sort of took the whole out of the middle of the summer for us.

The year before that we had two sessions packed into one year, and I think all of us were getting a little ragged. When we get back to a more normal intersessional period, we might well be able to pull together a couple of meetings, and it might be useful for the committee.

MR. KATZMAN: — Without being facetious, Ned, I'm not so sure that they're necessary. And I mean that. If we work sufficiently, as we did last year . . . It's nice to have them in case something goes wrong. I won't argue that with you. But I thought we got our work done. Now, the people that really got in trouble around this building were Crown corp.

I mean they're nice to have as back-up, but I don't think we should plan to do it. We should plan to try and get it while the people are here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I agree with that.

MR. ENGEL: — Could I ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — When do we normally get the auditor's report that we can start looking at it and what departments to call on? Is that down much prior to the spring session?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, not recently. It has not been done before the spring session.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Engel, I'll respond for this year. We have not yet received the *Public Accounts* of the province document. And until we receive that, we are reluctant to finalize our report at any time. I would have to suggest that it will, in all probability, again be in the spring.

MR. ENGEL: — It won't be, like, in the end of January, the first part of February, something like that?

MR. LUTZ: — Well, I would call that in the spring session, sometime after . . . It could well be the end of January, but not in December, I wouldn't say.

MR. ENGEL: — No, I'm not thinking about December. What I was thinking as far intersessional sitting, I'd sooner, if we need to get at some accounts, I'd prefer to come in here in the end of January, first part of February. A farmer has a lot more time than he does in May.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The difficulty with that, Allen, is that we still table the *Public Accounts* in the report. And if it is not . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, that's what I was asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — If we don't get it in the next 10 days, then we will not get any of that until the session opens in the spring because it has to be tabled, and then it's given to us. You don't get it in the mail from . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. LUTZ: — That's right. The report has got to be tabled before the legislature before anybody else can see it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — And what Mr. Lutz is telling us is that isn't going to happen this year. It hasn't for several years, either.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, but let's also be . . . We normally do get a *Public Accounts* blue book, not Mr. Lutz's report.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, we only get the *Public Accounts*.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay. I think Al asked both questions.

MR. ENGEL: — No, no. I was basically concerned with . . . Normally this committee deals with a document that — a thin little document, Mr. Lutz.

These are the areas of concern that we have raised, and I think, I hope our committee doesn't expect to go beyond that. That's difficult . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Let me ask Mr. Lutz a question because there's some confusion now. We always get the blue book, the big heavy blue as I call the *Public Accounts* . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Volume 1, volume 2.

MR. KATZMAN: — And we always get those except for that one year before the House adjourned at Christmas time.

A MEMBER: — Not always.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I think, oh, maybe one year we didn't. But then we normally — the normal is to get your book in the spring. That's the norm. Am I correct?

MR. LUTZ: — I think past practice will verify what you are saying, yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — I mean, I don't think very often we've got yours . . .

MR. LUTZ: — I think I should maybe clarify one thing. The *Public Accounts*, as such, I have no hand in preparing that, so I can't speak to when that will be tabled, but what I am saying is unlikely my report will be complete until the *Public Accounts* are complete. So probably it will be in the spring session before my report is tabled this year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Which is normal.

MR. CHAIRMAN — Who prepares . . . The *Public Accounts* is prepared by the comptroller?

MR. LUTZ: — Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What's the hold-up there? Do you know?

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I guess you would have to ask Mr. Comptroller if you wanted some timetable as to when that document would be filed or tabled. I wouldn't be prepared to comment on it.

MR. ENGEL: — Is there a time drag because of different year ends, or are they pretty well all at the same time now?

MR. LUTZ: — Well, the *Public Accounts* are still March 31st, the government fiscal year. I guess the Crowns are different, but they don't necessarily interfere one with the other . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . That's right.

MR. ENGEL: — Well, it shouldn't affect the printing of it. They have since this past March had time to get that blue book out. Once their papers are compiled and put together . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Again, I would think that Mr. Comptroller should comment on this particular aspect of the subject because . . .

MR. ENGEL: — It's not fair to discuss . . . Well, that would be the only factor that would determine how many days we sit in between — if we'd have some work. If we haven't got our work spelled out for us, we haven't left any department hanging in mid-air. We finished our report last time, so I tend to agree with Katzman that there's really no point in a big budget item there between now and the May sitting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Are you saying you want to strike this item out?

MR. KATZMAN: — I'll build the step in where I was coming from. I was suggesting that I would be prepared to suggest we could strike this, Ned. That's where I was coming from. But I was going to add the second thing: that could be moved to a different section of our budget, reallocated within this document.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, got a speaker who's just here . . .

MR. MORIN: — On this topic, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should leave that item in on the off chance that we do need it, and, if we don't need it, we can always reallocate it internally.

MR. WEIMAN: — A couple of things we've found from experience in other committees, that the time that we meet seems to stand with the need. It seems it has a way of self-fulfilling itself in that you only have two meetings marked down here at any rate, and in consideration that we've always been on time; we've always finished our work-load; the only reason I could see for that still remaining is if we lagged behind, if we fell behind. Past practices indicate that we haven't, that we've always kept on top of our work-load, so I can't see any reason for that, at the present time.

MR. YOUNG: — If I might express an opinion on there. I would like to coincide with Mr. Engel. These would be the farmers; you don't have a lot of farmers on this committee, but there's certainly three or four of us anyhow. And I would think that that may sure come in handy if things get going in May, and we want to . . . Say the House gets out in mid-June, as it usually

does, we might want to resume after the House has adjourned in, shall we say, June 15, and finish this off. And thus we could sure use that, giving ourselves more time in May to be farmers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would like to see it left in too, for a somewhat different reason. It is very difficult to predict where these accounts are going to take us. It may be that everything will be tidied up, neat and tidy, by the middle of May. It may be that we will want to pick up some items, with departments, later on when they've had a chance to pull up their socks a bit. And I would like to leave it in there, in part for the reason suggested by the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg and the member for Saskatoon South . . . Sorry, Eastview, in part because I think we may want to follow up with some departments. I don't feel terribly strongly about it though. Any other comments on this item?

MR. KATZMAN: — I am of the opinion that we should be taking item 1 and item 2 and putting them as one grouping, and just, you know, conferences and travels and committee meetings. Changing the title may accomplish what we're both wanting to do. Do you follow me, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I do . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Not to knock the money out of the budget, but if we are diligent and we get done early, then that allows you additional travel. If we don't get diligent, obviously we don't have it. It's sort of a compromise, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, well why don't . . . I think that should be a formal motion if you're going to do that. Why don't you move a formal motion. I'm going to really just express some dissent from it, but . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I'm just voicing a personal opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. My own view with respect to the conference is the argument in favour of more people going to conferences, that it improves our work as members of the Public Accounts Committee.

In my view, if research staff would do a good deal more to assist us in improving our work and if we're not prepared to spend the money on research, then I don't think we should be spending money on additional travel either. So I would express dissent from increasing the travel allowance if that's the only effort we're going to make to improve our work as members.

MR. KATZMAN: — Now, Mr. Chairman, we have . . . I think \$2,000 of intersession is travel now — actually \$3,000 — and \$4,600 is per diems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Where are you reading from?

MR. KATZMAN: — Intersessional committee meetings. The item 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 will have the same thing on them as the 2 section. For example, 1.4 and 2.4 are the same thing — accommodations; 1.3 and 2.3 are sustenance. All I'm saying is let's put them in one global budget. The only one, of course, the per diem, is also in the top one. It shows a thousand dollars. Once again, just saying move the 46 into there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm expressing dissent from that.

MR. KATZMAN: — Fair game. I'm not hung up on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any other . . . I don't think Mr. Katzman does want to move a motion just for a moment until we get some expression of view on it. Perhaps he does.

MR. KATZMAN: — No. Just a personal view.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any other comments on this?

MR. MORIN: — I'd like a little clarification. My earlier suggestion was that we could leave things as they were and shuffle funds if needed. I sort of got the impression that we're not allowed to do that. Is that the case? Or is it we're not allowed to co-mingle funds?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Are we allowed to vire, so-called? Do you . . . I guess that really should be asked of Mr. James.

MR. KATZMAN: — I think that's our problem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Nice question, eh?

MR. JAMES: — I don't see why not. I don't think it's been done before, but . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes, that was where I was heading, so we didn't have to vire. We had that nice either/or. That's what my motion would do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You're saying that we . . . The specific question I have is: if we pass this budget as is, and we don't use the money for intersessional committee meetings, can it then be used for conferences and travel?

MR. JAMES: — My understanding is that it can be.

MR. KATZMAN: — With a virement.

MR. JAMES: — Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — With somebody or other's permission.

MR. JAMES: — That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The Board of Internal Economy, I guess, in this case.

MR. JAMES: — Presumably.

MR. KATZMAN: — But if both joint in-and-out-of-province are in the same thing, then we know we can use it either place and we don't have to have a vire.

MR. JAMES: — That's true.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's right. I think you're right, Ralph. If the committee meeting were held in the province, I think that's right. We could hold . . . no magic in holding the committee meetings in Regina; you could hold them in Saskatoon or Prince Albert or, God forbid, North Battleford.

A MEMBER: — Shellbrook.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, God forbid.

MR. MULLER: — Waskesiu.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Or Waskesiu. Yes, now that makes more sense. That's the proper place to be.

Do you want to leave this as is and play it by ear?

MR. KATZMAN: — I'd be prepared to make the motion that item one and two be combined. We may have to take a couple of words out of them, but that gives us total flexibility without going to virements to move them from one subvote to another subvote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Moved by the member from Rosthern that subvote one and subvote two be combined into committee meetings, conferences, and travel, I guess.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any comments on that?

MR. KATZMAN: — If I may, to the Provincial Auditor. You indicate in your report every virement, every movement of money from one subvote to another, don't you?

MR. LUTZ: — No, those are shown in the *Public Accounts* but you have to go back to the basic budget document first and do a lot of arithmetic and do your own thing to really figure out where the virement's happened.

I guess maybe I would speak to this one subject. If you did this thing and it became a tradition that subvote one was never used and you always had a lot of money to push over to subvote two, the question might be asked why you were over-budgeting in subvote one in the first place. But I haven't said that officially and I'm not sure that I want to say it officially, because I haven't seen this thing before. But it would be a concern.

MR. KATZMAN: — Doing this motion that I'm suggesting makes it more legitimate by the official working systems.

A MEMBER: — It gives you more flexibility.

MR. KATZMAN: — It gives you that as well.

MR. LUTZ: — Well, it does remove the need to vire between one and two. If they are combined you don't need to vire between one and two.

MR. KATZMAN: — It leaves the committee a little more in charge of its own destiny.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, I grant you that. I'm not sure that's in accordance with the sound principle of public administration to leave each agency free to wheel around as they see fit. Any comments on this? I have a comment to make.

I am opposed to this. I fear that this will be seen . . . Whatever was intended, I fear this will be seen as a stir-up to this method of getting more money for out-of-province conferences travel. I do not think it is in accordance with sound budgeting principles to have a glob of money that you can do what you will with. I fear that it will be seen as a means of getting more money for travel.

MR. LUTZ: — But, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — As I say, I link — I do so publicly — I link additional research staff with additional travel. If we're prepared to spend more money on travel we should be prepared to spend more money on research staff.

MR. WEIMAN: — I tend to agree with the chairman in this respect because if we're coming to

the question of additional travel outside of the province, then we should deal with that totally up front. When we come to that common agreement that says instead of two going there should be four or six, that's something we should deal totally up front with instead of trying to vire money back and forth.

I still suggest, for the reasons that I gave earlier, that budget item number one, intersessional committee meetings, should be dropped, and again for those reasons that I gave. As well as, if you did go with it, there are some inadequacies in the actual budget itself, in light of the comments you made of where these meetings could be held in the province. Item 1.2 specifies, basically, that it must be Regina, because it says "actual Regina to residence, return." Another inadequacy there is there's a few members on this committee who live in excess of 160 kilometres away from the city of Regina, you know.

A MEMBER: — It would average out.

MR. WEIMAN: — But for the three reasons I gave earlier, I would prefer to see item one deleted from the budget completely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, any other comments on this?

MR. GLAUSER: — Okay, I would like to see that left in there for the reason that we did run into a situation where we had to come in here in 1982, in the fall of '82, to do some work relative to plans for some upcoming meetings. So I think that contingency should be there, but I would not want to see it placed into one heading of "conference and travel."

MR. ENGEL: — I appreciate the vice-chairman's account because there's one other argument that I'd make for leaving it here, and that is that as a Public Accounts Committee, and if there's some information we're trying to get, and we have a deadline of a session to deal with, it would be very easy for the members on the government side to appear to be hiding some information by filibustering us and getting us beyond the point of being able to finish before the session adjourns. And that would be the simplest way not to look at a sensitive topic.

If we know that we can meet intersessionally and we have that right, there is no advantage to drawing it out. So even to make it look as though this Public Accounts Committee has the right to meet intersessionally, I'd like to see at least two-days meetings in there that we could use if we need them, you know. And the minute we take this out then they say, well, then we're not a year-round MLA or a full-time MLA, and we're not necessarily going to meet intersessionally, and so on.

So this tells us that this is a committee that can meet year-round. I think those of you that have been around since '71 would know that doing things beyond the terms of the sessions took some doing. I haven't really explained that, but we never had committees meet, when I first got elected, intersessionally. There wasn't such a thing. We did our thing when session was on. When session was off we were actually considered not an MLA. We weren't even paid on a monthly basis. We were paid sessional allowance and so on.

So I think by broadening the scope and by fighting for our rights and broadening our role as members, we've accomplished something that we shouldn't just move away and say we're not going to use that time if we should happen to need it. So I'd like to see a couple of days in there that we could meet intersessionally, along with some the other arguments that have been made. I appreciate the arguments you made and I'm not going to reiterate those.

MR. KATZMAN: — I just want to correct you, Mr. Engel. As of the rules and regulations committee report, the last one, this committee is never shut down except when the House prorogues, in the four years it sits. We're constantly allowed . . . When the legislature dissolves is the only time this committee's shut down now. That's under the new rules. The committee is a

four-year committee. It's not reappointed each year. The chairman's a four-year. The term of the whole . . . 23rd, were a little different rules than prior to this time around.

MR. ENGEL: — You were just restating exactly the same thing I was trying to say, Mr. Chairman, because that's . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Great minds think alike.

MR. ENGEL: — Oh, easy. That's the point I was trying to make, and all I'm saying is that I appreciate that aspect of it. But by taking out a budget item, saying that we're not going to meet intersessionally, we're just kind of eroding some of the advantages we've got.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Unless there are some scintillating comments someone's got to make . . . There are, I guess.

MR. WEIMAN: — I just want to rebut one comment from the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg. Half of his logic built on a previous member's comments. But there's another half when he said that it could be held up to — and I hope I'm using the right words — blackmail, in that you can say, well, the session is coming . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, okay, it could be held up to filibustering. I apologize, Mr. Member. That's the word I was looking for. It could be held up to filibustering because session was coming to an end, and you could literally say that you want to jam this through and that's it.

The opposite is true too if you think — taken to comments of his earlier comments that had to do with the need to return to the land, the inappropriateness of the time. The opposite could happen, too. We have a good, I would think almost a majority of members here that because of the circumstances have to go to the land. And they could be absent, which would allow us, which would deny us quorum to sit, too. So I mean, it could be an opposite type of filibustering, and not intentional, but because of necessities of getting your crops in.

However, I state again, in the past we have always taken those types of things into consideration. I know we have juggled times in the past to help alleviate that difficulty. We've always found either additional hours or additional days to get the job done while session was in hand, in order to accomplish that end. I still speak against it.

MR. SVEINSON: — In this committee, just for my own information, can you not exchange your right to sit in this committee with another member of the government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, not like in Crown corporations. You can't make changes.

A MEMBER: — No substitutions.

A MEMBER: — You don't have to worry anyhow.

MR. SVEINSON: — I don't have to worry anyway.

A MEMBER: — That was my next question. Who did you have in mind? . . . (inaudible) . . . party caucus.

A MEMBER: — You can't get Ralph to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. All in and done? The motion before you is:

That the committee's budget for fiscal year '85-86 have items one and two combined into a section entitled committee meetings, conferences, and travel.

All those in favour? All those opposed? Yes, washed.

NEGATIVED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Then item number one. All those in favour of leaving in item number one as it stands?

SOME MEMBERS: — Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All those . . . I'm trying to get a way of getting through this budget item by item. Okay, all those . . . I'll call it again. All those in favour of leaving in item number one as it stands, without amendment? Okay. All those opposed? Carried.

AGREED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Conferences and travel.

MR. WEIMAN: — Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. WEIMAN: — Now may I bring up a point?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You may.

MR. WEIMAN: — Regarding item number 1, now that it is in the budget, may we make changes to item number one . . .

A MEMBER: — Dot two.

MR. WEIMAN: — Item number 1.2, that's right, decimal two, that the word "actual Regina, change to "actual headquarters" . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — If I can just make a comment here. The comments under travel are not intended to be definitive of how the travel is used. Mr. James is simply explaining to us how he estimated it, and that was his method of estimating it. But it doesn't mean that we actually have to travel to Regina, nor are we, in a sense, bound to exactly \$891. We can vary from the wording and from the amount.

A MEMBER: — That's what I wanted clarified, yes. Because, as indicated, the majority of members are past 160 kilometres.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, that's just his . . . He's telling us . . .

MR. MULLER: — Do you only get paid for 160 kilometres?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, you're paid for your actual costs. That is just to explain to the members how that figure was arrived at. It's not intended to say that everybody gets \$160. Obviously, I won't.

MR. ENGEL: — Well, should that be realistically adjusted so we can get to meetings? Because I look around the table here, and even Regina to Saskatoon is 160 kilometres, isn't it? . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, that's what I say, you know . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's a fair comment, I suppose, is that the majority . . .

MR. ENGEL: — You see, I'm 150 miles.

MR. GLAUSER: — If I may interject here, I think we are causing quite a bit of problem for the recorder here, with everybody trying to talk at once.

A MEMBER: — She started out with jet-black hair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, one at a time. The member from Saskatoon Fairview points out that this figure is unrealistically low because the make-up of the committee, just by circumstance, is such that they don't live an average distance from Regina. The majority of the members come from the northern part of the province. What, maybe, we might ask the Clerk to do is to adjust the figure accompanying the actual distances, since 160 does not seem to be an average for this committee. It may be an average for the legislature, but it doesn't seem to be an average for this committee. I think the point's well taken.

A MEMBER: — Three hundred is the average . . .

MR. ENGEL: — I'd say double it, and we're right on. Just take that as 160 miles, and you'll be just about right on, because that would average out then. Instead of kilometres, you know, I think just double it and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right.

MR. ENGEL: — If we can change that, then, at least we'd have that right to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Agreed to that, 320 kilometres.

MR. ENGEL: — \$1,700, I'd say.

MR. MEAGHER: — Change that to miles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think Mr. James indicates he may have got kilometres and miles confused here when he was making his calculations. Anyway, the point's well taken. We have made the adjustment. We also have 10 members, which there'll have to be an adjustment made for that.

Any other fine tuning to be done to this?

MR. WEIMAN: — There will be adjustments all the way down the line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All the way down the line, yes. The whole item will have to be adjusted. Mr. James will do that for us.

MR. KATZMAN: — With that in mind, I'll move item one.

A MEMBER: — I thought we'd already done that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Conferences and travel, the same comment applies. You have to adjust it. No, you don't, because there aren't . . . No, you don't have to make that adjustment. Sorry, go ahead, conferences and travel.

MR. ENGEL: — Are we missing a line in conferences and travel because the members usually . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — As a member of this committee I would doubt whether I'll ever be asked, so I would just pass on that comment. It's arranged here that the opposition and the government travel, I would think, and I'm just an added member that was balancing the committee, and I see there's another member added to the committee as a result.

A MEMBER: — That's to rebalance it.

MR. SVEINSON: — To rebalance it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — May I make a comment here under this thing. I have been elevated to the high office of vice-chairman of this council. In addition to that honour being bestowed on me because of my many fine qualities, the two who went to Prince Edward Island will tell you that the real reason was because of the rotational system. It would normally be our turn in 1986 to host the conference, and the province which hosts it, their chairman gets booted on as vice-chairman the year before, and the year of the conference you are then chairman.

So, as I say, in addition to the many fine qualities which no doubt attracted the selection, it really had more to do with the location of the conference. There's been a bit of some confusion over that, which we are unable to resolve, because we may be moving that conference to B.C. for 1986 because of the Expo '86. However, I've had a talk with the chairman about it, and I think I'm probably going to remain as vice-president. I may just be on it as vice-president for two years if our turn slips back to '87.

MR. ENGEL: — Are there two vice-presidents now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's just one vice-president.

MR. ENGEL: — What about the guy from B.C.? Do you remember what happened?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — He's not at all. He's not an officer. That might be a problem, I suppose, we'll have to iron out this year at Whitehorse. However, it would be awkward, since I'm vice-chairman, if I didn't attend. I don't necessarily have to, but that would be awkward. I say this further to the comments of the member for Regina North West because in a sense that may limit your selection of who you want to send to this thing. You may want to increase it to three or something. I don't know. You may want to increase the number you send to three or something. I don't know. You don't have to send the vice-chairman of the council, but it would be kind of awkward if you didn't.

MR. KATZMAN: — I would love to get into this long, tedious argument with you, Mr. Chairman, but I would go back to, I guess, if I was to be logical, I would go back to 19 . . . I guess it would be '82 or . . . I guess the thing was the summer of '83 where we had a motion around here, if my memory serves me correctly, that all members can go, but the committee would only pay per diem for those over two. You had to pay all your own bills. Do you remember that motion? In other words, if you want to go, we'll give you the per diem and you pay your own bill, which was the arrangement in '83, I believe, because I was going to Toronto no matter what. I said I would take the per diem and I'll pay my own way and I'll pay my own hotel bill and so forth. What ended up happening is the vice-chairman didn't go, it was only you and I there, so . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It turned out to be an academic discussion.

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes.

MR. SVEINSON: — Why then cannot that logic be transposed back to one member? Why don't we just send Ned. If we're looking at the logic of simply cutting our budget and not spending money, why send two? What's the magic number? Why is two such a magic number? I fail to understand that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The chairman and the vice-chairman.

MR. KATZMAN: — It used to be one originally when Mr. Andrew went the first time and paid his way totally and never got a cent from this committee when he went the first time. This committee never paid a nickel of his expenses.

MR. SVEINSON: — And you must have had some debate before the committee with respect to another member who did the same thing. I missed that, but . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay, no, they are a little different situations.

MR. SVEINSON: — One was Conservative and one was an . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — No, no. The committee came up; he got invited. I gather for the first time the committee hadn't dealt with it prior to him going, and he went on his own hook, and if he got his money back he accepted it. Well, the decision was he didn't. Mr. Engel was a different one, and we'll get into that one later. Then it was decided in this committee in '83, there was some discussion that after there started to be two people, the chairman and the vice-chairman going, and that became an accepted practice. There was concern that some other people would like to go. The decision was if you feel strong enough that you're willing to go, they will pay the diem only, and you pay everything else yourself. And one or two members at that time indicated — I wasn't the only one that was going to go; there was two of us that were going to go — and something happened because of the timing got changed or something, so that it only ended with Mr. Shillington and myself going.

But that aside, all I'm saying is if a person feels strong enough that he wishes to go and pay his own expenses, the only thing is that by paying him his per diem I believe he is totally protected. He basically becomes an official delegate. Now the per diem is \$100 a day or something?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't know.

MR. KATZMAN: — He isn't going to make any money. You lose money on it. It's going to cost you money to go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It will to Whitehorse, I can tell you.

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes, it's going to cost you money. But if you feel strong enough that you're willing to pay out of your pocket for the benefit of the knowledge, fair game. There is no way to let you go — and I have to go to the Clerk here to ask — I don't know if you could come as a total auditor without some approval of this committee. I don't know if I could show up in the Yukon, or wherever it is, and pay my own way, rather, totally without some blessings of this committee. So the cheapest blessings of this committee to allow me to go would be the per diem. There's a technical problem there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think that was the agreement we had in 1983. It has never actually been put into practice because it's never actually happened.

I'll make this ruling to get the bear out of the buckwheat, and then you people can challenge the ruling or move a motion or whatever.

That was the practice in '83. It was agreed upon. It remains the practice, and remains the rule unless and until there's a motion which changes the practice.

MR. KATZMAN: — If that rule's still there that's great. Let's leave it alone.

MR. JAMES: — If I might, Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, which holds their meeting annually, has in its constitution provision for automatic membership for members of public accounts committees throughout Canada. So if a member decided that

they wanted to go on their own, then there's nothing to prohibit them.

MR. KATZMAN: — You don't need the per diem any more.

MR. JAMES: — Right.

MR. KATZMAN: — That was just handled the last year there. Since that we brought it up at Toronto. Ned and I brought it up in Toronto, and they said that they didn't have provision at that time . . . (inaudible) . . .

A MEMBER: — Mr. Chairman, what's the practice of other committees?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Whoa! There's a . . . Well, okay. I'll answer that question first, and then the member from Saskatoon Fairview has been patient.

The practice of other committees is to send two people, by and large.

MR. ENGEL: — It seems in Charlottetown there were more than two from some. Ontario seemed to have more there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Ontario has, in the past, sent more than two people. Yeah. They have sent three or four at times.

MR. ENGEL: — B.C. and Manitoba and all the rest seemed to have two, didn't you think?

MR. MEAGHER: — I think Quebec had more than two.

MR. ENGEL: — And Quebec had more than two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yeah. Mr. James has got a comment here.

MR. JAMES: — Ottawa had four members and two staff. Ontario had seven members and three staff, I believe.

MR. MEAGHER: — And Quebec, do you recall?

MR. JAMES: — And Quebec had more than two, but I can't recall how many.

MR. MEAGHER: — I think it was four.

MR. JAMES: — Was it four?

MR. WEIMAN: — In light of all the discussion we had on this last spring, and the reasons why people should be going to these conferences, you know, the very valid reason of information and education, and also the argument that if we keep sending the chairman and the vice-chairman, what we're doing is, it's almost becoming a closed shop for that informational process to expand to the rest of the committee members.

Also, if you take into consideration the expanded size now of this Public Accounts Committee and the reality that our legislature is now made up of three representative parties — and I hope that this comes off across the verbatim as an inaudible comment — I don't know why we're playing silly bugger with this. You know, either we stay with the way it is, or we expand it.

I would prefer to see one of two suggestions put forward: one, either that no less than one third of the committee be allowed to go on these conference and travel, particularly the Canadian Council of Public Accounts; or because of the numbers — 10 is the number now — or four.

Really I guess what I'm giving you is an alternative of three or four when I say no less than one-third.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think what you should do is make a motion of one or the other so we've got something we can say yea or nay to.

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, okay. I don't want to go through all the arguments of why it should be expanded. We've gone over that for hours already. Therefore, I will make a motion that there shall be an increase from two to four members, in light of what I've just said about the expansion of this committee as well as the reality that there three . . .

MR. YOUNG: — I'll second that.

MR. ENGEL: — Why don't you word it "up to four," in case something comes up, instead of just specifically saying: if four don't go, then nobody goes.

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, no. We never had that before where it says two. We don't say "up to two."

MR. YOUNG: — Ned, I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There's no such system in Public Accounts. Motions aren't seconded. I appreciate your voice of support, but we don't have seconders.

MR. YOUNG: — Why?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Because sometimes we have one opposition member here. The practice has been not to have seconders.

MR. YOUNG: — You'll hamstring Billy, otherwise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. That rule was here before Bill was here.

MR. YOUNG: — Oh, I see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I have sat here on many meetings by myself. There's no seconders. Are there other comments on this motion?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well I would argue against my friend from Saskatoon, slightly. I understand what he's saying.

MR. WEIMAN: — That's two understandings this morning already. We're not doing bad.

MR. KATZMAN: — I agree with, in principle, what he's saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Always a prelude to saying I disagree though, when he says "I understand what you're saying."

MR. KATZMAN: — But I liked — maybe it's because I've been around a little longer — but I liked the option. I would be prepared to accept the member for Fairview's motion. But I would love him to add the one clause of the concept of '83 which says: if you're willing to pay out of your own pocket to go. I mean, I've always been in agreement with that. If you think it's valuable enough to pay out of your pocket, then let you go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Moved by the member from Rosthern an amendment to the motion which

says that members may go and receive the per diem allowance.

MR. KATZMAN: — Only. Members above the four may go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Members above the four may go and receive the per diem allowance.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's all they get. They pay the rest out of their pocket.

MR. MEAGHER: — Well, Mr. Chairman, on the amendment put forward by the member for Rosthern, is that not the practice now? It's just been indicated to us by the Clerk that that is an acceptable practice. It seems if that's true that this amendment may be redundant.

MR. KATZMAN: — It was the same with the old practice, and my amendment is redundant, but I'm scared that we're losing my old practice.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Ralph wants to put it in neon lights here — no possibility it will be lost.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm concerned of some confusion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The motion's in order, I think. You may vote against it or for it, but I think the motion's in order.

MR. MEAGHER: — I was talking about the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ENGEL: — Speaking to Ralph's amendment then, I would suggest that you'd carry it one step further. And I'm just throwing this out as a discussion that you then — seeing we're all members of this Public Accounts Committee, and let's say six decide to go, you would calculate how much money you're going to spend for the foregoing. You'd calculate the additional per diem allowance of the additional one or two that want to go, and you'd put it into a pot and divide it by six, would be the fairest way of handling that one, because you've got a certain amount of budget. And why say that one is a more preferred member than the other one.

And so if you're going to use that practice, Ralph, I would say that be a socialist at least once in your life, and do the thing right. Doesn't that sound like a good idea?

MR. MEAGHER: — The only aspect of that plan of socialistic is it's somebody else's money you're dividing up.

MR. ENGEL: — I'm speaking for somebody else because I had my turn; so did you. You likely won't be included in those extra . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I'm sorry, I was drafting the motion here.

MR. YOUNG: — I don't believe in these sorts of times that there's going to be much take-up on Ralph's suggestion of a per diem to Whitehorse. Good gosh! The costs of going up there are boggling, and I think that . . . I don't even think the motion's worthwhile because of the fact that I couldn't perceive anybody taking up on that one — for \$100 per diem?

MR. ENGEL: — Well, look at the line there. It's only \$700 for a flight.

MR. YOUNG: — It is?

MR. ENGEL: — Yes.

(. . . inaudible . . .).

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It's been checked with Pacific Western, the Clerk said. That's the figures — \$450.

A MEMBER: — Is that how cheap it is to go up there?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's what he says . . . I'm sorry. You've been thinking.

MR. MORIN: — Can you read the motion we're now dealing with?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Your ever-loving chairman can do virtually anything. You believe that, right?

Moved by Mr. Weiman that there be an increase from two to four members permitted to attend conferences on behalf of the committee and be reimbursed appropriately.

An amendment moved to that by the member from Rosthern which would add at the end:

and that additional members beyond four may attend, and be reimbursed as to per diem cost only.

Any comments before we deal with the amendment to the motion?

MR. MORIN: — Okay. Well, my comment would be that I would be opposed to the main motion and my reason for that would be this: I think the way that we have the situation that we work under now allows us that, should a conference come up which we determine to be valuable, we can make allowance to send more people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, that was the problem we got into last June.

MR. MORIN: — Well, all right. In that case then, I guess I'm still opposed to it because one of the reasons that I was opposed to more research staff was because of the increased costs. And I think that if we are going to send two people down to any conference, that two people out of ten should bring back some value for all of us. If we start to send four, then we're going to be sending four, and we're going to be doubling our costs, and I think that it just doesn't do much for controlling the economy of our committee. So for those reasons, I'm opposed.

MR. KATZMAN: — What about the amendment?

MR. MORIN: — On the amendment, the member for Rosthern says . . . You know, far be it for me to tell somebody if they want to go out on their own hook that they shouldn't go. Fine, let them go.

MR. SVEINSON: — I would support the motion and I think the member from Saskatoon earlier indicated — I think his arguments were valid. I think that basically the party was structured along two-party lines. There's now three. I don't think that has to be the guide-lines for sending members, but it seems to me that it was certainly the guide-lines for choosing two and not three or not one. Even though you've got the chairman and the vice-chairman, they are on opposite poles. And I think you'll have to agree with that, Ralph.

I doubt if we'll sit intersessionally. I would doubt whether we will in the next term, and I realize there's still some question about transferring those funds over to travel and conference allowances. But I can't see the government allowing an intersessional committee meeting. I think the pressure is on this committee to sit during session, and I think that \$7,691 and the adjustment will never be spent.

And we have the option as members of this committee, if we're looking at economy, why would we even pass a motion allowing members of the committee to travel at their own expense and pay their own hotel bills while we're paying their per diem? If it's economy we're looking at and we want a messenger to go to the meeting, let's send one messenger. Let's send the chairman.

So I support the motion basically along those arguments, and I also support the amendment for the same reasons. I think if members of this committee want to be involved in the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees for their information, it can be delivered back to the committee. I think every one of us, when we attend these things — and I have attended two or three meetings of another committee — I just feel that they're invaluable as far as the system is concerned, as far as deriving benefits that might be brought back for a committee are concerned. But I support the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I dissent from the motion for the reasons given by the member from The Battlefords. I am not a fiscal conservative. It may surprise some of you people to know. I do think however, if we're going to spend more money sending people to conferences, we ought to spend more money on research. If we had agreed to spend more money on research I could have supported this quite happily. I just think we're being inconsistent, and therefore reluctantly opposed to it. I do so with some reluctance because I say, realistically, unless this thing goes to the Board of Internal Economy with some degree of unanimity, it won't get through, in my view. I wish to say it, and I hate to do that, but I just think we're being inconsistent.

MR. WEIMAN: — There may have been a misunderstanding regarding the motion that I place. I should have been more specific. The motion that I placed had tended to be for section 2.1, and that is only in regard to the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committees, and not under the whole heading of conference and travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, I did misunderstand you.

MR. WEIMAN: — That's right. It did not intend to take in the comprehensive auditing foundation annual meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, I see. I did understand you properly, then. Yes. I thought you meant 2.1.1. — you only intended to increase 2.1.1.

MR. WEIMAN: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No. Okay.

MR. WEIMAN: — Just 2.1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I understood you properly then. I think everybody else did too.

Okay. No more comments, I'll call for the vote.

MR. WEIMAN: — On the amendment only?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — On the amendment only.

MR. MEAGHER: — Would you mind, Mr. Chairman, reading the amendment again?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I can tell you, I can do anything. I can even read this thing again.

Mr. Weiman: That there shall be an increase from two to four members permitted to attend conferences on behalf of the committee, and be reimbursed appropriately.

An amendment moved to that by the member from Rosthern, which adds at the end:

and that additional members beyond four may attend, and shall be reimbursed at the per diem costs only.

All those in favour of the amendment to the motion.

Okay. The motion as amended. All those in favour of the motion as amended. All those opposed.

AGREED

Comprehensive auditing foundation. I'm wondering about this item in the budget. The difficulty with this conference used to be that the first four or five years this conference was in early October, and it was reasonable to expect the members to attend it. The year J.J. Macdonell died, which was I guess last year, they moved it from October to December, and it has now got to be very awkward to attend. We are inevitably in the middle of the fall session when this thing is going on, and I wonder about the wisdom of leaving this in. I say that as one who is becoming a firm supporter of comprehensive auditing . . . (inaudible) . . . So I make that comment about comprehensive auditing.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well what is your comment so you can put it on the record, sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — My comments for comprehensive auditing are that I am a firm believer in comprehensive auditing. I wish that the gospel could be spread to more of the non-believers. Having said that, a conference has been timed in the last couple of years to point this . . . (inaudible) . . . It's actually the last three years. It was two years ago that we changed it. This is the third year now they've held it in early December. I think it is a goofy time for a conference, three weeks before Christmas.

MR. YOUNG: — Pardon me, Ned. What days of the week are they and . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Always a Monday and Tuesday. Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, actually.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I would make a motion that we delete this out of the budget, and at the same time the Clerk — and I'm not sure if we have to do it through our auditor, or if we have to . . . (inaudible) . . . send a letter saying that due to the timing, that Saskatchewan feels that it is very inopportune, and therefore for the third year in a row we will not be sending anybody.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I support that suggestion. We write them a stinging letter telling them to get their act together . . . (inaudible) . . . Make it really nasty.

MR. ENGEL: — I think that if the motion would include when we think would be a better time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're just drafting a letter here . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . Order, order, order. We've got a little too much levity here.

MR. MEAGHER: — If I might add to . . . If it's proper, in order for me to add to his suggestion that the comment in the letter be made that another time be selected for this conference — a suggestion, I should say, in the letter, that another time be selected, that we are not opposed to the conference or the objectives.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — And probably would have sent someone had it been held at a more opportune time.

MR. WEIMAN: — I think it's important to explain why the time is inappropriate for us, and that has to do with the sitting of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN — And because of the proximity of Christmas, quite . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — That's right. But I think it's important that that is explained in the letter.

MR. KATZMAN: — Could I suggest that a new date be picked in consultation with all those affected, rather than us setting a date? Because other provinces may still send somebody — but the timing is tough, but they still send them.

MR. SVEINSON: — Does the province still . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We haven't for the last two or three years.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I attend on behalf of the audit office. I have no input whatsoever into any attendees from this group of people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — For several years running, we sent a couple of members, and I went in the first year I was chairman, in October, to Montreal. I found it very worthwhile. I got a lot out of it. And it was the last year we sent anybody. The next year the leading light, the founding father, conference father, by the name of J.J. Macdonell, died. Because of his death it was postponed to early December. And for some reason which utterly escapes me, they fell in love with the time, and they've held it in early December for the last two years. But I think it's a terrible time for a conference.

MR. MORIN: — It's probably good for the Christmas shopping and the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In Montreal. It's going to boost retail sales in Montreal, perhaps. Anyway, all in favour of this motion?

A MEMBER: — What is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: —

That item 2(2) of the committee's budget for the fiscal year '85-86 be deleted, and that the committee Clerk write to the comprehensive auditing foundation to request a more mutually acceptable conference date.

Our beloved clerk will write them an articulate and steaming letter.

MR. KATZMAN: — . . . (inaudible) . . . one that's acceptable by everybody, I think.

MR. ENGEL: — January would be a much better month than December.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. All in favour of this motion?

MR. YOUNG: — I hope the Clerk will send us all a copy of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Of this vicious letter? Okay.

A MEMBER: — And I'll see how mean he can really be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We want to see if he's really up to being Clerk of this committee — how mean he can be. Okay, personal services. The rest of this I think is pretty routine — personal services. The rest of this is fairly lean. Okay, agreed with three?

MR. ENGEL: — Have we discussed 3.2?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — In detail?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It bounced, yes.

MR. ENGEL: — You can't bring it up again in this line here? Now that we've saved \$8,160, you're not prepared to spend half of that, at least . . .

MR. MORIN: — We just said that in point two, everything we saved in 2.2 we spent in 2.1.

MR. KATZMAN: — We actually knocked 15-grand off this budget.

MR. MORIN: — How do you figure that? We just doubled 2.1.

MR. KATZMAN: — We knocked seven out of the first side . . .

A MEMBER: — No, we didn't.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, we unofficially didn't, but we're not going to use it.

A MEMBER: — Well, we don't know that.

MR. KATZMAN: — All right. It's in the budget. All right. As Bill says, on the eighth, we've knocked, was it, how much?

A MEMBER: — We knocked eight out of 2.2 and we . . .

A MEMBER: — 3,595.

MR. KATZMAN: — \$3,500, and you've got \$10,000 that you don't think you're going to spend in this budget.

A MEMBER: — Well, that's good.

MR. KATZMAN: — Now we've also added back into this budget another . . . What's the Yukon trip?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Another 8,000.

MR. KATZMAN: — So actually in total dollars, you're down. I think that's what I was trying to say.

A MEMBER: — Now he's trying to say we should be using that in 3(2).

MR. KATZMAN: — I assumed that was the point that you were going to make was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Do you want to move that as a motion?

MR. ENGEL: — I will make that motion that we . . . This interim thing, I understood, isn't a very costly item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It would be about \$8,000, I think.

MR. ENGEL: — For even the short time that the session's on?

MR. WEIMAN: — The suggestion is it's done from January 1 to June 30 because of the university year if I read Mr. James' report correctly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think the feeling was that we'd have difficulty getting a competent person for two months. The university does have an intern program which then they would second someone, presumably somebody who's pretty good. I think they'd give us their best.

MR. ENGEL: — Could we pursue that further rather than going the full shot on it and say that we're prepared to take one from March 1 to June, March, April, May, a third of the year; March, April, May, for those three months because I feel that, especially after coming back, and I haven't tabled my report . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Point of order. I realize we're getting back into this again, but we've already dealt with a motion at the top of the meeting regarding it and the various reasons given for it, and I think what is going to happen is all we're going to do is reiterate our arguments and counter arguments for it. And since we've already dealt with the motion specific to the topic at hand now, I think that's inappropriate.

MR. ENGEL: — If I may speak to that objection, Mr. Chairman. The motion I'm making is quite different in that it cuts the time in half, and it takes into account that we have redeemed a little bit of money in this budget, and the opposition has been very accommodating to the changes that have been made in it. And I think that, to show some mutual agreement in some decision amongst committee members, that we're going to try and have a year where we can get in and do some discussion on it; I think we should reconsider this item and at least get a half a measure rather than no measure at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You are speaking to the motion as distinct from the point of order?

A MEMBER: — Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'll give a ruling on the point of order if I might. If you want to talk to the point of order, that's fine, otherwise I'll give a ruling on it.

MR. WEIMAN: — No, I'd like to speak to it. Never, and I hope that this is understood very clearly by all the members here, in the argument and counter argument on the original motion, unless my hearing is deficient, never was the topic of finances brought up. The argument and the counter argument had nothing to do with finances when the motion was defeated. And I can read to you very well the four arguments that were placed, and not one had to deal with finances. They had to deal with the appropriateness of having a research intern at this time, and not one of them dealt with finances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think I have to rule — with great reluctance, I think I have to rule that this is out of order. The motion which was brought up was a comprehensive motion which dealt with research. That was defeated. It wasn't a specific suggestion of a specific item earlier, which was a comprehensive motion. And I think we'll need this.

You can move, if you like, a motion to reconsider that point, but I think that's what you'd have to do is move a motion to reconsider it because I think it is the same subject matter. So, if you want to move a motion to reconsider, I would accept that. I wouldn't . . . The motion in its present form, I do think, covers the same ground.

MR. ENGEL: — It sounds to me as though the government members are trying to steamroll and carry their weight, and it would just be a waste of time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think it's academic anyway. Yeah. It doesn't sound as if there's any particular . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I take exception. Mr. Chairman, I take exception with that. I had hoped that we had gotten to the point that we are not talking government members or opposition members.

I think in comments this morning, already, we've talked about members of the Public Accounts Committee. We have made references to the composition of the committee being made up of members of three political parties. But we have never indicated — I hope we never denigrate ourselves to that — where we're talking government members in oppose to opposition members.

A MEMBER: — Can I speak to that?

MR. WEIMAN: — And I hope that we can keep it at that level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No. This whole discussion's out of order.

A MEMBER: — Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I am sorry. The whole discussion is out of order.

MR. ENGEL: — I would prefer to, on a point of order, make a point and clarify a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, go ahead. Clarify your point of order.

MR. ENGEL: — The point of order is this: that I have somebody sitting on my right that doesn't have a research officer. I have somebody sitting across from me that have research officers assigned on a basis of 15 or 16 or 17 opposition members. And I come from a caucus that I don't have enough research staff to do the work that I should be doing. And I felt that public accounts would be one committee where we could be on a different realm altogether where we'd have some research that wouldn't be political research.

And the members opposite are challenging that. And I'm saying that's a different kind of a matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I think we will slide on. I'm going to bring an end to this discussion. This has nothing to do with the point of order raised by the member from Saskatoon Fairview.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the comments made by the member from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, the comments were out of order, and so is your rebuttal.

MR. YOUNG: — We haven't voted on this. And I assumed we're still talking about the item, are we not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're still talking about personal services, yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify something here because Mr. Engel, I believe, has made a slur on the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm going to throw you both out, yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Engel has made a slur on the committee and I think it is proper to correct that slur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't think he did.

MR. KATZMAN: — I believe that Mr. Engel might not have been here earlier this morning when this item was discussed.

MR. ENGEL: — I certainly was.

MR. KATZMAN: — Were you here for the whole thing?

MR. ENGEL: — No, not for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order, order, order. No. You're out of order. I am going to bring this meeting back to order. I'm sorry. The member from Saskatoon Eastview.

MR. YOUNG: — I would suggest that all members have use, and first priority use, of the legislative library, which has always treated me very well in any sort of research I've ever wanted to do. And accordingly, there we are. There's lots of research and lots of expert research. I don't think anyone here would want to suggest that the people in our legislative library aren't anything but superb. And that provides adequate resources for most of us. That's where I do my research, by the way, is through those people. So I would think that the other members could do the same.

MR. KATZMAN: — The formula that we ordered for research is the one . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member for Prince Albert. Order, order.

MR. KATZMAN: — put in by the NDP government 'cause they choose to put it in. And now Allen Engel don't like to live with it. He wants his cake; he wants somebody else to pay for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order, order! Come on, you people. The member from Prince Albert.

MR. MEAGHER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to comment on this personal services — that we have access to the same research material as all the other members of the committee, and this committee's functioned for a number of years on that basis and is doing, I think, a good job. It seems kind of ironical that the suggestion would be made that there's a government caucus as opposed to an opposition caucus, when just a few moments ago the comment was made that our vote was quite split on a couple of motions here in this side. It seems rather inconsistent. That's all I want to say about that.

MR. SVEINSON: — Just one comment on research services. I can certainly identify with that nil budget.

MR. ENGEL: — On personal services, I have a question of the chairman and our staff, either Mr. James or whoever cares to answer, if one of the government members want to. But can I go to the library and ask for research, saying that I would like information on a certain department's public housing costs and get a breakdown from that person, saying that he'll give me some numbers on Sask Housing's expenditures in the North, for example? On what the contract costs was and what the intermediate costs were? And will the library staff member get into Sask Housing's books and dig that information out for me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We are fortunate enough to have a former staff person of the provincial library here, so I'll . . .

MR. ENGEL: — That's why I directed the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Go ahead.

MR. JAMES: — If the research is of a substantial nature which requires the legislative library to prepare a background paper or a brief, that cannot, at the present, be accomplished.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you. I know . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — . . . they produced documents that are in their files for you as you wish them.

MR. ENGEL: — But they do not have filed with the library system, information relating to various departments as to expenditures and as to contracts. And that's the type of information and the kind of research I require for operating effectively on this Public Accounts Committee. And the only point I was making is that service is not available to me and neither is it through my own staff office.

MR. KATZMAN: — But you voted in favour of that when you sat on the library committee that that's the way it be done. So now because you're sitting in opposition, you don't like the rules that you made when you were government. That's the part that . . .

A MEMBER: — Times change.

A MEMBER: — Inaudible interjection here.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's the time, you know . . . Everything that you wanted when you were government, you are now saying you don't want while you're opposition. You know, you made your bed, baby; you got to sleep in it.

A MEMBER: — Shame on you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order! I want to warn members that I'm going to take objection to the use of any profanity in the committee . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . No, you didn't. But I just want to warn members that it's not going to happen again without some comment.

MR. WEIMAN: — I just want to reiterate my earlier comments to the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and I also want to make those comments clear. The member of Rosthern, I would hope that we do not denigrate ourselves by getting into battles of political allegiance in this committee — that we talk as a whole as a Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that you would hold rein over that.

MR. MEAGHER: — I appreciate your comments with respect to profanity in the committee. I just wanted to know, Mr. Chairman, if that applies to your suggestions to the Clerk when helping to compose letters.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, the Clerk has a free rein and drafted the letter as he sees fit. There's a quality, and then there's a quality, I guess.

A MEMBER: — Let's get on with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let's get on with it. Any other comments under personal services?

A MEMBER: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Agreed to personal services?

SOME MEMBERS: — Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I dissent from it, and I think Mr. Engel does. But it certainly passed . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yes, why don't you?

MR. JAMES: — Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, if it's agreeable I can ask the legislative librarian to provide a description of the services and limitations, if there are any, to each caucus, outlining the programs available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you want to set that up for the next meeting? I think it's agreed we do.

MR. SVEINSON: — Question. Would the universities not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, no. Just correspond direct . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay, okay. No, I misunderstood. I thought he or she was going to be here to be talking to us. Okay.

MR. SVEINSON: — Would the faculties that are involved in maybe research staff and assistance of this nature, would they maybe not co-operate on a system that maybe sends a student into Regina, and not pay for it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No.

MR. SVEINSON: — That would not be a . . . There are students here in Regina, I'm sure, that are taking courses. They pay for the course, and would this maybe not alleviate the need to take one course toward a degree?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You may be able to make such arrangements privately. I think it would be very difficult to arrange officially in committee . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — Certainly it would be a good precedent if we could establish it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. We're going to call the vote then on personal services. All agreed with the item as it is? Right.

MR. ENGEL: — Opposed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Opposed. Passed.

Services and Supplies. Entertainment.

SOME MEMBERS: — Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: — I would just point out at \$15 a meeting we could come close to scoring breakfast, I'd imagine, if we used it. Is it \$15 a day for this coffee that we have every morning? Is that what this is trying to tell me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — There used to be . . . we have had muffins here. Lately members have been put to the hardship of buying their own. But at one point in time we used to have them here. The item could be reduced. It's such a small item it's not worth spending a lot of time on, but the item could be reduced, I think, if all we're going to bring was coffee.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like a . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right, do you have a serious comment?

MR. GLAUSER: — I think that when we were meeting at 7:30 in the morning that's when we had the muffins in here. Otherwise, it's not been a practice.

MR. ENGEL: — Could I make one more suggestion? Seeing that coffee is as detrimental to the health as it is, would it be possible to again get an alternative, a juice of some kind or other.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Some juices in addition to the coffee, and delete the muffins. I think the Clerk has the sense of what we want, no muffins and juice. No food and juice, yes. No food, but juice.

The rest of it is on the original item here, contingency, \$200. That's fairly reasonable. Okay, all agreed?

Ah! I didn't see that. There was one here, subscriptions. This apparently covers transcripts from previous proceedings and things that we might ask the Clerk to get for us and so on. There aren't any regular subscriptions to Maclean's magazine or something. It's material and subscriptions, call it that.

MR. KATZMAN: — What's the problem — too high, too low?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Nothing. I was just wondering what it was, in case some members had some questions about it. I don't think there's any problem with that as it is. All those in favour of supplies and equipment?

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, the Clerk will fine tune this thing and we'll circulate it in the House. I think there's no need for another meeting over it unless someone feels that something's been misunderstood by the Clerk. Otherwise it will go directly from here to the Board of Internal Economy which meets next Thursday I think, if I'm correct. Okay. That's the wrong meeting notice. Public Accounts Committee follow-up report. Okay, we have dealt with sub-items (1) and sub-items (2). Sub-item (3), reimbursement to the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg.

MR. WEIMAN: — I just want to try to clean the slate as much as possible. We also dealt with sub 3.2, the reports too, have we not? There's the only one outstanding thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I thought we had adjourned the question of their reports until today (. . . inaudible . . .) It may be in there. I thought we had asked them to report today.

MR. ENGEL: — We were prepared to give oral reports, and it was agreed that the report would be more meaningful, once the verbatim is tabled from the meeting that they don't have yet.

MR. KATZMAN: — And we don't have it here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We still don't have the verbatim from the meeting.

MR. WEIMAN: — Here we are. If I may make reference to page 347 of the verbatim from November 28.

Are we agreed then that the oral report constitutes a written report, once it is in the verbatim?

Yes, I think we are for these purposes, yes.

MR. ENGEL: — Read on.

MR. KATZMAN: — We went further to say that we would wait until we got that (. . . inaudible . . .).

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We'll take calls in a moment then.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, Mr. Chairman. I think we agreed that we would wait until that big book came, and then they would give their (. . . inaudible . . .).

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, I guess you did.

MR. KATZMAN: — So 3.2 is off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. The member from Saskatoon Fairview is right, but for the wrong reasons. We only really have one item here, and I guess I shouldn't request approval of the travel expenses in the amount of . . . the member's travel expenses, do you have the . . . (inaudible) . . . that the expenses of the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg be paid for travel, costs, incidental to the Canadian Council of Public Accounts Committee annual meeting in Charlottetown, July '84, seconded by the member from Rosthern. No. The member from Saskatoon Mayfair.

MR. GLAUSER: — I just want to speak on this. I think what we would want to know there is how those have been calculated, and that they should not be any different than the member from Prince Albert. They weren't?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let me speak to that since the members have raised that. What the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg was paid was the cost of an airline ticket to and from. He was not paid the cost of flying his own aircraft to New Brunswick or wherever he got to before he gave up on it and started to walk. I think he had to rent a car from Fredericton or something, but he was paid the same. I can give you assurance that he was paid the same as the member from Prince Albert.

MR. YOUNG: — Has he been paid?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, no.

MR. KATZMAN: — I've heard the word \$2,700. Is that what you're saying that it cost to send Mr. Meagher . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — He is being paid the following sums if you want to copy them down.

MR. KATZMAN: — No, no, I don't really want to break them out. All I'm asking is, is it the same as Mr. Meagher?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — I mean, Mr. Meagher.

MR. YOUNG: — What did Meagher pay? I think they're asking that — that's the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Within \$100 of each other.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay. That's all I'm asking. I mean I don't need the numbers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You don't need the figures, no. He's being paid the same. He was paid the cost of an airline ticket, which was the question some of you had raised.

MR. ENGEL: — Plus so many nights in a hotel plus the per diem.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — He found out that it would have been — I think it would have been

cheaper to go by Air Canada than by himself down, but that's neither here nor there. I'm sorry. I think I said 27. It's 2,100. I'm sorry. The member from Prince Albert.

MR. MEAGHER: — I would just, if I may, I would like to make a comment on this question for the purpose of straightening up the record. Mr. Engel, the last meeting, made comments and I'll quote him that he says:

I took the word of Mr. Meagher before the session adjourned that this change would be ratified.

And clearly left the indication that I had entered into some kind of an agreement with him that he would be paid. It's quite obvious, of course, that his suggestion is untrue because, by his own admission, the agreement was entered into by the House Leaders the day of adjournment. How I could have made some kind of a commitment prior to the adjournment escapes me. But I simply did not make any such commitment or undertaking because I was unaware of any agreement. I may have said, and quite properly, that if an agreement had been entered into by the House Leaders, then I'm sure they would respect it, and that is probably the comment that he is referring to.

MR. YOUNG: — What page is that that you said that, Paul?

MR. MEAGHER: — Page 351.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member from The Battlefords. Yes, the member from The Battlefords.

MR. MORIN: — Well, I want to make a couple of comments on this thing too. The proceedings of our last meeting when we discussed this ended up in the *Star-Phoenix*, and I don't know where else. And I think that the comments made in that newspaper left us all in rather a poor light, and people who then read those comments, I think, transpose that feeling across the whole legislature that we all look like a bunch of children down here playing foolish games. And I think that it did a disservice to this committee, which, Mr. Chairman, by your own admission, has worked well, that the deal was ever struck; that if we can't look after things within the walls of this committee, then we shouldn't be running off and trying to renegotiate things outside of it. The members on this side of the table, I think, were left in an unfair position. That's, at least, partly your people's fault. It's my opinion that the things that we do within this room should stay within this room, and the deals that are made within this room should be final within this room. And to run off to the House Leader to negotiate shutting down the House for this and that particular consideration strikes me as being somewhat attuned to a child running from one parent to other to see if they can negotiate a better deal, and I was frankly incredibly disappointed by that sort of thing happening.

Maybe that's the way things work around here, but maybe we should also have some sort of a rule that after you've been here a couple of years, you're no longer eligible to sit on committees because it seems that you lose a little bit of integrity or something.

A MEMBER: — Are you suggesting that the member for Rosthern shouldn't be on this committee?

MR. MORIN: — Well, it might go that far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't think that's a proper question.

MR. MORIN: — But I let that comment stand, and I frankly would have expected better from you people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I admit that the discussion, the way it developed, didn't do us a lot of

credit. Without getting into all the nuances of it, I didn't expect the discussion to develop the way it did actually. I didn't anticipate that it would be controversial. That was the part of the problem. I just assumed it was a routine item that you'd approve.

MR. WEIMAN: — The issue at hand at the termination of the last meeting, November 28, was a very simple resolution. Where agreements made — and agreements were made — shall we honour those agreements, and I would prefer that we get to that resolution right now.

MR. CHAIRMAN — Okay. I move the resolution if you want to call a vote on it.

MR. KATZMAN: — I want to speak for a slight moment or two. On page 351 of *Hansard*, I read Mr. Engel's words, and I watch him pretend like he's a shovel man now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Order, order.

MR. KATZMAN: — I would suggest that what the member from North Battleford suggested is partially correct, but then we have to decide . . . We're into a situation that he has basically . . . I'm not sure what's the proper way to phrase it without using unparliamentary language. That's my problem. He is accusing Mr. Muller . . . Meagher, of doing something improper — blank, blank, blank. And I think he owes . . . There's two issues on that comment. I think there's a rule in parliamentary language that if a member said such and such, you must accept his word. And Mr. Muller had made some indication that he was no part of it . . . Meagher. And Mr. Meagher had . . . And yet Mr. Engel decides to make the comments he does. And I think that's improper, and I don't know where is the proper place to correct that, here or in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — If you like we could take the transcript under advisement. It is unparliamentary, I suppose, to impute improper motives to someone. I didn't hear the member from Assiniboia-Gravelbourg doing that, but if you like I'll review the transcript . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm just looking at 351. I don't . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm not sure where all this is going to get us.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the point is, because I took the word of Mr. Meagher he makes the comment, and all I'm saying to, Mr. Meagher says, "I wasn't part of any type of arrangement. I know nothing about it." And then he accuses him of being part. I mean, that means we can make all kinds of accusations. We don't have to back the thing up. First of all, because it's in the committee; and second of all, Mr. Engel's made, you know, Mr. Engel, in my particular situation is another issue, because he's also made them outside the committee. But that's a separate issue. But this one he's putting on the record of the House, of this committee.

MR. ENGEL: — What statement did I make outside of the committee or when?

MR. KATZMAN: — Read the *Star-Phoenix*.

MR. ENGEL: — The *Star-Phoenix* was sitting in here during the whole committee meeting. I never talked to *Star-Phoenix*, ever.

A MEMBER: — Yeah, they were sitting Ralph; I was here.

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, I know he was here; no, no. The *Star-Phoenix* said, on leaving the House you made some comment, and then he quotes you. I said, read the *Star-Phoenix*. That's a separate issue.

MR. SVEINSON: — There've been a lot of accusations thrown around in the last two weeks, and a lot of the aspersions were cast on me, Ralph, outside this committee, by members other

than this committee and, certainly, members of your Executive Council. And I suggest that, you know, if you want to continue to muck-rake and involve this member, maybe we should order a parliamentary committee to study the actions of all members of this House, because I could . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — This committee can only deal with what goes into our *Hansard* in this committee, the same as the *Hansard* that goes in the House can be dealt with in the House, and the *Hansard* for the Crown corporations is dealt with in Crown corporations. All I'm suggesting . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — We can enter anything into the *Hansard* of this committee.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm asking Mr. Engel to look at his comments on 351, the page where Mr. Engel speaks, and I'm not even talking about the words between him and I. I'm talking about the words, the reference that he makes to Mr. Meagher . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . One, two, three, the fifth place, the first time you speak:

I don't believe this, Mr. Chairman . . . because I took the word of Mr. Meagher . . .

Now I think you've got your people confused, possibly. That's where the problem is because Mr. Meagher says he never spoke to you on this issue. I mean that's the problem we're interested in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm just looking at this thing. I do not have — unfortunately, I did not bring my copy of *Hansard* with me. If anybody has got one and isn't using it, would they be . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — That's the only problem. Mr. Meagher at the meeting told you he had no involvement, and yet you still accuse him of involvement. It has now been discovered that the House Leaders made an arrangement.

MR. SVEINSON: — Do I understand this right — that the trade off is \$2,100?

A MEMBER: — No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order. I'm going to start getting a speaking order here if I might.

MR. KATZMAN: — The point I was making to the member from Regina is that there was an arrangement made in the House . . .

A MEMBER: — Which is not unusual.

MR. KATZMAN: — Which is not unusual. I don't argue that. But some of the members of this committee were not totally aware of it, and, in fact, the House Leaders made an arrangement. What Mr. Engel is accusing is Mr. Meagher, of Ted giving him Mr. Meagher's word. Mr. Meagher was not even part of that.

A MEMBER: — What is the debate? Are we going to wrap up the business or . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — The debate is a correction on an accusation, and you have the right to have the record corrected.

MR. SVEINSON: — Well, I was just trying to establish what the debate was whether, you know . . . I missed the original discussion. I wasn't part of this committee at that time when the trade off was made between two House Leaders for a trip to Charlottetown if that's what happened. And apparently the rest of the committee wasn't privy to that information either. How does that information come back into our committee after a deal such as that is made?

MR. MEAGHER: — Mr. Chairman, that question is not on the subject at the moment. The

subject at the moment is clearly my concern that — and I'm not sure the new member, relatively new, that the proper procedure — but I'm asking the question that that kind of a slur can be made and put onto the record without any recourse at all.

MR. ENGEL: — Mr. Chairman, may I comment, and maybe that will solve a lot of problems. Can I have that book back, please?

My understanding — and I wasn't try to slur my good friend at all. We had a good trip; we enjoyed it. My understanding was that I'd talk to you while the session was still on, before we prorogued. If we didn't, then my memory serves that we had a discussion that I was contemplating not going. And you implied to me — and I'm not going to drag anybody else into this . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — Don't drag me into it, Allen.

MR. ENGEL: — I don't intend to. But my understanding was that you said, "There should be no problem with getting your money." I understood this. Now if I said it after the session, I would ask that words in here be struck from the record, or I'll apologize for saying "session." Because I honestly believe I talked to you, Paul. If I didn't, then I will withdraw that statement as well. And I didn't mean it as a slur, because I went with the full confidence that I was going to get my expenses of my trip covered, and I didn't discuss it with Mr. Katzman, but I did think I had talked to you about it because we were the two that were going.

Now if I said it after the session but prior to leaving — maybe we met in Regina here that I said it — then and my memory is clouded. And if it is, I really apologize. But I am convinced that I talked to you before I left Regina, and you said, "Oh, you come along. There surely won't be any problem you getting your money."

The error was that the committee didn't get together after the agreement was reached. That is definitely an error of this committee's action. I was aware of that error and decided not to go, and I was assured that I would get my money — there wouldn't be a problem because the committee can ratify it afterwards. We discussed it, and I felt confident about it, and so I went. If there's anything wrong with doing that, and if we can't take each other's word for it . . . If I said on the way out of here that my dad told me never to trust a Liberal, or a Tory, then I guess I should even apologize for that because I maybe shouldn't have said it out loud. But you can't take it from my heart, eh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In a fairly complete fashion I think the member said he'd withdraw it if it wasn't accurate. That's all you can ask.

MR. MEAGHER: — Well, I'll accept the member's comment, and I think that it's fair comment. If in the course of a discussion . . . I raised at the last meeting — and I'm looking at *Hansard* — that I had no objections at that time to any member of this committee going, least of all the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, and welcomed his presence at the conference. I objected then to the tactic that was used by the opposition caucus to the net effect of which would be to limit the number of members going. I objected then; I still do. But clearly there's a misunderstanding, and I accept your comments.

MR. ENGEL: — I suppose if there was any error at all, it was that the committee a long time ago didn't have in place a budget that would have allowed for more than two to go. And we were just acting on not getting involved. When you're in a tight restraint on all kinds of programs, we just, as a caucus, had felt strongly that we stay within the budget. And that presented problems, and I think it's sad. If you think the *Star-Phoenix* hurt you people, put yourself in the other person's shoes. I think the kind of discussion we had should have been an in camera session. I'm disappointed that this one wasn't this morning. I really feel you're about to cast aspersions on members of this committee. And because I, in full confidence, went, I spent my own money,

there's no room in there for a line for interest or reimbursement of any kind; if I'd owed the government \$2,100 for six months I'm sure there would be some room for some interest payment in there, but I accepted it. I went along with it, and I'm prepared to live with a negative decision here.

That's just one of the roles of being a member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let's see if we can get this thing to a conclusion.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, at least the committee met. I've had the opportunity to speak to our House Leader, or I should say our Deputy House Leader, who informs me that there was an arrangement made on the floor of the House on the last day re Mr. Engel's trip. And we in this caucus, now that we have been totally made aware of it, that there was an arrangement, we will be prepared to retroactively honour that arrangement that was made by the House Leaders on the day. As the minutes will indicate, we asked for time to go back and talk to the House Leaders, to clarify. I have talked to your House Leader, I have talked to our Deputy House Leader that was involved at that time, and they both said they should have told us, and neither one of them did tell us.

MR. SVEINSON: — Are we privy to that arrangement as a committee?

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, that Mr. Engel would be able to take the replacement of Mr. Shillington?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You were not present in the House on the day in question, so . . .

MR. SVEINSON: — The last day of the session? Yes, I was.

A MEMBER: — Yes, he was.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Sorry about that.

MR. KATZMAN: — I was the only member of this committee at the time that was in the House.

MR. SVEINSON: — You mention a deal was struck. Now, I'd just like the other side of the deal. What was the deal, and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The other side of the deal, I think, was that you were put on the committee. I think that was . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — But the arrangement of the House, if I correctly stand, the part that I was involved in, was that you, Mr. Sveinson, would be put on Public Accounts, and the part of the deal that I was not aware of, I was not involved in the discussion because they came and asked me about you, and I said, well, you've got a problem with quorum, and I'll fix that in a motion yesterday or the day before.

The other portion that was discussed — and I wasn't part of that discussion — was the switching of Mr. Engel . . . Sorry, the final discussion. Correct that. The final discussion. Mr. Engel is correct in his comment about me. At the time in the House when it was brought up, and you were brought up, I said, "Well, the motion says the opposite." And that's where I stand.

So they went back and talked about it, and made their decision. And I, as one member of the committee, now that I've talked to the Deputy House Leader, who was involved, Mr., the member from Meadow Lake, and talked to the House Leader for the NDP from Shaunavon . . . They had that agreement, and I will live by it because this place must operate on gentleman's agreements. But at least we should know about them when they happen. That's basically why we all got in a mess.

MR. YOUNG: — I assume we are eventually going to get to a motion to approve this thing retroactively?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I assume that before we all die of old age we'll get there.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's what I was moving.

MR. YOUNG: — Back to Ralph, he's going to move it so we can get on with this thing.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, that's what I was moving.

MR. YOUNG: — Oh, you did move it?

MR. KATZMAN: — I moved it and Bill asked for some background. That's why I explained it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Question? The member from Prince Albert had his hand up. Pass? Okay, all those in favour? Opposed? Agreed.

AGREED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any other business? Ah, we have the teacher's actuarial report — actuarial report, teacher's superannuation — we haven't dealt with.

MR. GLAUSER: — Before, as sort of a recap on this whole area here, I would just like to make a comment. And I would like to refer you back to the member from Saskatoon Fairview's comment on the politicizing of this committee. And I think since we've started out this year on somewhat of a bad foot, and I would like to see this change. We have not experienced this in the past. And I think that it's time it's got corrected, as from here on in, and keep this to the non-partisan group that we have had the experience in the past.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just one question to clarify. I don't know, from what you said earlier Ned, when we're going to meet again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What's that?

MR. KATZMAN: — I don't know when we're going to meet again, from your clarification, and I wouldn't mind discussing that issue before we go into . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right.

MR. KATZMAN: — I assume we only have three or four minutes left and we're done today if I understood we met till 11:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, we have three minutes left.

MR. KATZMAN: — So I don't know our times, and could we now start to work on what time we will meet each week?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do want to meet next week and deal with this actuarial report next week then, given the hour and the day?

MR. KATZMAN: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — Thursday we have a meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, we can meet Tuesday or Wednesday.

A MEMBER: — Not Tuesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right, Wednesday.

MR. KATZMAN: — My comment, Mr. Chairman, is could we also start to now work on the times this committee will sit between . . . (inaudible) . . . so that we can plan our own schedules?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. May I lead off . . . All right. May I lead off that discussion by saying that I think — and I speak only for myself — I don't speak for the opposition caucus because we haven't discussed this — I would rather start at 9:30 and end at 11 o'clock or 11:30, rather than the earlier sessions we had last year. It gives us a chance to brush up on things in the morning and get going — just a personal preference.

MR. WEIMAN: — I realize that those 7:30 mornings were a tad early, but it did satisfy one situation that we all have and that's the multiplicity of chores that we have. And by extending the hours the way we did it allowed us to get to our other duties that we have. And I would . . .

In a sense, I can agree with your 9:30 thing, Mr. Chairman. However, I hope that by going to 9:30 does not extend our meetings over three days — that we do continue the two day situation that we had in the past to allow us to be free to do those other duties that we all have as sitting members of the legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let me respond to that, if I can. And that is that we start out meeting two days a week. If on the first of May, it looks as if we're lagging a bit, and we're . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Then we'll make adjustments.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We can make adjustments. But let's try, during March and April, two days a week, 9:30 to 11 . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Two days a week. That is the Wednesday, Thursday meetings?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — 9:30 to 11:30.

MR. GLAUSER: — Well, my comments will centre around that time. Number one, 9 o'clock, perhaps, could consider running to 11. The other thing that I think we should consider very closely is the first meeting we have that we sit down and study very carefully the departments that we are going to look at, and that we each will have our homework done, so that this thing can progress in an orderly fashion and that the people will be selected, who are going to carry those, and do a thorough job on that. And then I think we can keep this confined to the two days a week and get the job done.

MR. YOUNG: — I think I'm going to probably speak on something that Mr. Engel and a few others will agree on. I think that we shouldn't start at 9:30 in the morning, right off the bat. I think we should start earlier and "give her snooze," so to speak, in March and April and back off in May on our times and our meetings, and give her again in June, if need be.

But I don't think we should start off slow in the first two months. I think we should go hard then and lighten our load in the months of May and June . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Okay. And further . . . Well, perhaps we'll be finished by May, but whatever, I think that we shouldn't start off and then kind of see where we're at come the 1st of May. I'll make a motion to that effect if I have to, but I hope the committee will kind of go in that direction with me. Secondly, and it's a very small item, but we used to have those cardboard box things with one side cut out of them for our materials.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It's still available, I think.

MR. YOUNG: — It's very handy, and I would hope that Mr. James would try to get us organized in that fashion again. It is very handy. You could just grab that box and it comes down here and you've got all your *Hansards* and all your reports and whatnot in there, and it really makes things easy.

MR. KATZMAN: — I can go after Mr. Engel if he wants.

MR. ENGEL: — I appreciate the comment because I was going to make the same thing, and say that I'd sooner start at 8:30 and be done by the 1st of May, then start at 9:30 and go in May, because I tend to use my aircraft and fly back and forth and do my farmings in the mornings in May, and it complicates things if I got to miss every meeting in May.

But the other thing I was wondering, as far as assigning departments and all, I'd appreciate some idea from the auditor's office as to which departments we're going to have to be going at before we can decide just how we're going to do it. You know, once that report is out, then you know well, we've got to call this department because of this shortcoming; we've got to call that department because of that one, and it's pretty hard to do that. You know, I'm just commenting on the statement you made that I should decide that I'm going to take a certain department now before I see the auditor's report, and I might be spinning my wheels on a department that . . .

A MEMBER: — When's the first meeting?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In March.

A MEMBER: — Once we get the auditor's report.

MR. ENGEL: — Oh, I thought you were talking about this next meeting we're having here, and, as I say, there's just no way I could be ready for that until I see the report. Okay, that covers it all.

MR. SVEINSON: — I would just like to speak to that point for a moment. I realize the government would like to get their members up early at 7:30, and get them out on the hustings and working diligently in this committee. I would suspect that maybe there are other motives for starting at 7:30 in the morning and working till . . . I don't know what time of the day you suggest. I would say that if the committee can guarantee that we're finished by the end of May, I'd support that. Otherwise, I think that we should just meet from 9:30 to 11:30 as we did today, and give some of us who do work, who do have a lot of heavy workload within the legislature, a little time in the morning to get up and review what has to be done for the day. We're sitting in the House till 10 o'clock at night, and expected to do our research after 10 o'clock — between 10 o'clock and 7:30 in the morning. I think that's asking a little too much of members of this committee, unless we've got a lot of time on our hands, and some of us haven't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member from Rosthern is going to let that comment slide and make a non-partisan comment here.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, I don't believe what I have just heard, but I will hold my tongue for a short while. Mr. Chairman, in the past we have met roughly three hours each day, two days a week. We did finish on time. We did not get ourselves in the box that Crown Corp is. Their game is a little different style of committee and we have run a little different style in this committee.

A MEMBER: — You should double check with your ministers before you start challenging Crown Corp.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order, order, order.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just for the benefit of that member, we have trouble occasionally getting groups in front of us, too. But my comment is, I'm a little nervous about your comment of bringing us down to an hour and a half, which is at 9:30 to 11:00, which is three hours a week rather than six hours a week. I'm more in favour of — I guess Mr. Young suggested and Mr. Engel seems for it — that we look at that 8:30 or the earlier. Well, I'm one that didn't mind 7:30 but I realize for some people it's a problem, but I won't get into that issue either.

What I'm saying is, we need sufficient time each day to do them. We have two days a week that we sit. We should make sure that . . . I would rather see us cut back after we had started than cut back at the start. I'd rather see us take the time to start and see what happens, see how it's going. If we find we're moving right along very smoothly, I don't mind taking an hour off or half an hour off, or whatever; I'm saying shortening the time. I'm not opposed to saying getting down to two and a half, or two hours, you know. But I am very concerned that we shouldn't get down like just to three. I could live with four or five hours a week. But I have a feeling if we get down below four we may be in real trouble for getting our work done. And I got to agree with Mr. Engel and Mr. Young that when you start getting the nice sun weather it's a little tougher, and I don't care — not just the farmers . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let me say. Let me say — I'm going to recognize the member from Saskatoon Fairview in a minute, but let me say that I'm easy on the time. If you guys want to start at 8:30, 8:30's right as rain with me. I'm not hung up on it. I'll come whenever you want. The member from Saskatoon Eastview, don't think you have to persuade me. I'm easy.

MR. WEIMAN: — I would like to move that motion, and let's get on with it right now, that we meet Wednesday, Thursdays, 9 o'clock to 11:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I think the member from Eastview said 8:30 . . . (inaudible interjections) . . . He said 8:30.

MR. WEIMAN: — In that case, 8:30 to 11:30 then.

A MEMBER: — It gives an hour to do some work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Order, order. We've got a speaker's list here, and the next person is Prince Albert.

MR. MEAGHER: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Leaving the time thing aside for a moment, I think we can come to a consensus there, a reasonable compromise, and as early as we can accommodate and get the work done. The first part, I think, it's an excellent suggestion.

But I also would like to expand a little bit on the suggestion made by the member from Saskatoon, that each of us, or two or three of us, take a particular department or particular area, and do a good job on it, and, too, I'd like to make a suggestion for the members to just kind of mull around over the next few days, that perhaps we could design this little split by — because of the make-up of this committee, there's a bit of an imbalance here, that a member of the government side, and a member of the opposition side, work together on one, to make the non-partisan nature of this committee a little more evident. And I think that would be something that I'd like to see considered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Something to consider for March.

MR. MULLER: — I have to agree with Mr. Young and Mr. Engel on the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — 8:30 to 11:30 or 8:30 to 11?

MR. MULLER: — 8:30 to 11 is fine.

A MEMBER: — 8:30 to 11:30, or 8 to 11.

A MEMBER: — I like that last one. 8 to 11.

A MEMBER: — I like 8. If you feel five hours a week is not enough, extend it to six.

A MEMBER: — I like 9:30 to 11:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The motion before us . . . 8:30 to 11.

MR. YOUNG: — I would ask members . . . (inaudible interjections) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Order, order.

MR. YOUNG: — I would ask members to vote that one down, and let's either go at 8 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Why don't you amend it? Give us your time. Never mind the drafting.

MR. YOUNG: — Does that accommodate you, Ned, because you want to get your time before dinner?

A MEMBER: — Why don't you amend the amendment?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You can't do that. Only one amendment allowed. All right. The motion is, Mr. Weiman:

That the Standing Committee on Public Accounts sit Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays from 8 to 11 . . .

A MEMBER: — No, I said Wednesday, Thursday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: —

That the Standing Committee on Public Accounts sit Wednesdays and Thursdays from 8:30 to 11.

Amended by the member from Saskatoon Eastview: the times are 8 to 11.

Unless there's more discussion on this, I'm going to call the vote.

MR. ENGEL: — The question I would ask: do we feel we need more than five hours a week? You see 8:30 to 11 is five hours.

MR. YOUNG: — Six.

MR. ENGEL: — No, but if you're going 8 to 11 it's six. And I think at five hours a week, if we know we're going to work at it, two and one-half hour sitting is good. You get to the three hours, you're going to waste a half an hour. I think you can take any group dynamics course you want, and a two and one-half hour meeting is long enough. And if we work at that two and one-half hours . . . I'm speaking against your amendment.

MR. MORIN: — Well, following the logic of the member for Assiniboia-Gravelbourg, if you're going to sit for two and one-half hours, you're going to waste a half an hour anyway, and then

you're only going to have two hours. I believe we ought to go for three hours at a crack. If we finish up, fine, we finish up. And let's just bear down and try and get the job done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The member for Saskatoon Eastview, Fairview — I wish these names didn't sound so much alike — the member from Saskatoon Fairview said something, made a comment that I don't think was accurate last year. He said the work expanded so as to fill the time available for its completion. That actually didn't happen last year . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — I didn't say our work did. I said generally work seems to expand to fill the time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Generally, it does. Actually that didn't happen last year.

We sat longer hours and we finished early. Anyway that's not an argument for anything as I say. Any time you set with me is right as rain. Are there any other times? Do we not have a 6 a.m. to 9 a.m. person here?

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, if I may, I agree with Kim, and I understand Allen Engel's problem. My comment will be very simple. Let's start with Kim's idea. If we're rolling real good and we believe we can move down to five, let's move down to five, as your concern is. But let's start with the maximum and see how we're rolling.

MR. ENGEL: — I was just trying to be practical, but . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — The first two meetings we'll need the three because going through the report, picking out the departments, we're going to need them. After that we may not need them. So let's start with the three, and then once we see the Provincial Auditor's report, then we will have an idea.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Any other?

MR. ENGEL: — Question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — A question on the amendment to the motion. The motion says:

That the Standing Committee on Public Accounts sits Wednesdays and Thursdays from 8:30 to 11.

Amended by Mr. Young:

That the hours be 8 to 11.

All those in favour of the amendment please raise your right hand? Opposed? Carried unanimously.

CARRIED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All those in favour of the main motion, please raise your right hand?

MR. ENGEL: — As amended.

SOME MEMBERS: — As amended.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All those opposed? It is carried unanimously.

CARRIED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right, 8 o'clock then next Wednesday, we'll consider the Teachers'

Superannuation Report.

A MEMBER: — Will you have the people here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Given the limit of the agenda — that was supposed to be a joke, do you guys want to meet at 8 o'clock next Wednesday . . .

SOME MEMBERS: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — . . . given the fact that our agenda is so short? That's for intersession, yes. 9 o'clock, all right.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, before we go further, relative to this document, you will have the teachers' superannuation people here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, we will have them here by 9 a.m. in the morning.

MR. LUTZ: — Thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.