

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
April 24, 1985

Consideration of Provincial Auditor's Report

. . . that \$35,000 has been recovered, and there again it would just be a case of them coming in here and reporting such. I would suggest that we not have them . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let's just adjourn this for the moment. I suspect everyone's here who's going to be here. You'll then begin the recording session again, Helen.

With respect to the Department of Urban Affairs, the first paragraph and the second paragraph, I guess, are all one problem. These failures — we've had problems before, perhaps not with Urban Affairs but with other departments with respect to their failure to recover amounts which could be claimed from the Government of Canada.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just a minute, didn't Cal say that they got the money?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, but that wasn't quite my question. My question is: is there a procedure in place which would ensure that the Department of Urban Affairs would — that this wouldn't happen again. Is there a set procedure in place? Is there some checks in place, or is this just if someone comes in to do it and they don't get . . .

MR. BENSON: — There's an audit conducted either by the Provincial Auditor's office or by our office on almost every claim that's made. And, in fact, I think this item came to the attention of everybody because of the audit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see.

MR. KRAUS: — There's two aspects to it. Number one, the departments do have systems in place to identify these costs and make sure that they're claimed. But like any other system they're not perfect, and, therefore, there is a chance that something goes wrong. But we do have an audit. It's not only by Mr. Lutz's office, but there is an audit that we perform as well to certify that the claim is correct. And we do sometimes find where departments have not always included all the costs I think that they should. It shouldn't happen, but it does happen from time to time.

And in this particular case, the federal government did reconsider their position and agreed to pay the 95,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. So, in your view, there's no ongoing problem with respect to agreements with the Government of Canada? So there's no soft spot here in the system. In your view then there's no ongoing soft spot in the system?

MR. KRAUS: — We don't believe so, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Any other interest in calling Urban Affairs? All right. D then, I guess.

Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan — too many generic terms in here. What was meant by "over disbursements at certain locations"? What disbursements at what locations?

MR. WENDEL: — That would be PCS Mining, Central, and PCS Mining, Allan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Those are the locations. What were the disbursements?

MR. WENDEL: — It would be the normal cheque writing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm sorry. I still don't understand you.

MR. WENDEL: — Cheque writing, the payments to suppliers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see. And in what sense was the system deficient? People could send in . . . could bill them twice, and they could pay twice for a drill bit or something?

MR. WENDEL: — Oh, just what it says here. They have access. The accounting personnel — “have access to signed cheques and the accounting records and there is no subsequent comparison of paid cheques to the cheque register.”

MR. KATZMAN: — The same person doing both jobs, basically, instead of having two people so that there's . . . to counter-check on you. Am I correct?

MR. WENDEL: — A segregation of duties. It's not as good as it should be.

MR. KATZMAN: — Has it been cleaned up, Mr. Kraus?

MR. KRAUS: — I can't speak to the potash corporation, Mr. Katzman. No, it's one of the Crown managers . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I have a suggestion for government members here, and that is that we call this corporation, but only for the purposes of dealing with this particular problem, leave the larger political problems to Crown corporations.

A MEMBER: — I'll agree with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't think it's appropriate for this committee to get into their annual report, and whether they're making money or losing money. That's Crown corporations.

On the other hand, I don't think it's realistic to expect Crown corporations to deal with this kind of a problem. I'll make the motion that we call the Potash Corporation of Saskatchewan. I guess I'm supposed to put it in writing.

MR. GLAUSER: — Would you need a motion to do it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. We'll just take my word for it then that we won't get into a whole bunch of other issues when they're here.

MR. GLAUSER: — We'll hold you to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You'll hold me to it. Okay. Call them then as an A, but only for that narrow purpose. It doesn't matter.

MR. KATZMAN: — An A or a B?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It doesn't matter. Okay, A.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, if I may, relative to this subject, is potash going to be an A category item? This is definite we will call them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes, definite we will call them.

MR. LUTZ: — In that event, Mr. Chairman, I think I should possibly advise you that I will probably have their auditor here, sitting in this place, to answer these questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. We'll have to have them . . . And where is that? Is that in Saskatoon or Regina?

MR. LUTZ: — He's from Saskatoon. We can get him here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — So's the potash corporation from Saskatoon.

We'll have to call them, then, on a Wednesday morning, and deal with it first thing. Well, I guess we won't deal with it at 8 o'clock in the morning. That will mean they'll have to stay overnight. We'll deal with it at 9:30 or something . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Our committee secretary can advise me of the day, and I'm sure we can arrange to have the auditor here.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just a minute. Hang on. We could deal with them at 9 o'clock in the morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — And can they catch the aircraft to get in . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — That's what I was working out. The flight arrives at 8:35 or something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. We'll do that then. We'll just make a note of that later on when we slot these folks in.

MR. KATZMAN: — It leaves at 7:50, so about 8:35 or so. I think it's 40 minutes.

MR. GLAUSER: — In Crown corporations would they get into a matter like this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It is a straight political operation, Cal. They don't deal with administrative questions at all. Actually, if you haven't, government members should sit in on a Crown corporations meeting. It's illustrative of how not to run a meeting, actually. But it's also illustrative of the difference. It's worth your while to sit in on a Crown corporations meeting just to see the difference.

Prairie . . . PAMI (Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute). There were a number of observations made with respect to fee-for-service revenue earned by the institute, and I gather that they're not sending out the bills and not collecting them if they do. Can you speak to this?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes, I could speak to it, Mr. Chairman. Part of the problem here was that the institute, the head office was not recording revenue until revenue was collected. And I believe that was with respect to activity taken at the Lethbridge station.

Head office was preparing invoices and sending out the billings for the Humboldt and the Portage la Prairie operation, but not for Lethbridge. They weren't really aware of what revenue was involved until they received the cash. They've moved one step in that direction in that Lethbridge continues to issue its own invoices or bills and then sends a copy to head office, who in turn records this, so at least they know what revenue they should be collecting.

So that's an improvement, but we're of the opinion that as long as Lethbridge continues to prepare its own billings, there is a possibility that revenues may not be accounted for properly. And we're not aware of any reason why head office couldn't be preparing the billings for Lethbridge as they do for the rest of the operation, just to tighten it up. That's our position on it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I guess we want to call this, do we, folks?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I've got a little problem with it, Ned. And I may be wrong. This is a

three-province agreement?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes, it is. Three provinces share in the operating costs, yes.

MR. KATZMAN: — Are we the lead province and, therefore, do we have the right to call that Alberta branch in? I don't know the answer, and I'm just questioning that concern. I think there was . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I was operating on the assumption that the administration was in Humboldt and, therefore, they had the overall responsibility to . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — But I understand somehow Lloydminster, or the Alberta one, does it just a slight difference because of some sharing in . . . I'm going back in my memory to when your ministers . . . when you guys were government, and the minister said something about it, that there was some little difference between Manitoba and Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you believe that that is being done at the request of the Alberta government or something?

MR. KATZMAN: — I think that's what I remember, but I cannot . . . that they wanted there to know what they were doing for Alberta's side, not locked into the other stuff. I'm just going by memory.

MR. KRAUS: — There may be some differences, Mr. Katzman, but, when it comes to this type of activity, the billing and collection of moneys and general administration, I'm not sure that they're not all under the control and direction of a general manager that's located in Humboldt.

MR. KATZMAN: — Yeah, but there was an assistant manager over there, and I remember something about they like to know what they were doing, separate from what the manager was doing, so I'd assume that's why they want to do their billings. Now I'm not sure what's correct in this case, and I'm flexible. And I'm just concerned that we may be overstepping our bounds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — My suggestion would be that we call them and, if that's the explanation offered, let it go at that. Obviously, whatever the Alberta government . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Why don't we get an explanation and then decide if we're going to call them first. Maybe they can give us a written, to tell us if they are, if it's something to do with the intergovernment agreement, or if it's not. Maybe a phone call by Craig can maybe get an answer so we can give some direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I would . . . I'm not necessarily sure that I want this answer directly from them, though. This is an interprovincial agreement.

MR. BENSON: — Mhmm.

MR. ENGEL: — Three provinces. They're not all in at the same rate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Three provinces. Administered by Saskatchewan. Okay, let's . . . I would rather we get the information from Intergovernmental Affairs or from the Justice department, rather than them personally with a phone . . . I'm not, in that sense, doubting their integrity. It's just . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the people doing that have been changed, I understand.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware that it has anything to do with Intergovernmental Affairs. I think the Saskatchewan end of it is supposed to administer this sharing operation, as Mr.

Kraus has said. And we are not sure either why Alberta seems to be going their route, but I don't think it has anything to do with the intergovernmental, and I believe the people from Humboldt can tell us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Why don't we call them and let them offer their own explanation.

MR. KATZMAN: — My concern was that I thought if we could speak to them, maybe we'd decide if we need them after we get just the basics, a little information. There may be a reason, and that may solve it, or we may want to call them. I'm not hung up either way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I just don't like dealing with these things over the phone.

MR. KATZMAN: — I just hate to call anybody this time of the year in this industry, because this is when they're going hard. Shouldn't they, Al? 'Cause they get a lot of questions . . .

MR. ENGEL: — I don't know if there's any specific time of the year when they'd go harder than another one on their regular testing program. I've been up there several times. The arrangement that I understood is that they were giving Lethbridge's operation some special autonomy. I don't know if Lethbridge is doing work over and above what their regular testing program is with PAMI. I think they do the work with PAMI, plus they do a little addition. And, as a result, maybe we should even check with Alberta public accounts if they audit that one, or if they do some work there, if these people just report to you. Would you know that?

MR. LUTZ: — We audit.

MR. ENGEL: — Lethbridge, as well?

MR. LUTZ: — Lethbridge we audit; Portage la Prairie we audit; and we audit Humboldt.

MR. ENGEL: — Well then I think we have a responsibility to know what's going on. I'd suggest we call them and have somebody explain that financial arrangement we have. Because, by the sound of this, Lethbridge just sends the bills to Humboldt on ones that they're going to charge for. The work that they do for gratis, they don't bother sending the bills in, is what it sounds like to me.

Now maybe they have some arrangement where they do some work for gratis, and I'm not sure if they do or not, or what the score is. But if we're responsible and Saskatchewan is responsible for that administration, I think we should know what kind of arrangement they have there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Presumably they work gratis at our expense.

MR. ENGEL: — That's possible.

MR. GLAUSER: — Yes, it seems to me that this has been in here before.

MR. KRAUS: — They may not have been in last year, Mr. Glauser, but I'm sure they were in since . . . well, they were in the year before then, at least. They were here a couple years ago, I believe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We called them the first year that we sat after '82. We called everybody that year, though.

MR. BENSON: — Not for this. Their general accounting records were in pretty bad shape several years ago when they had some assistance from a public accounting firm and helped them get a new accounting system put in place.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you want to put it down as a B then?

MR. GLAUSER: — Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation. Am I mistaken, or is this a problem which has been here before? Seems to me that I've heard this said of them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Last year it was the million dollar phoney, you know, where they declared a dividend, and they had to borrow the money to do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I recall that. I guess I could have checked with my last year's report, but I thought last year we had raised this issue as well — you had raised this issue as well, rather.

MR. WENDEL: — There were more issues, I believe, with Sask Comp.

MR. LUTZ: — Yes, but I don't have my last year's report with me, Mr. Chairman. I guess maybe it's over there.

MR. KATZMAN: — How are we, Mr. Kraus? Have they cured the problem?

MR. KRAUS: — Mr. Katzman, we're running into a series of corporations now that are again Crown corps.

MR. KATZMAN: — Fair game.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It is on page 10. It was 2.2.(2). Yes, there it is. First item again. It's the first item.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you do Western Development Museum?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes. We're responsible for it.

MR. WENDEL: — We continue to have some . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see that. I would suggest if this is an old problem we call them. Gentlemen, any problem?

MR. KATZMAN: — What do you want it, a B or an A?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Perhaps since it is an old problem, we should make it an A. It's not A yet.

I read this and I wonder what the solution is. As was generously pointed out by the Provincial Auditor, there's so few people around that it may not be possible to segregate duties.

MR. LUTZ: — That may be exactly right, Mr. Chairman, which is, I guess, regrettable, but we will probably continue to report this in the interests of self-preservation, I suppose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Right.

A MEMBER: — What are we doing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We're doing the Saskatchewan Development Fund. The difficulty that they have is that there's so few employees left that they can't segregate their duties, and no solution appears to me. I just don't know what the solution is to that. Okay, D . . . And probably the Provincial Auditor will continue to audit this — will continue to see that these people are audited. If this was Crown corporation, it would be audited in any event.

Forest Products Corporation — this doesn't sound to me like a new problem either. I'm asked for some assistance then from the Provincial Auditor . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I think as a result of our new legislation which came down in '83, the auditors of these various Crowns, when they were not myself, were asked to put up a internal control opinion, and this was another one of those which was done by private sector auditors. We're really quoting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. If it were my office that this was said about, I'd have some concerns about this. To not have a proper procedure to ensure that all product shipped was invoiced — I'll tell you what happened if he doesn't; it doesn't all get invoiced. I can tell you that from running a six-person mob, because, I don't know . . . Do you people want to call them and discuss it? B?

A MEMBER: — B, okay sure.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I would then advise you that if you do indeed call Sask. Forest Products, I will try to arrange to have their auditor here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The same comment applies to this. We'll have to watch this — stage these.

MR. KATZMAN: — Would I be correct in Mr. Lutz was suggesting that they don't get called till May, the private auditor group, because they're probably . . . (inaudible) . . . till April 30th as normal?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Would most of these be accounting firms?

MR. LUTZ: — Oh yes. This is part of their business. If I get called, they can get called.

A MEMBER: — Good shot. Good shot.

MR. LUTZ: — Well, that's fair ball. You know, they get paid for this job, then let them finish the job.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, we can call them in May though. We may anyway.

MR. LUTZ: — It's up to the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Saskatchewan Government Insurance.

MR. GLAUSER: — That's covered under Finance . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I guess it is going to be covered under the Finance, isn't it? Okay.

Printing company. Same comment applies with respect to the printing company.

MR. KRAUS: — We can speak to the printing company because it is now a treasury . . . under treasury board's jurisdiction, for a little while, yes.

This is a case where they weren't checking supplier invoices for mathematical accuracy and reviewing invoices prior to payment, and so on.

MR. KATZMAN: — Are they doing it now?

MR. KRAUS: — They are doing it now, yes.

MR. WEIMAN: — That's not that pigs one again, is it, that were flying Air Canada?

A MEMBER: — No, no.

MR. WEIMAN: — Okay.

A MEMBER: — Remember that one? First class tickets to Japan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Again, the same comment applies with respect to the . . . I guess again you're not able to give us much assistance with respect to the pork.

MR. KRAUS: — It actually is under treasury board . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Oh, is it?

MR. KRAUS: — . . . but the problem is not different from the development, Saskatchewan Development Fund. They don't have very many staff. They just have a very small clerical staff and two management people who travel an awful lot. And it's hard to divide the duties up in a manner that gives you the kind of satisfaction that one person hasn't got control of the whole transaction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What do you want to do with this?

MR. KATZMAN: — I want . . . I'd like to put this on the A for two reasons: (a) that it is now a marketing board controlled by the producers, and this is the last crack we get to make sure that everything is proper and that, you know, they're not checked again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Any comments on that?

MR. KATZMAN: — Am I correct on that statement? Because they're now a producer's group. They've had their vote, and from now on we won't be touching them anymore.

A MEMBER: — One more year.

MR. KATZMAN: — Maybe one more year. So we want to make sure that everything's right and snuff.

A MEMBER: — Snuff?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well it's a problem. One guy signs a cheque and also . . . Can you turn that thing off for one second, please?

A MEMBER: — Let her roll.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Have you got any strong feelings on this, Al?

MR. ENGEL: — On the hog thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Call them as an A then if you want.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's the only reason I'm calling it, is to make sure that problem's not . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Housing corporation, to put it mildly, did not come out with a clean bill of health here. This strikes me as an A, just to make sure the . . . I don't know whether you guys have had a chance to read the comments. It strikes me as an A. It goes on for two pages.

MR. KATZMAN: — Two and a half pages. They're getting . . . Almost three pages. Almost must be an A.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. Any contrary views? A it is, then?

A MEMBER: — A it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Liquor board. Apparently they had not signed a contract with the brewer's association, and therefore the sale of beer and malt liquor by the Saskatchewan Brewers Association was not authorized in accordance with The Liquor Act.

A MEMBER: — Big deal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Is this . . . Was this a new phenomenon? And I'm not going to get into an anti-liquor trip here, but has the Saskatchewan Brewery Association always sold beer and malt liquor?

MR. LUTZ: — Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see. Well, what's unusual then? Did this problem just come to your attention, or did the old contract expire and no new one was signed?

MR. WENDEL: — The old one would have expired, and the new one has not been executed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Has it now?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes. Actually it was signed on March 29, 1985, and it covers the period March 1, '83 to March 31, '86. So it's just a recent signing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay.

MR. KATZMAN: — It's the same as a union contract, retroactive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. I don't feel strongly about calling the liquor board.

MR. KATZMAN: — Put them on D.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, D it is.

Power Corporation. Again, this, it would appear, would come in with the Department of Finance when they come wheeling in with their — oh, not quite, I guess.

MR. KATZMAN: — Oh, these are Many Islands though. This is the small side.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — This is the subsidiary, right? Dealing with the two different issues then.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, issue 2 will be done with Finance, I assume.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well, I was wondering, isn't . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . It is pension. Okay. Issue 1, we have no means of knowing whether or not this problem has been rectified. It isn't . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Does Mr. Kraus know if it's been cleaned up?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, he doesn't. I just talked to him.

MR. BENSON: — All we've been given is some verbal assurances, and we have no way of knowing what . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Can we handle this in the following fashion: since this is a minor subsidiary, this is kind of — I guess every dollar is not small potatoes, but in the scheme of things the Many Island Pipelines is not the centre of the government's operation.

Could we have the Clerk address a letter to the appropriate officials asking them for their response to this, and, if they can give us an explanation which satisfies us, all well and good. If they can't, we'll call them. And for the moment, put it on the back burner.

MR. GLAUSER: — If they could just confirm in writing what they have verbally told the comptroller, then I think we could settle for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yeah. That's what I was thinking. Given the size of the thing, it's not . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Yeah. That's what it is, I think, yeah. Okay. I take it that we're going to write and ask for their response and whether or not they've cleaned up their act.

MR. KATZMAN: — Or would it be profitable that the comptroller do it? Therefore he has it in his records.

MR. BENSON: — We would probably be dealing through Crown management for it through that indirect fashion.

MR. KRAUS: — I should say we have a certain amount of formality we have to follow, and so rather deal directly with Sask Power, we would likely, as Mr. Benson says, go to the CMB (Crown Management Board) officials first.

MR. KATZMAN: — Craig, write the letter. It's simpler. We won't get tied up in red and blue bureaucracy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. The Clerk is going to do that then, and report back to us.

The Saskatchewan Research Council, number one, is a bit of a problem. Has this been tidied up at all?

MR. KRAUS: — It has, to some degree. They have some of the same problems we were talking about earlier about a small staff. But at least they have somebody now who is independently checking the cash received to the final moneys that are deposited in the bank, and any adjusting entries that are made to the records are approved by their own comptroller. I don't think it's reached the stage, though, where it's going to meet the minimum standards of internal control. And we're just not sure whether they can again because their staff is so small. They have such a small office staff. It's a problem we have when the organization is so small.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — This crowd is in Saskatoon, aren't they?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes, they are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — They're actually on the campus, yes. Not the kind of a thing where you can get other officials from other governmental departments to do it for them, because it's not in Regina.

Just without finalizing that one, they apparently were in an overdraft by twice the allowed amount. They had an overdraft of \$955,000 which was not authorized. What action did you take to ensure . . .

MR. KRAUS: — First, they should not have done that, obviously, but what they did do is they applied for an increase in their limit. And the Minister of Finance approved an increase on January 2nd, 1985. And their line of credit now can go to 51.2 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — So it's now covered?

MR. KRAUS: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — Is that a problem of ours that they don't have board meetings on a regular basis, or an independent lot up there, or . . . What do you suggest, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — The . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, they meet three times a year, it says.

A MEMBER: — They're supposed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — They didn't in this year.

MR. KRAUS: — They advised us, and I'm not just sure what the problem was, but they said '83-84 was a transitional one for the council, with the appointment of a new minister and new board members. So they've now been agreed and have scheduled to meet at least three times in the year after '83-84. So they feel they should be able to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you think this was an isolated problem due to the change in government? I'm not casting aspersions on the research council or the president . . .

MR. KRAUS: — No, no, I . . . '83-84 was the transitional year, so I'm not . . . I couldn't.

MR. KATZMAN: — Wasn't the change of government the wrong comment? It was with the change of Dr. Katz retiring, and all those other things happening over there? Isn't that . . .

MR. GLAUSER: — Dr. Pepper retired, and then Mr. Hutch came in. This would be the transition that you're talking about?

MR. KRAUS: — It was in '83-84, so it's after the election.

MR. KATZMAN: — That's correct. That's when all the key figures up there were retiring and so forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, it appears then it may have been an isolated event. If we . . . if members were concerned about this, we could again ask them to address the comment in writing. Do you want it? Okay, I gather there's no serious interest, and together we are satisfied that the problem has been resolved.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay, the sheep in the market thing — the only thing that I would say on this one, it's pretty tough to get the livestock dealers on check-off because on the other stuff, the other check-offs, they don't have to pay if they're the middleman — the cattle check-offs. So I assume they treat this the same as the cattle. It sounds like it's a different set of rules.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It doesn't sound fair, though.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, on the cattle check-off, if I'm a cattle buyer it's checked off when I buy them. When I sell them it doesn't get checked off a second time. So you don't pay the penalty every time. In this one it looks like you must. And that's only a guesstimate, when I say on this one, because if Allen Engel was a cattle buyer and he picks up at the yard in Swift Current and hauled it over to the yards in Moose Jaw and resold it, the check-off is not taken because he shows the check-off has already been taken off once. That's been there forever in the cattle side, Ned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You may be right. You may be right. It doesn't strike me as appropriate, though, to be missing some check-offs. It's not fair to those who are paying them.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, the only question I have is: is it the same as the beef check-off? If it is, then I think the auditor's made an error. If it's different than the beef check-off, then the auditor's right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Can anyone respond to that?

MR. ENGEL: — I think there's a little difference here that Mr. Katzman is overlooking, and that is in the area of beef. I can either get mine back . . . There used to be a place where I'd say, "I don't want to belong," and I didn't have to have my check-off go there. And I think in the sheep and wool market it's a compulsory thing that everybody that belongs to it has to pay it, but they would have people market on their behalf. I think . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see Mr. Kraus, who's an expert on these woolly matters . . .

MR. KRAUS: — I wouldn't say I'm an expert on the sheep marketing matter, but I do understand that they are entitled to . . . the commission's entitled to receive a check-off fee for every sheep or lamb sold in the province. And we know that there's some difficulty ensuring that there's a fee collected for each and every animal that's sold because of the variety of ways in which they can be sold.

I think when they go through the commission, that's fine. There's auction houses . . . they can be sold through auction houses, and we're advised that the brand inspectors of the Department of Agriculture has agreed to ensure that all producers selling through the auction houses complete some type of manifest form and forward that to the commission, so at least they know they should be getting a check-off fee there. But it even goes further than that. You can sell these animals at — I guess they call it the farm gate. Well, then you're on the honour system.

MR. ENGEL: — Does the check-off apply between the farmer and farmer?

MR. KRAUS: — We believe it does. And, at some point here, I guess we get to the point where the sheep and wool people could probably speak to it a lot better than we can. We know there's a bit of a problem. We're just not sure what they're going to be able to do to resolve it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — If they're not getting it at the farm gate, that's understandable. That's an awkward problem to resolve. But if they're not getting it at commercial establishments . . .

MR. BENSON: — Well, we're also advised that they can sell to the livestock dealers and, again, there's no way of confirming those either. We don't know how significant the problem may be.

MR. KATZMAN: — The drover situation is not collectible under any of the check-offs, because the drover is not required to collect it when he does from farm-gate to farm-gate sales. That's what a drover does.

A MEMBER: — What's a drover?

MR. KATZMAN: — A drover is a cattle buyer who does, is . . . His real name is a drover. That's what they call them. He basically goes from farm gate to farm gate, not to auction mart. There would be not collection . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, I believe there's one other problem here, too, that has not necessarily been addressed, and that is: in cases where the check-off fees have been collected, there is no system in place to make sure that that money ends up residing with the commission either.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would think we should call these folks. B? A? I think it's B? I would put them down as an A again. I think we're going to wind up calling both the B's and the A's, so I don't feel strongly about this thing.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, what do you want, B or A? Which one?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I was going to put them down as an A, given the fact that really, in a sense, it's the farmers' money that is . . . (inaudible) . . .

Saskatchewan Telecommunications. I think that's coming in under Finance.

A MEMBER: — Yes, that is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — D. Well, in a sense I know what to deal with those things. They're all coming in.

Saskatchewan Transportation Company.

MR. GLAUSER: — I wonder if the comptroller has any, or do you do this one?

MR. KRAUS: — No, we don't. It's a Crown management Crown. We know a little bit about it, but . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What is the little bit you know about it?

A MEMBER: — Was that amount recovered?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Have they actually been met with a mechanics' lien claim that they didn't have a hold-back for? Have they got hung out to dry on this thing, or is this just a potential problem?

MR. KRAUS: — Well, the one note I do have here is that I know that the company advises that they're suing the consulting engineers to recover this \$209,000, and the matter's before the courts. I don't know a lot about the details.

MR. KATZMAN: — Whoa, what was that last line?

MR. KRAUS: — It's currently before the courts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Have they started to withhold? Have they started . . . Have they changed their procedures such that they are now . . . I gather the problem here was, the direct problem was, that they didn't keep the hold-back that they should have under The Mechanics' Lien Act. They paid it all out before the 35 days.

MR. BENSON: — Well, they relied on an opinion from the consulting engineer, and that's who they rely on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — In other words, they're not complying with the Act. The Act doesn't give them any right to rely on a . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — This was all prior to 1982.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Maybe. Maybe. Has the procedure changed since then? Are they now, have they now cleaned up their act, or do you know?

MR. BENSON: — Well, they've indicated to us that this was a unique circumstance. But again, since we have no responsibility for them, we generally don't follow these items through.

MR. KRAUS: — No. We can't speak to them with any great amount of knowledge at all.

MR. KATZMAN: — Just, if you will, one question. This is the new bus barns in Saskatoon, isn't it?

MR. KRAUS: — I think so. I couldn't be sure. I'm not sure, Mr. Katzman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, there's a special Act, though, for the public creditors' . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — Could somebody tell me, is this the new bus barns in Saskatoon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I think that's the wrong name . . . I think it's a different matter.

MR. WENDEL: — No. There's a special clause in The Mechanics' Lien Act, Mr. Young, that says you can't lien the Queen, if you like, but you can lien the cash. You can't lien the property, but you can make claim to the whole hold-back. But you can't register the lien. You have to register with the Crown, and the contractor hadn't done that. So we're not certain what the problem is here. It's quite involved, very legal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well perhaps if it's in the hands of lawyers it's in good hands.

MR. ENGEL: — As far as the role of this committee is concerned, if it's in the court we don't comment on it. Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It appears to be a unique problem. I don't care.

MR. ENGEL: — No, but I meant would we be in an open forum like this, calling a witness and debating it? Should we just do a section in camera while somebody makes an explanation here, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I don't care. If it's a unique situation which is now before the court, we probably should not be calling them. If it's a mere general problem, perhaps we should be.

A MEMBER: — It's an accounting thing, not a legal thing.

MR. LUTZ: — I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we are now sitting before the highest court in the land. Of whom are we free? This is the best court in the land. You make the laws.

A MEMBER: — I want to quote that. There's a lot of people who've forgotten that in this province.

MR. YOUNG: — In all seriousness, we're not arbitrating in any way against the worker. It's the owned transportation companies and accounting procedures. So the other party is not a party to it, the guy who's got the claim for 209,000 bucks; he's not even involved. It's our guys, whether they're crunching their paper right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you want to call them — A?

A MEMBER: — Go ahead. Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Bring them on.

MR. KATZMAN: — B?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — B? Okay. A. Doesn't matter. I don't think it matters. I think we're going to call both.

MR. WEIMAN: — . . . very quickly that A and B are going to be held together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I agree. It's the same list.

Teachers' Superannuation Commission have some internal problems. They have not implemented appropriate system development controls, and I seem to recall this is not a new problem. Am I right or wrong in that? It's been a problem since July of '81. Well perhaps they deserve the opportunity to come and explain themselves then.

MR. KATZMAN: — Okay. Bring them on.

A MEMBER: — Bring them on.

MR. KATZMAN: — They're getting to be normal . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — . . . getting to be old faithfuls.

MR. KATZMAN: — We're getting to be the new DNS. DNS is the one that got called before you even knew the committee was there. You knew DNS would be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Provincial development museum are not ensuring that all donations of Government of Canada grants were recorded.

MR. KATZMAN: — Court case. Phelps and the museum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It is not a new problem either, apparently.

MR. KATZMAN: — It is not a new problem. All that donated machinery — who owns it? Here we go again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. Well it seems to be more than that, I think. Maybe it isn't.

MR. WENDEL: — It involved gifts. The more important matter would to be the Government of Canada grants and their controls over those grants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Let's call them. B, A. Give them a B.A.

Worker's Compensation Board. Do I assume from your comments there that it is possible that claims might not be properly paid. Some folks might be overpaid, and I suppose it's conceivable some might be underpaid; some might be paid twice and some might not be paid at all. Although I suppose you'd hear about that. Is that the potential problem that arises?

MR. LUTZ: — We had some concern, Mr. Chairman, that their computer environment was not adequately protected. And who knows what this can do to you. We don't really know.

A MEMBER: — It is possible.

MR. WENDEL: — They put up a new computer system that year, and they've gone on-line with a very sophisticated system. They were having a few problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yeah. I was going to ask you for comment. Has it been cleaned up since?

MR. BENSON: — They now advise us they're balancing the outputs and the inputs, and they've also instituted "top secret," which allows protection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Which?

MR. BENSON: — 'Top secret.' It's a file protection mechanism offered by Sask Comp.

A MEMBER: — Yeah. We talked about that security system last year.

A MEMBER: — Okay. B.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yeah, I would. We've got it.

MR. KATZMAN: — Mr. Chairman, before we go on to the other matters, if I may. I've just been doing some thinking. Maybe we should change the hours of this committee to 7 o'clock in the morning. But then I realize that wouldn't work at the rate everybody's coming. So maybe we should consider moving to 8:30.

A MEMBER: — I think about 15 minutes after whatever time you set it for.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm starting to think that 8:30 seems to be the fall in, which gives us simultaneously in Crown Corp as well as . . . They're starting at 8:30, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We have . . . Can we deal with that after dealing with other matters?

MR. KATZMAN: — Well, I was hoping to deal with that because I've got to leave right away.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — How's that? Okay. You want to leave right away. Okay. We have a secondary problem here that we're going to run into if we start moving the time back past 11 o'clock.

The government House Leader has started to refer a goodly pile of the legislation to non-controversial Bills, a move that I personally applaud. Much of that stuff is not appropriate. I think it can be dealt with in detail in the Legislative Assembly, but I applaud what he's doing.

The problem is that now have run out of days. We've got really just Tuesdays and Wednesdays — Wednesdays and Thursdays that are available to us. And we've got a fairly heavy agenda in that committee.

MR. KATZMAN: — We're prepared to go to 11, still.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — You want to go from 8:30 to 11? Okay. I'd just assumed you'd be going from . . .

MR. KATZMAN: — We have a clue what we've got on our plate now. That's why I feel we can say 8:30 to 11.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — That's fine with me.

MR. KATZMAN: — Until we've got through this, I wasn't, you know, sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Originally it was felt that we would start at 8 o'clock to allow some of these southern barons to get their crop in. But we started so late in the year that the southern boys are going to be seeding long before we're finished anyway.

A MEMBER: — Not just going to be, were.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Were seeding, yeah. They're probably already into it. So 8:30 is right as rain with me. I know the media are going to kick up a terrible stink about this.

MR. GLAUSER: — Actually, Mr. Chairman, I think we could even go with 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — 10 to 11?

MR. KATZMAN: — 9 to 11.

MR. GLAUSER: — But that those, we'll start on time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. You government members could start getting here on time. I tell you, it's very, very annoying to us.

A MEMBER: — And opposition chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Moved by the member from Rosthern that the committee, from now, start at 9 a.m., April 25th, 1985. All right? Any more discussion needed on this?

MR. GLAUSER: — Through to 11.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — To 11, yes, 11 a.m. All those in favour? Opposed if any? Okay. I think it was all in favour.

AGREED

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Which department do you want to be responsible for acting as critic on, just before you go?

MR. KATZMAN: — Are we going to do that tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I thought we were going to do it today.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well what are we going to do tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Well I thought we might start with the Department of Finance or some such other deserving . . .

MR. GLAUSER: — Maybe you better go on to some such other deserving . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. We could find another department and call it tomorrow. There s lots of other people we can call tomorrow.

MR. KATZMAN: — You don't want to call Finance tomorrow? Is that what you're saying?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No.

MR. KATZMAN: — Do you want to call anything tomorrow, or take tomorrow off?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, I think we should get started. I would like to get started and call some people. I think we've got a fairly full agenda, and I'm not sure we're going to finish this thing very early.

MR. KATZMAN: — Well you can probably, and without being facetious . . . although Cal said . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Cal's not big on Department of Finance.

MR. KATZMAN: — I'm just looking at what the other . . . Well it's pretty tough to get anybody one's day notice — that's what bothered me — from the departments. Highways is aware they're being called. I've already told them, but they're a B list. That's why . . . I don't know if anybody else is aware they're being called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — These departments can get ready in one day.

MR. KATZMAN: — Why don't we let the chairman and the deputy chairman . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, relative to whom you call, may I be advised before we come to this meeting so I can bring the appropriate people with me to deal with the matters before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We've got to make a decision before we break up today.

MR. LUTZ: — All right? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We still have a couple of pages left. The only reason we got into that other item was because the member from Rosthern had to leave early. We still have not dealt with "Other matters."

Now, I have to confess I didn't totally understand this. Which ones were over-committed then? I guess that's one question I have.

MR. LUTZ: — Which ones?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. LUTZ: — Starting several years ago, Mr. Chairman, we ceased advising the committee which ones, which meant that if you wanted to find them you had to go back to the *Public Accounts* book. Now this has been happening now for probably five years, I think — six years maybe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I had one other question, which is unrelated to this. I'm sorry to insert it, but we always used to get a third book of *Public Accounts*, which was the list of payments for individuals. We didn't get that this year.

MR. KRAUS: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, as far as I know it's . . . Oh, I know it's available for tabling. I'm just not sure whether it's been tabled yet or not. It has been prepared? Perhaps the Clerk would know.

MR. JAMES: — We have them in the vault, but they haven't been tabled.

MR. KRAUS: — They haven't been tabled yet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I see.

MR. KRAUS: — It's a supplementary volume, yes, that brings some of the numbers together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Who is the . . . It is Mr. Rousseau that's responsible for tabling that?

MR. KRAUS: — I believe the tabling is still with the Minister of Finance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We'll have to get after Andrew then . . . He may have overlooked it.

MR. YOUNG: — Estimates first . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Get through the Minister of Education's estimates first. Okay. We'll raise that then with the Minister of Finance. Okay. What's the name of it?

MR. KRAUS: — It's just called the . . . Volume 3 Supplementary. Supplementary — I think that's the title. Yes. Supplementary information. It's a supplement to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay.

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, if the members are interested in the departments which did over-commit or overspend, it begins on something like C15 in the *Public Accounts*, and the far right-hand column will show either underspent or overspent and over-committed. But we have not been identifying the departments for many years now.

MR. KRAUS: — I can identify them for you, if you wish, by reading through this quickly. I'll see if I can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Perhaps you'd be kind enough to do that.

MR. KRAUS: — We're talking about the Consolidated Fund, and the Energy and Mines is over-committed by 335,000. Highways, capital vote, is over-committed by \$202,000; and the Indian and Native Affairs Secretariat is over-committed by \$4,900. That would be the three that total 543,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Give me Energy and Mines again.

MR. KRAUS: — Energy and Mines, 335,000.

MR. ENGEL: — The numbers in brackets on the far right hand of this page, eh?

MR. KRAUS: — That's correct. And what has happened there, as I'm sure the committee remembers, is that they haven't actually spent in cash in excess of their appropriation, but what they have failed to do is make sure they have sufficient moneys to cover both cash paid, plus accounts payable. Moneys due and payable. The two have to be added up.

MR. BENSON: — In that case they an accounts payable of 344,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What does a bracket . . . In the virements, the bracket means there was money vired out of the . . .

MR. KRAUS: — Out of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Out of. Okay.

MR. ENGEL: — So just to do an explanation of that, Mr. Chairman, on page C26, on top, Highways and Transportation, how do you come up with an over-committed amount there of 202,000?

MR. KRAUS: — Well, what's happened is that their total appropriation remained exactly as per the estimates, so they had some estimates, they made some virements, but the virements don't affect the total. Sorry. The estimates may include a special warrant. It very well may include a special warrant. But in any event . . .

MR. ENGEL: — In this case, it did.

MR. KRAUS: — I see there's an asterisk there, and I'd just better check and see what that . . . That may mean there was a special warrant, in fact. I just want to be sure. Okay. There was a special warrant for some amount of money, so that the original estimates were increased by special warrant supplementary estimate. But, in fact, the total appropriation then became \$110,750 million. They spent in cash \$108,688 million, which meant that they were underspent, as far as cash disbursements went, to the tune of \$2,061 million. However, they had received goods and services to the end of the year, March 31, to the total — and it shows in the accounts payable column — of \$2,264 million. They should have had an appropriation to cover that commitment as well. So the difference between . . .

MR. ENGEL: — All these lines. Okay. I see it now.

MR. KRAUS: — Yes. You see how it works?

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, because I saw there a line underexpended by 2 million, and still they had an overcommitment of 202,000. I just couldn't figure out how that is, but I see . . .

MR. KRAUS: — You have to look at . . . Yes, the accounts payable. And they've actually received goods and services; they just haven't paid the cash out. But, nevertheless, the law requires you have an appropriation to cover that as well.

MR. ENGEL: — Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Is there any need for any further action on this? I don't personally see it. I assume that . . . Well, Highways is coming, anyway, if you want to raise it. Energy and Mines over-expended by 335,000. I assume the matter's been brought to their attention by others.

MR. KRAUS: — Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, it seems that we advise departments not to do this every year, but some departments still fail to comply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Has Energy and Mines been an offender?

MR. WENDEL: — . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What's that?

MR. WENDEL: — They're on that report . . . (inaudible) . . . They're in for \$16 million on another appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Energy and Mines is also in for 16 million elsewhere?

MR. KRAUS: — That's in the Heritage Fund. They are the only ones that were over-committed, and it's quite significant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Perhaps we should raise the matter with them. Call them as a B?

MR. ENGEL: — Could I ask another general question about that, Mr. Chairman ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

MR. ENGEL: — Could you tell me why some departments have more money outstanding in the accounts payable line than others? Like, you take some departments, there's a very small percentage of them of the budget that is in an accounts payable receivment, and these that get into the over-committed bracket, like Highways, and as you have a fairly hefty . . . Like, for the Department of Highways to have 2 million out of 110 is quite a large amount to have in the accounts payable end of it, by the time the fiscal year and the book's up.

Can you tell me how that happens, or is there contracts out that they've let, and the gravel's hauled, and they just haven't finalized it; or the contractor hasn't got his job done, and they call it an accounts payable? Or how would you get to this big amount?

MR. BENSON: — We don't have a system that records these commitments as they occur, and so what happens is, when the bills come in to the extent that they're paid, they show up as a charge to the corporation. To the extent that they're unpaid, they show as these accounts payable. But probably Highways could tell as to why they have such a significant amount of money outstanding here.

MR. YOUNG: — Like, if they ordered a piece of earth-moving equipment and disputed the price because it didn't have power steering or some particular perceived flaw in the thing, they would hold it like that, and there it would be. Is that not the way it would work?

MR. KRAUS: — Well, that's an example, yes. But I mean they would . . . It's only the departments themselves who would have to explain why their accounts payable were extraordinarily high if, in your opinion, you thought they were.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I would think we should call Energy and Mines. There may be a charitable explanation.

MR. ENGEL: — Highways are coming too, according to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Highways are coming . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. GLAUSER: — I would just like to ask the question of the auditor. I don't suppose you would know what happened in the final analysis then?

MR. LUTZ: — For which one?

MR. GLAUSER: — Well, for Energy and Mines.

MR. LUTZ: — You mean why this payable was there, or what do you mean?

MR. GLAUSER: — Yes. You don't have any explanations. Not for that?

MR. LUTZ: — No, not with this, Mr. Glauser.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We'll call them — hear their explanations. Sixty million dollars is not a trifling sum. Nor is 300,000, for that matter, a trifling sum. Added to the expense budget, travel budget of the Public Accounts Committee, that would make a fair dent.

A MEMBER: — Oh, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. The special warrants. There's another item here we hadn't quite polished off. Oh, there's no percentage required. Okay. So there's nothing there to . . .

MR. LUTZ: — Mr. Chairman, there's a statutory item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. Statutory item.

Okay. With respect to people to be called tomorrow . . . We don't want to do Finance.

MR. GLAUSER: — What about Culture and Recreation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I just have this caveat, but I don't know how I'm going to call it. I would have offered to act as the lead critic on this because I was the minister of it, and I know a little bit about the department. Unfortunately, I'm not going to try and prepare it for today because I think I'm going to have estimates before the House. I understand they're going to deal with the employment . . . (inaudible) . . . Perhaps someone else would be prepared to act as critic.

MR. GLAUSER: — Okay. Well may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we decide today who we're going to call next Wednesday and Thursday and start then?

A MEMBER: — Recess tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Why not start tomorrow?

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, I think it's the same issue of preparation for it for all of us, no matter who gets lead-off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, I'm not going to get into . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. ENGEL: — As far as tomorrow's concerned, Mr. Chairman, are we going to go through the other matters and the appendix, as far as the auditor's Bill is concerned?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No.

MR. ENGEL: — You mean, we're not going to take time for that. That's just there for our information?

MR. GLAUSER: — We're finished. We're finished with the matter, I think.

MR. ENGEL: — Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, if you guys feel strongly about not meeting tomorrow . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, it also gives us an opportunity to meet and discuss our delegation of departments, too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. This isn't my view, but I'm not prepared to get into a snit about it if you guys don't want to.

MR. GLAUSER: — We could make up that day somewhere along the line if we have to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Any strongly held views on this?

A MEMBER: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — It may give us an opportunity to run The Securities Act through the . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Craig, will we get an updated list then, tomorrow?

MR. JAMES: — If we're meeting tomorrow. If not, then . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — You could send it in the House.

A MEMBER: — Circulate it, anyways.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay. Do you want to knock off some of these smaller departments first, or are you going to lead off with Finance, which is a major fuss?

MR. KRAUS: — Mr. Chairman, I have talked to the people from Finance. And they said, unfortunately, both the deputy minister and the — I'm not sure if he's assistant or associate — assistant deputy minister of investment and financial services are out of town all next week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, that settles that, then.

MR. KRAUS: — And they have to be here to speak to the issue.

A MEMBER: — Well, let's save them for dessert, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, save them for dessert. Okay, Culture and Youth. There's no reason why they shouldn't be called next week. We might as well lead them. There was a couple people coming in from Saskatoon.

A MEMBER: — Western Development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes. Why don't we knock them off first thing? Why don't we knock them off at 9 o'clock next Wednesday, then. They'll know when they're coming.

A MEMBER: — Which one are you talking?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — WDM (Western Development Museum).

A MEMBER: — WDM?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — They've got to come from Saskatoon. Okay?

MR. YOUNG — So it's WDM for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — WDM will lead off.

MR. YOUNG: — Next Wednesday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Right. Culture and Youth might as well come in next week.

A MEMBER: — Who?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Culture and Youth.

MR. ENGEL: — Can we do more than one? I don't think . . .

A MEMBER: — Ralph won't be back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Ralph will not be back. Why don't we knock off some of these little guys? Culture and Youth Wednesday? Or line them up. We get through whatever we get through.

MR. WEIMAN: — Well, I don't think the museum thing is going to take us too dam long.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Parks and Renewable Resources? We might as well knock that one off?

MR. ENGEL: — Parks and R & R on stand-by? Do you think we can handle that in two hours? Okay. I think we can.

A MEMBER: — We've got WDM and Culture and Youth, so far.

MR. ENGEL: — Yes, and Parks.

A MEMBER: — And Parks on stand-by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Rural Development for Thursday? All right.

MR. WEIMAN: — Well which one are you talking about, Ned? Oh, I see. Inappropriate accounting records.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Right.

MR. WEIMAN: — Okay.

MR. BENSON: — Mr. Chairman, they had requested some time, if possible — if they could be deferred on the thing. Is this on the pension issue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, this is on their accounting records.

MR. GLAUSER: — So the pension issue will be covered under Finance?

MR. KRAUS: — The municipal employees superannuation plan is also under Rural Development.

MR. ENGEL: — I suggest we leave Rural Development and have them all in one sitting rather than bring them back.

MR. GLAUSER: — What about Kelsey?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Thursday? Okay. Do you want to knock Kelsey off Thursday at 9 then? The people we've got to bring in from Saskatoon. They'll come on first thing.

MR. ENGEL: — Well we could run into a problem there by doing those in a row because if we're holding Parks and Renewable Resources over . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We'll just keep them in the bull pen and they can go when they're finished. The other thing we could do is knock off some of these Crowns. They're not going to take long because we're just going to deal with some of the accounting problems.

A MEMBER: — Potash would be . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Potash and utility corporation. Potash has got to come in from Saskatoon, though. I don't think we want to call two people from Saskatoon for the same day. What about the utility corporation?

MR. ENGEL: — I don't think Kelsey is a big issue that's going to take any length of time there, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you want to deal with potash on the same day?

A MEMBER: — Potash at 10?

MR. ENGEL: — Could we have another department on stand-by in case we finish Kelsey in 15 minutes or something like that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — We could do that. We could have the pork producers marketing board. That's a Regina crowd?

MR. ENGEL: — Are they in Regina? What about sheep and wool? Sheep and wool are in Saskatoon, too? What other one did we decide on this morning?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Teacher's Superannuation Commission is a Regina group. Why don't we get SaskCOMP and teacher's superannuation then for Thursday as well?

So for Wednesday we have WDM and Culture and Youth, Parks and Renewable Resources. We'll do well to finish all that on Wednesday. Thursday we have Kelsey at 9; potash corporation at 10; and in the bull pen we'll keep SaskCOMP and Parks, and teachers' superannuation on stand-by.

We can agonize next week then who we're going to call the week after.

We now need to assign lead critics in these things. I will offer my services on WDM and health care to youths simply because I used to be minister and know a bit about it — not a lot — but a bit.

MR. GLAUSER: — I'll take the potash.

MR. ENGEL: — I'll go parks and renewable, seeing I'm the critic there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right, Allen is going parks and renewable. The member from Saskatoon Mayfair is going to potash. Who feels Kelsey is their bag of tea?

MR. WEIMAN: — Sure, I'll take Kelsey, the training activities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — What have we got left then?

MR. ENGEL: — SaskComp and teachers' superannuation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Kim — SaskComp sounds like your specialty.

MR. WEIMAN: — Ralph will probably want one. Give Ralph superannuation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Give Ralph teachers' superannuation. He's always been big on that. Kim Young has just volunteered to do SaskComp.

MR. YOUNG: — . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. ENGEL: — That doesn't mean somebody else can't ask any of the questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, no, just lead off. Just be prepared to start it off and lead it off.

MR. GLAUSER: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Clerk if he would, when he's making up this list, if he would put the A's together, B's together, and so on, and we can pick them out quickly then and . . .

MR. WEIMAN: — Mr. Chairman, it's . . . (inaudible) . . . I think he did it in past years, too, that when you revise this list, in parentheses, can you put the names of the lead-off players, too, just to remind them that that day it's theirs?

MR. ENGEL: — Maybe one further comment. I think A's and B's are the same thing, eh ?

We have two categories. We have category A and B that we're likely going to call. Then we've got C and D that we . . .

MR. GLAUSER: — I would like them segregated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Do you want to go through the entire list now and assign critic areas so we know what we're going to do, or do you want to leave that until next week?

MR. WEIMAN: — We'll leave that for next week when we determine the . . . (inaudible) . . .

MR. GLAUSER: — Ten minutes will do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — All right. Now, we really don't know how many people are going to attend the public accounts conference yet.

MR. JAMES: — And you're talking for 1986?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Yes.

A MEMBER: — In Whitehorse?

MR. CHAIRMAN: — No, Waskesiu.

A MEMBER: — You've sent the postcards off, Craig?

MR. JAMES: — No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I'm wondering if he knows how many delegates elected to attend the conference.

MR. JAMES: — Well, in total it'll be about 125, between the auditors and ourselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, let's perhaps deal with that, then, first. All right, let us deal with that then. Can you have a little report that we can have a look at in camera Wednesday morning? And we'll deal with that, then, first thing.

MR. ENGEL: — Why don't we call a meeting Wednesday morning at 8:30 to deal with assignments, critic assignments, and then the in camera session, so the meeting starts at 9.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Okay, 8:45 will probably do us.

MR. GLAUSER: — Can we ask who has these people come in? If we are having them come here at 9 o'clock, they should be at the door at 9 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — I agree, Cal, and I'm going to be very disappointed in government members if they're not on time.

MR. GLAUSER: — Well, at the call of the Chair, we'll go.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — Gentlemen, I think that's it. We're going to adjourn.

The committee adjourned at 9:34 a.m.