

**Public Hearing: Saskatchewan Housing Corporation
(continued)**

Mr. Chairman: — Good morning. Let's call this meeting to order. We left last day with the Saskatchewan Housing — corporation, who are here again, the same people, so we won't go through introductions. So I think we will just begin it where we left off.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — We left off, Mr. Chairman, in discussing the question of the type of consultations that it's normal for a developer to undertake with communities prior to becoming fixed on a particular housing development, recognizing that property acquisition might, in many cases, precede any discussion with the community. Inasmuch as public discussion of properties to be acquired might have a less than desirable effect on property prices.

And my sense was that Mr. Little agreed but . . . and in saying that he pointed to an example in Saskatoon where the housing corporation, subsequent to the purchase of property, had in fact made some, changes to specific building plans in response to input from the community.

My question is, and it wasn't entirely clear: just what kind of input was sought from the community; that is, both, the neighbourhood through their groups and say, Regina, prior to announcing the specific development? I appreciate the fact that there couldn't be any consultation about the property purchase and the like, but I just wonder about this specific development, what kinds of discussion was there? What kinds of opportunity was there for changes to the plans . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Little: — The project was committed in 1984. My understanding of the process associated with the project is, is that the land was purchased from Safeway's. At that point in time there was a conception that a social housing project would be delivered on the project. Discussions were then undertaken with the Regina Native Women's Association about using that site for their project.

At the same time that discussions went on with the Regina Native Women's Association, the community was made aware of it, and then the matter proceeded to become one of discussions with the Regina Native Women's Association as the same time as the community association in terms of what could be done on the site. So it was one where the land was purchased, we were going to be doing a social housing project on it. The nature and who was going to be the sponsor of it was one where we subsequently had discussions with the community and the RNWA (Regina Native Women's Association) after the site was purchased, and it was one that went on for some time.

Unfortunately the non-profit group was not able to proceed and the project was then turned over to another group.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — How did the RNWA, the Regina Native Women's Association, come to be a party in all these discussions? Is that as a result of intervention through the minister's office?

Mr. Little: — I'm not aware of any intervention by the minister's office. It's one where we were approached throughout Saskatchewan by native groups looking for projects that they would like to have occur. In 1985 we had some 22 projects for natives that we delivered. I would say that of those 22 projects almost 100 percent, if not 100 per cent, were ones where the native groups asked for them. The native community asked for them, and we delivered them,

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I see. That project now, what's the status of that project? It's been built, I gather, but there's no recreational component to it; it's simply a housing, development.

Mr. Little: — That's correct,

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And is that project administered directly by Sask Housing. or has it been turned over to another non-profit group?

Mr. Little: — It's been turned over to the bible college who administer it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can you tell us whether the opportunity was provided to any other groups in the city to administer that project?

Mr. Little: — As you're aware, the project was originally intended for the RNWA (Regina Native Women's Association); however, they weren't able to proceed. When they weren't able to proceed, we had discussions with a number of groups. The Canadian Bible College was the one group that were able to demonstrate that they would be able to capably administer it and move in and occupy it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can you tell us what other groups you discussed this project with, with a view to having them administer the project?

Mr. Little: — We don't have the particular names with us.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I wonder if that information could be made available to the committee, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, I think we should request it. I want to make this point because we got into this last week. This series of questions started last week. If the officials did not anticipate that we might want to have that information, then I think that they're acting irresponsibly and have not done their job,

But we will want it, and we will want it early next week . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I have you on a list.

Mr. Muller: — I don't know if you were on the list to interject, but . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, I am on the list. Carry on, Mr. Van Mulligen.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Chairman, I wonder, Mr. Little, if you can tell us what kind of involvement the minister's

office might have had in, first, the suggestion that the Canadian Bible College be contacted, any work that his office might have directly become involved in with respect to the Canadian Bible College ultimately becoming the administrators of this project.

Mr. Little: — I don't have particular knowledge on that. At any point in time that we're going to be committing a project to a group, there is discussion with the minister's office from the standpoint that it is only prudent and required of us, in fact, to be able to proceed with a commitment, that the minister's office have the opportunity to see that and approve it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can I just ask you on that point, is that now then standard practice that for all the housing projects that you have, that the minister's office become involved at an early stage, in so far as becoming advised and having the opportunity to cast judgement on whether a particular group or another should be the administrators or become part of a housing project?

Mr. Little: — As a matter of course, the minister, as chairman of the board, is provided with a list of the projects, the communities that we have analysed and believe would be able to proceed with a project in any given year, and they have the duty and requirement to approve that for us.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I don't have any further questions at this point, Mr. Chairman, if someone else wants to . . .

Mr. Muller: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As it pertains to the amount of information that officials come to this meeting with, I think it's pretty near impossible for them to look ahead to see what every question will be and bring that information with them. And the practice of this committee over the years, as many, years as I've been on it, is that officials were certainly able to come with that information or send the information to committee at a later date. So I have to stick up for the official, in this case and say that I can understand them not having everything at their fingertips at the whim of the questions of the committee members.

The one question I have for Mr. Little is: local governments quite often, or always, I've understood, were quite involved in where Sask Housing projects were built. And I'm not as familiar with large urban centres as I am with small towns, but I was under the understanding that in small town Saskatchewan anyway that when a local government applied to Sask Housing or a local group applied to Sask Housing, that the town council actually zones or finds the land or the property for the Sask Housing to go onto. Am I correct or incorrect on that?

Mr. Little: — That's correct. Any time we do a public housing project there is, until the program changed in later years, a requirement that the municipality contribute 5 per cent towards the project. And the normal process under public housing is that the local housing authority, if there is one, requests through the municipal council. If there isn't one, then the municipal council directly requests a project from the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation. So it is initiated from the municipality.

Mr. Muller: — Yes, and Sask Housing doesn't have a lot to say of where the local government puts that housing within the town boundaries or hamlet or village or wherever it goes. It's pretty well up to the local government, isn't it?

Mr. Little: — That's correct.

Mr. Muller: — That was always my understanding.

Mr. Martin: — I have three questions.

Mr. Chairman: — Three questions. Can I keep track?

Mr. Martin: — All related, I believe. First of all, when was the decision made to proceed with the bible college decision? In other words, RNWA (Regina Native Women's Association) couldn't handle it apparently. I missed some of the discussion last week, so I'm trying to pick it up.

Related to that, was the city involved in this particular decision to let it go to the bible college? This is related to what Mr. Muller was saying. And then I have another question which I'll ask you after.

Mr. Little: — The decision to proceed with the RNWA project, as we're discussing it here, was made in 1984. In terms of discussion with the city of Regina on the Canadian Bible College, I do not have factual information before me that would enable me to clearly state this categorically.

However, the city of Regina were prepared to financially participate on a portion of the RNWA (Regina Native Women's Association) project with us. And the discussions with the city in terms of the ability to proceed with the RNWA project and what would be done in the event of not proceeding with RNWA project are ones that continue to proceed for a number of months. So I would well imagine that they were informed of the decision for the Canadian Bible College to go ahead.

Mr. Martin: — So are we dealing then with the right year here? You said the decision is made in '84, but the chances are it carried over into '85, so we're probably legitimately talking about the right year. I mean, this is an '85 subject.

Mr. Little: — My understanding is what is under discussion is the year of operations, which was 1984 . . . or 1985. In 1984 the commitment was made for the project, and I don't believe that any subsidy funds flowed for the project in 1985. It was simply a matter of capital funding that was going on underneath it.

Mr. Martin: — I may then have to ask the chairman for some kind of a statement on that, and then I'd like to ask another question. Are we really dealing with the right year here, because just of what Mr. Little said in terms of 1984? Or should we really be off this particular . . .

Mr. Chairman: — '84-85, '85-86, in there. You were in the ballpark.

Mr. Martin: — Pardon. I thought we were dealing with the year 1985 here.

Mr. Chairman: — No, '84-85 and '85-86 is what we're dealing with.

Mr. Martin: — So this is an '84-85 thing that we're discussing . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — At the last meeting we went through '84-85, and we said that many of the comments there also were in '85 and '86.

Mr. Martin: — Well, all right, that's fine. I understand that. I don't need the comments. Thanks very much.

What kind of . . . I understand you to say that there were . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . I beg your pardon.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Rolfes will have to let the member ask his questions here.

Mr. Rolfes: — My apologies. Just trying to be a Little bit humorous this morning.

Mr. Martin: — You talked about 22 projects having to do with the RNWA. You said there were 22 projects involving the . . . or rather, involving native groups, 100 per cent of them asked for by the native groups. What kind of success ratio is there there, and what would determine success in your projects with native groups? What are you looking for?

Mr. Little: — Where we deliver a project for a native sponsor or for a native community, often they have a very strong desire to have initial input into the project, where it's going to go, who it's going to serve, opportunities for selecting the people that will be moving into them.

In particular, in 1985 we delivered, I believe, the first of a number of log housing units in northern Saskatchewan. It was a program that was requested by northern residents, it's one where they wanted to reduce the size of mortgages underneath their houses. They wanted to have a home that was more fitting with some people's preference for particular life-style, and so we developed a log housing program in 1985 and committed some units underneath it. And that was a tremendous success because it showed the opportunity of the corporation, working together with native groups, to meet the particular needs of Northerners.

Mr. Martin: — Okay, do you want to expand on that further? What about other areas?

Mr. Little: — In the other areas, they would primarily be in northern Saskatchewan. Again, it's a matter of the municipality, the town, their leaders would request a project. We would enter into discussions with them on where we could locate it. We'd enter into discussions with them on the types of units they were going to be getting. We would enter into discussions with them in terms of how they could employ northern labour in the projects, And we were very successful in all of those projects, and I'm not aware of any complaints associated with them.

Mr. Neudorf: — Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had a number of questions on my mind last Tuesday, but following the series of questions by Mr. Van Mulligen and the excellent encompassing way in which Mr. Little has been answering those questions, most of my concerns have been laid to rest.

However, there are a few issues here that I would just like to follow up on in a Little bit more detail, and that is on page 160 of the auditor's report for 1985-86 — 31.13, under disbursements. He indicates that any kind of a systems management control should have adequate segregation of duties so that you don't have one person basically in charge of everything, so that one person has complete control from the top down, like vertical integration perhaps might be a word, I think is something that he's referring to. If this is to avoid perpetuation of the errors and fraud, I'm just wondering what have you done in relation to react to this criticism from the auditor in terms of the segregation of duties? And furthermore, on 31.15, clerical accuracy — because clerical accuracy is, again, checked by the same kind of people, and there's a concern running throughout this section on disbursements, as I see it, I'm just wondering what kind of reaction you would have.

Mr. Little: — The payment system that we have is computerized system and it's one where we try to put as many checks and balances into it as possible. There's two key principles that we have to look at in any payment system when it's computerized, is that no system can be made 100 per cent foolproof because people are involved and people sometimes make mistakes. The second one is that with any system we have trade-offs between controls and the cost of those controls.

We've tried to put effective systems of segregation of duty into place, and I believe that has been successful. In regard to clerical accuracy, we are of the opinion that no further controls would be required.

I've got a fact here that in 1985 over 12,000 payments totalling \$69 million were processed. The Provincial Auditor's sample found errors in three payments, for a total of \$7,822. Of this \$7,822, 7,778 or almost 100 per cent — virtually 100 per cent — were discovered and corrected by the corporation itself through checks and balances in the existing system. Prior to the audit identifying these errors, we'd already found them and corrected them.

Mr. Neudorf: — What are you indicating then, that this is perhaps not a just criticism on how the department is currently handling it, or even prior to the auditor's report?

Mr. Little: — I think that the provincial comptroller is making a principled statement about segregation of duties and clerical accuracy, and it's something where there has to be a continual and ongoing monitoring of it to make sure that it's as accurate as possible.

The corporation has striven to make sure that we are on top of that, and I believe that our record in 1985, showing that we had found virtually 100 per cent, or almost 100 per cent of any human errors that had been in the system

were found beforehand, means is that we are very, very successful.

Mr. Neudorf: — So you have almost 100 per cent accuracy rate.

Mr. Little: — That's correct.

Mr. Neudorf: — Okay. Just continue on to another section here on the regulations. It is indicated that the legislature intended the Executive Council to exercise control over the eligibility criteria governing the grant and subsidy programs, and apparently these kinds of controls are not there.

The way I understand it is that in order to control that, there have to be a set of regulations and so on drawn up, and this should be done by Executive Council. And my interpretation here is that the inference is that these regulations, although promised, and even amendments to existing regulations, have been promised but have not been forthcoming up to that point. Is this an accurate statement on my part?

Mr. Little: — There has been discussion with the provincial comptroller's department for ... since the corporation essentially was incorporated in 1973 on the requirement for regulations. It's been a matter of ongoing discussion with that office on whether they're discretionary or mandatory.

We have legal opinions that they are discretionary, that they do not have to be mandatory. And that recognizes that we are a Crown corporation, a treasury board Crown corporation with a board of directors. Throughout the 14 years of the operation of the corporation, there have been programs which did not have regulations.

We are moving now to have discussions with the comptroller's office, to have discussions on the programs that we are continuing with, to see whether or not it would be prudent at this time to put regulations into place on them.

Mr. Neudorf: — So what you're telling me is that it is not unparliamentary or illegal to operate this kind of thing without a set of regulations in place?

Mr. Little: — That's correct. It is not illegal.

Mr. Martens: — I have a couple questions. On supervision for construction of housing units, is there ... what kind of supervision do you have in place there in general in 1987?

Mr. Little: — The corporation, where it is directly delivering projects, will have a system in place where from project commitment there is typically an architect involved, who acts on our behalf, doing inspections of the project and giving reports to us. We have contract administrators who review the amount of work in place and make progress advance payments accordingly. Those are done on the basis of an inspection by one of our inspectors who goes out and reviews the project to make sure that not only is it meeting the national building code and the specifications that we have dictated for the

project but, indeed, that it is being done to our standards of excellence, and that the work is in place and properly done and that payment can proceed on it.

Mr. Martens: — Is that what you do when you have joint ventures with CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation)? Are you the supervisor or is CMHC the supervisor, or how does that work?

Mr. Little: — With our relationship with CMHC, on occasion they will be the direct delivery agent where they will have the same system of controls that we do. The vast majority of projects are delivered by the housing corporation on behalf of the partnership, and we have all of those controls in place.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Let's say in 1985, did you ever go and assess the value of housing, or do you on an ongoing basis assess the quality of the structure in dealing with the units as they exist? Or is that, once it's done, just left?

Mr. Little: — We have a process that we rigorously monitor the projects while they're being built. It's a process that also includes the people that will be receiving the project. For example, if it's a local housing authority, they have a representative that views the project to make sure that they're going to be satisfied with it, as well as the corporation. So the end recipient has to be satisfied with the project.

Once the project is complete, we then turn it over to, under public housing, over to the local housing authority. They then will do reviews for any type of maintenance or modernization improvements that they feel are necessary. Those can be concerns raised by tenants to the local housing authority. The local housing authority have part-time managers or full-time managers. They have maintenance people that will review the project to see any type of repair that are necessary.

In addition to that, the corporation has a property management department where inspectors from the corporation will go out and review the projects to ensure that they are being well maintained, offering local housing authority assistance, and making sure that we keep these projects in as good a shape as possible.

Mr. Martens: — How many were you involved within 1985, I mean in total? Like how many did you build?

Mr. Little: — The total number of units committed in 1985 was 1,392.

Mr. Martens: — 1,392 — of those units, is that individual units or is that multiple?

Mr. Little: — Those would be individual units. Some of them would be in a multiple housing form. They're not all single-family dwellings.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Do you have a breakdown of the amount of units that there were then?

Mr. Little: — Do you mean single-family dwellings?

Mr. Martens: — Well including single-family dwelling

and units in total.

Mr. Little: — Like apartment units, housing units? It would be a total of 1,392, wouldn't it?

Mr. Martens: — No, no, I'm still not understanding you. If you had two in one, how many of those . . . nursing home unit as a single unit, how many, of those units where you had either a single dwelling, a multiple, how many of structural units did you have?

Mr. Little: — If I'm reading you right, we delivered 67 projects.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Of those how many . . . that was in 1985?

Mr. Little: — Yes.

Mr. Martens: — Okay. Of those, how many were involving some sort of religious order, do you know?

Mr. Little: — There would be approximately four projects for about 309 units.

Mr. Martens: — If it's not unusual then for religious groups — like I know we've had Seventh Day Adventists and stuff like that who've done this — it isn't unusual for them to participate with Sask Housing in developing units?

Mr. Little: — No, it's not unusual. In fact what we find is that underneath our non-profit programs it's the norm for a church to come forward and want to sponsor a project for a group that they see in need, primarily senior citizens.

Mr. Martens: — Do they deal with nursing homes too?

Mr. Little: — There will be the occasion where there will be one that's involved with a nursing home, but primarily it will be a number of municipalities that would get together and sponsor the project.

Mr. Chairman: — Can I . . . I just want to ask a few questions on follow-ups on some that have already been asked — brief ones. There has been a comment on the need for regulations on programs which don't exist, and the auditor has referred to sections 14, 15, and 16 of The Saskatchewan Housing Corporation Act in which he says the legislature intended that there be such regulations.

So it seems to me it's not a question of just a legality in the opinion of the housing corporation, it's a question of what is the responsible thing to provide to the legislature, which in the end is responsible to the taxpayer for its money.

But the one I want to ask is, this issue has been raised in '84-'85, and '85-'86 which is the years that we're studying here. Can I ask the comptroller: at what stage is this review, which it is indicated the comptroller is doing on these regulations, and when can we expect something to come forward?

Mr. Kraus: — There have been discussions from time to time, but as far as an intensive review or anything, that

really hasn't been taking place. As the president of the corporation said, they've indicated they would like to discuss this matter further with us, and we'll be doing so fairly shortly.

The issue as is indicated; there's a dispute as to whether or not the law requires regulations. One interpretation is it does; the other one says no, it's permissive. And I guess from our perspective, we as well would agree that the matter should be resolved one way or the other. Either the law should be amended, or perhaps should be amended. If it isn't clear, it should be amended to make it clear or else regulations should be issued, something like that. That would be, generally, our approach and our position.

Mr. Chairman: — So you really have not done a review, you've had discussions.

Mr. Kraus: — We've simply had discussions, that's right. And we have been asked to get together with the corporation again. The corporation's asked to meet with us, and so we will be doing that shortly.

Mr. Chairman: — Do you have any kind of a time-line, since this has been around now for something like two years? Do you now have a time-line in which you hope to have this concluded?

Mr. Kraus: — We have not set one, but I don't see why we couldn't come to some conclusion on it fairly quickly. After all, it's a matter of making a decision, should we or shouldn't we, and then making those. If it requires a decision at a higher level, a higher authority, then that proposal should go forward in short order. It really shouldn't take very long to come to some conclusion at our level — I don't know, a month, two months.

Mr. Chairman: — I accept that, and I urge that it be done, because obviously something that has been raised more than once needs to be addressed. I don't think we should take . . .

There will be times when there is disagreement between the auditor, I'm sure, and department officials, and that's part of the operation. But I think the need to expedite the resolve of that dispute quickly is something that, I think, everyone should have a right to expect. And I'm glad to hear you say that it's going to be done expeditiously.

I have a question on something else. In the housing corporation complex on — is it Pasqua Street, that Mr. Van Mulligen was talking about — is there an ongoing subsidy that's now in place?

Mr. Little: — Not provincially; from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation there is.

Mr. Chairman: — So there is a governmental subsidy through Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Was there any money that was put in by the province which is not ongoing but was initially put in and therefore in a sense is a subsidy?

Mr. Little: — No.

Mr. Chairman: — If there is a subsidy, how is the rent

determined by the individuals who are there? Does everybody then get a cut rent, or is it depending on income, or what's the situation?

Mr. Little: — This project falls underneath a program which no longer exists. At the time, it was one that . . . there was an interest rate subsidy write down from the rate at which the mortgage was written at the time down to 2 per cent. That provides a subsidy amount which, in its final impact in terms of being able to produce rents downwards and help low-income people, is one that . . . often the cost of new construction of apartment buildings is such that it takes almost all of the subsidy just to bring them down to a market rent level.

As a consequence, in terms of targeting of assistance it is difficult to target it just to low income people. The vast majority of it goes into reducing the rents down to a market level.

Mr. Chairman: — So it could very well be that while there is a subsidy in this complex, there may be people who are top of their income level, teachers, living in the complex. Do you know a way to determine that that's not the case?

Mr. Little: — This project is one of a number of projects that falls underneath that non-profit program. By and large, throughout Saskatchewan for years when they were built, the high costs of construction at the time versus what existing market rents meant is that they had to be reduced, the subsidy had to be used to reduce the rents down to a market level. Once they were at a market level, we encourage the local housing authority, if it manages it, or if we manage it we try to put people that are of a lower moderate income into them. However, the bottom line becomes, one, is that there is not sufficient subsidy to be able to go through and reduce them down further so that you can put just low-income people into it. So you will have some people of higher income in them.

Mr. Chairman: — Is their rent in any way then adjusted accordingly as it is in low rental housing where it is 2 5 per cent of income?

Mr. Little: — No, it's not.

Mr. Chairman: — So it could very well be that people of some considerably high incomes are living in these apartments which we are subsidizing.

Mr. Little: — The point of subsidizing higher-income individuals becomes one where . . . the situation becomes one of how do you keep them occupied. We go through, we use the full amount of subsidy to write down the rents in the point where it's a break-even point. Once they hit break-even point it's a matter then that you've got essentially what becomes a market accommodation. When you go to the market and try and rent it out, some low-income people can't move into it because they can't afford it. They're referred to public housing where there is that deeper subsidy available. This program from its inception in the early 1970s was one where we had to simply write down the rents to a market level, and people that could afford to make the payments would move into them.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just pose a hypothetical thing and then get into my questioning. If, for example, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation were to make some major changes in its programs that had financial implications for the province, am I right in assuming that they would contact you in advance and hold discussions with you in advance so that whatever implications it had for your budgets that you would be able to incorporate those changes in your budgets? Is That par for the course?

Mr. Little: — I believe that CMHC are very much committed to consultations with the provincial housing corporations and we do have discussions with them . . . As a national organization, certainly they will have particular interests which they represent, and at points in time not all provinces will concur with what they desire to do in a particular portfolio, and they may do something which is not particularly agreeable to one or another province. However, we do have consultations with them.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And there's generally some notice if it has financial implications for provinces. Even if you disagree on points, the fact is that there is discussion and there is then some notification of changes that might take place, and you're able to adjust to those things.

Mr. Little: — That's correct.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — My understanding is that SHC also has provided for consultation, say, with local governments in Saskatchewan. Mr. Muller pointed out that if SHC is planning to do some project in a town or village, it's normal for corporation officials to hold discussions with the town or village; and especially if it has financial implications for the town or village, you would give them plenty of notice so that they can incorporate those implications into their budget. Am I generally right on that as well?

Mr. Little: — Yes, you are.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The question I have then is: why was there no consultation whatsoever, none, with respect to the non-profit housing program for senior citizens?

Mr. Muller: — What was that?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That was a program that was announced by the province in mid-1985, early 1985.

Mr. Muller: — I thought it was . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — No. No.

Mr. Little: — In 1985 the figure you're referring to, the 25 per cent non-profit housing program — there was no requirement for a municipal contribution underneath the program. The consequence of that is that when we wish to have a project proceed, or we are looking for projects to come underneath that program, we simply make non-profits aware of the availability of the program. The non-profits then come and apply to us.

The onus for discussions with a municipality then flow on to the non-profit organization from the standpoint that it's

expected that they would have a site, a building site, the proper zoning, etc. And what they would be doing is having discussions with the municipality on what they intended to do on that site.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — You know and I know, Mr. Little, that that program has had financial implications for communities. I don't think we have to go much further than the city of Regina to begin to understand that. You know and I know that many of those types of projects simply will not get off the ground unless there's municipal participation.

And the question again that I have is: how could you possibly, how could you possibly announce a program like that in mid-year for municipalities, recognizing that the first thing that was going to happen was that non-profits were going to be going after municipalities? And that was certainly the case in Regina. Those non-profit groups are going to be going after the city saying, we need your assistance in order to make this project fly; we've got the money here from the province, but now we need your commitment.

Yet there is no prior consultation previous to the municipal budgeting cycle about the fact that this program was coming, about the fact that we've got X number of groups in your community that may be coming to you for a certain level of assistance. Whatever you bargain with them on is another thing, but we generally understand there'll be X number of groups, and therefore it may have such implications for your budget.

And again I ask: why were there no prior consultations — consultations prior to the minister's announcement that this program was now in place?

Mr. Little: — When the program was announced in 1985, there was no requirement for a municipal grant to be put in for the project. Municipalities often do budgeting on a year by year basis for a special allocation to non-profits, be it for housing or be it for other purposes. A non-profit group coming through to us is in the position where they recognize how much provincial funding will go into the project. There is the expectation that non-profits often put in an equity contribution.

The programs that we devise are ones where we put in as much assistance as we think will be necessary in order to make them grow. The municipalities have the opportunity to work with the non-profit and assist them further. And that's one where, in 1985, three out of the four projects that were done were ones where they did approach the municipalities and the municipalities did provide funding.

That is a discussion between the non-profit and the city, not between ourselves and the city. We deal with the non-profit organization underneath the financing guide-lines that we have in place.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I just might say — and I don't point to you, Mr. Little. You weren't the president of the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation at that time; you were preceded by a person who moved with all the finesse of a bull in a china shop — I just find it unthinkable

that a provincial government agency would set the wheels in motion in mid-year for many municipalities, wheels that had financial implications for municipalities and put pressure on them. I think it's a lousy way to do business.

It's not the way that the CMHC (Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) treats you. It's not the way that you would expect the federal government agencies and CMHC to treat you. If the federal government were to take that kind of attitude with provincial agencies, we would see no end of controversy. Yet somehow it seems that it's appropriate for a provincial government agency to behave in that way.

I'm not sure what the reasons were for the housing corporation's acting in the manner that it did at that time. Perhaps the province felt the need to put in place a new program and didn't have the time to do the consultations because they thought that there might be some political benefit with an election coming up, or perhaps it just simply reflected no more than the style of the person who was the president of the corporation. And we've seen his style in many instances, at least in the case of the city of Regina, where he seemed more intent to rub people the wrong way rather than to build a consensus on what kind of housing is desirable in a community and how can we pull the community together to provide that housing.

I would just want to leave this particular topic with the hope that we don't see a repeat of that kind of lack of consultation. If the province is of a mind to change or announce new programs, that definitely will have financial implications for municipalities. And no matter what you say about whatever kind of discussions can take place between non-profit groups and municipalities, there's no doubt in anyone's mind that it definitely has financial implications for municipalities, and they were simply unprepared for that type of program.

I'd like to just briefly turn to an item in the accounts dealing with the land assembly program. I note that there were no payments to SHC for subsidies in '85-86 with respect to the land assembly program as opposed to the previous year. I wonder if you can just comment on that.

Mr. Little: — If I can, I'll defer to my associate.

Mr. Boys: — The last subsidies related to land, I believe, were the in-fill subsidies.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — In 1985 the minister and the corporation began to let it be known that Saskatchewan Housing Corporation was, in fact, looking at selling off, divesting itself of land assembly holdings. Can you briefly tell us what kinds of discussions were held with what kind of groups with a view to effecting a transfer of those holdings from SHC to these other groups?

Mr. Little: — In 1985 we had a number of dormant land holdings, situations where there was, I believe, in total some 1,000 to 1,200 lots throughout Saskatchewan where there were difficulties selling those land holdings. Discussions were held with the municipalities in terms of what type of assistance, what type of plan we could work together with the municipality in terms of trying to sell

those lands to people.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And those discussions strictly with municipalities, or were there also discussions with private groups?

Mr. Little: — By and large it would have been with the municipalities. On some of the larger land holdings there may have been some discussion with individuals. We try to work very closely with the municipalities, with the housing industry. When we're looking at dormant land holdings, ones where there is no active demand, it is prudent for us to discuss with the industry what they see as opportunities for working together or how they could see some of those land holdings being sold.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Did you look at that time at divesting yourself of land in the city of Regina? I'm not talking so much about large infill sites, some of which have been developed subsequently in any event — the Trianon site and the like — but the suburban land that you had available for primarily residential development. Did you hold discussions with, say, the builders' association about divesting yourself of that land?

Mr. Little: — I wasn't personally privy to a conversation. It would be my belief that those types of discussions did occur. The house building industry is one where they have an interest in being able to acquire lots so that they can plan their portfolios for the future in terms of how many lots they've got to build on,

Obviously the cities, Saskatoon and Regina, have lots that do become available. They have raw land that is sitting dormant that is a potential supply for future years. The building industry has a vested interest in being able to say, where can we acquire lots? And in terms of working with the housing corporation and the city within the legal agreements that we have, they would have an interest in seeing what lots they can get.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can you tell me, sir, if there were any discussions with Cairns Homes or Nu-West Developments corporation, Harvard Developments corporation, McCallum Hill company with the view to having or exploring the possibility of those companies purchasing any portion of the land assembly lands in the control of Sask Housing?

Mr. Little: — I can't state that that particular conversation did occur. It would be again my belief that any major land developer, which those four are certainly in that category, would be interested in seeing whether they can acquire lots through us, through the city of Regina, on a continual basis. And they would have had some discussions with us.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Do you know if there was any records that had been kept of any correspondence or any discussions with those companies with respect to sale of land assembly land under the control of Sask Housing Corporation?

Mr. Little: — I'm not aware. I could certainly have a search done of our records to see whether there is a minute of a particular discussion with those developers. I

could do that. I could at the same time tell you that those types of discussions did occur. They would occur obviously in the context of the legal agreements, the binding agreements that are in place between us and the city of Regina, between us with the city of Saskatoon, the city of Prince Albert.

We have legal agreements that stipulate that how we're going to develop those lots, how we're going to hold the land, the cost-sharing relationship underneath it, the profit-sharing relationship underneath it. That would simply be made known to them that we have an agreement with those cities and that any type of discussion on it would obviously have to involve those municipalities.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Would there have been any discussions, inasmuch as you held those discussions with those other major developers, would there have been discussions with the city of Regina to see, as an example, to see if the city would be interested in picking up a greater share of those land assembly lands?

Mr. Little: — Whether the city of . . . I'm sorry, could I have a clarification on that? Whether the city of Regina would like to have a greater share in the development of the lands?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Yes. That is to say, whether the city would be either interested in purchasing some of those land assembly lands; that is, to buy out your 95 per cent, or participate to a greater extent than the 5 per cent.

Mr. Little: — Those discussions would occur as a matter of course. And that the matter of course is, is that we have what you could refer as . . . Is global agreements in place with the city of Regina, for example — global agreements that stipulate the financial arrangement in terms of the purchase of the land, the financial arrangement in terms of moving it into development.

Each and every time we move a project from a holding to a development category, we have to have a development agreement to take place. Within that development agreement there would be discussions on who we're going to sell those lots to — how many would be going to builders, how many would be going to home owners.

As a matter of course, those types of discussions do take place, and they take place on the basis of the industry continually being interested in the bread and butter of their industry — where can they acquire lots in terms of being able to build houses.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Does the corporation continue to hold the view that it's desirable, where land development might otherwise be left to one, perhaps two, major players, that it's desirable for the corporation to continue to have a role in land development with a view to ensuring that there is sufficient, adequate, meaningful competition in the market-place?

Mr. Little: — I would believe that the corporation would have an ongoing discussion, an ongoing discussion not only with the industry and the municipalities but an ongoing discussion that would come down to a policy

frame for how we operate. Discussions with the board of directors from the standpoint is . . . Is that as a corporation that does impact the housing market, that we want to make sure that the housing market operates effectively. And obviously, as a major player in the land development business, we're concerned that we don't oversupply the number of lots and cripple the industry, which could result also in us just having a number of lots that have been developed, that we've expended money on servicing, and it wouldn't be prudent.

So we have to know what the demand is out there is for lots. We have to know, in terms of our bringing on lots, what percentage we're going to supply to the market-place, what percentage the developers are going to supply to the market-place, so that there is a goodly supply of land, but one that's well co-ordinated. And that's in the interests of everyone.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — We might go on in this, but we may have some differences on some of those points. I just don't . . . I'm not aware of any major land developers operating in Regina that have been crippled at all, in my memory. But I appreciate that the corporation might have that concern for their financial health and therefore would want to make sure that there is not an oversupply of lots.

I would submit that there is another equation to that, that adequate supply of lots would also ensure to keep the prices down for consumers. It certainly was the experience in Regina in the mid-'70s that that's what happened as a result of the housing corporation's entry into the land development market. Those conditions may not be the same now, in fact are not the same now, but who knows when they might be with us again. That's all the questions I have at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When I put my hand up to ask to get on there was some questioning that I wanted to talk about, and now the line of questioning is satisfactory to me now. But I just want to make this comment. Mr. Van Mulligen was asking the gentleman here questions that I think was getting back into opinions as we talked about the other day. I think that he was bringing in his cheap politics by putting him on the spot about, is it done for election reasons and things like that. And I don't think this should have to come in this here room.

And while I've got the floor, Mr. Chairman, I want to add to a comment that you've been saying to each of our officials who've been coming in here. You rapped the wrists of these people pretty good this morning about not having their answers for all the different questions you're asking. I think you're asking . . . you might as well say, Mr. Chairman, let's move this here public accounts right over to the department so we can have absolutely every question answered immediately.

I think everybody that I've sat here with in the last few weeks have done very well answering questions. And if you're going to ask all detailed questions, I think it's pretty near impossible for these people to answer detailed questions. They'd have to have all their . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Well, Mr. Rolfes, you can just say what you want and interject. I have the floor. And you can decide anything you want, you can ask anything you want, but when I have the floor I'll say what I want and not be interjected by you, because I don't interject you when you're talking. When the time comes when I interject Mr. Rolfes when he's talking, you remind me and shut me up, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to make those comments and I'm very sincere about it.

Mr. Muller: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a couple of questions for Mr. Little, and seeing Mr. Van Mulligen went into the part about land holdings, my understanding was that in the 1970s that Sask Housing did go into a lot of land purchases and were holding . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — It's not the year under review.

Mr. Muller: — Well Mr. Van Mulligen went back to the 1970s, so I felt that it was . . . If I'm interfering with your comments, Mr. Rolfes, I hope you'd let me know.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Order. Order. Let the member ask his question please.

Mr. Muller: — Anyway, I don't see any problem with selling these lands to whoever is willing to buy them whether they be land developers. In some areas was there some Sask Housing land that was unsuitable for housing as, i.e., not sufficient water supplies? And maybe being the new chairman of Sask Housing you may not be aware of this.

Mr. Little: — I don't have the particulars on the R.M. of Lakeland in terms of the suitability of the land. The only thing that I . . .

Mr. Muller: — Well I certainly don't expect you to have that information with you today. If you could maybe supply that for me at a later date. But the comment that I wanted to make was that Sask Housing in those years was maybe buying up land that wasn't suitable for Sask Housing or for housing development and kind of creating a land bank within the corporation. That was my feeling. I just wanted to bring that point out.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. You will provide some of that information . . . Did you ask for information to be provided?

Mr. Muller: — Yes. I didn't expect them to have that detailed information with them today.

Mr. Chairman: — I have no other people on my list except for myself. Oh yes, Mr. Rolfes after myself. I want two questions, and then I want to make a comment here.

Under the senior citizens' home repair program — and if you want to answer under the year under review I assume it's still the same — do you have an inspection of all the work in each place that's done?

Mr. Little: — Yes.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, so for senior citizens' home repair, every home is inspected?

Mr. Little: — Yes.

Mr. Chairman: — I find that a little contradictory and strange in that under the home repair program, where people of substantial incomes are getting work, they're not all inspected. Why the discrepancy?

Mr. Martens: — It's not the year under review, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Well we steered a little bit. I just wondered if the manager would like to comment.

Mr. Little: — Is it at my discretion whether I comment outside the year under review?

Mr. Chairman: — Well I asked you a question, sir. It's not for you to ask whether it's your discretion. I'm asking you a question as a witness to this committee, to which you're obligated to answer. Now you will explain, please, why people who are senior citizens, who do their work under the senior citizens' home repair program, every one is inspected; but under the home program where . . . and it doesn't matter whether they have substantial incomes or not; that's not the case . . . what has changed?

Mr. Little: — Certainly the most obvious change in terms of the requirement for inspection would be the magnitude of the two programs. The senior citizens' home repair program would not have the number of applicants that all home owners in Saskatchewan entail. You then get into a decision in terms of the cost of controls, the cost of inspections versus the benefit of doing those. Underneath the home ' program, the number of inspections, if we were to do them for all applicants, the cost would be extremely high. We have determined a rate of inspections which we feel are sufficient for audit purposes, for management control, to make sure that there is no abuse underneath the program.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Little, it seems to me that under the senior citizens' home repair program the amount of funds involved are very substantially less than the amount of taxpayers' funds under the home program — and I really don't want to get into the home program per se — but therefore there are a great number more funds at risk. And one would think that it would be only good management to assure that greater funds at risk would have some supervision to see that they were all appropriately expended.

Mr. Neudorf: — May I interject?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, you may.

Mr. Neudorf: — On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think you're out of order. This committee has agreed that we are going to be discussing the year under review, and you're jumping ahead and putting the official in a position where he is going to be answering questions on the year that's not under review.

I certainly agree with you that the committee can ask

questions of officials as they deem fit, in the year under review, and they are obligated to answer. But when you go out of the parameters that we set for ourselves and tradition has set for this committee, they do not have to answer. And if a member of the committee is going to insist on asking those kinds of questions, then I think it is incumbent upon this committee to reject that question.

Mr. Chairman: — I'm not going to argue on the point of order.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, I didn't . . . when the member from Shellbrook asked a question about a program in the past, of the previous government, on the accumulation of land holdings for housing purposes, I didn't hear the hon. member saying that he was out of order. And that is why . . . and it was allowed at that time, and I think the precedent has been set. And they feel fine to ask questions in the past, not the year under review, and I intend to, under the next department, to also follow the same precedent. The member from Shellbrook just set the precedent a little while ago.

Mr. Chairman: — Let me interject here and make this comment, that we have to work within certain parameters and certain general guide-lines, and we shall try to do that, and we shall try to stick within that, and I will ask members of the committee to heed that, including the chairman. Your point may be well taken. My comments were basically made in a comparative basis, and I want to stick by those comments and ask a question under the year of review with regard to the home program.

My question is: what kind of preparatory work or research was done in developing the home program in year 1985-1986?

Mr. Little: — None at that time.

Mr. Chairman: — I see. So there was absolutely no work done in 1985-86 for a program that was announced in the middle of summer of 1986?

Mr. Martens: — Excuse me, Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I'm asking about the work that was done in 1985-1986.

Mr. Martens: — Up to March 31, 1986?

Mr. Chairman: — That's right.

Mr. Little: — The home program, as the program was announced — there were no specific discussions planning for it as a matter of course. The housing corporation is always examining the housing market, housing need, conditions of housing in Saskatchewan, and preparing options for the government to consider.

The home program, as announced, was one with a particular set of benefits, a particular set of criteria, that wasn't being considered in its form in which it was announced; however, there is this ongoing research that is done in terms of options that the government could consider.

Mr. Chairman: — And can you elucidate on the kind of option that you had developed by the end of March 1986 with regard to a program which ended up being called the home program? Precisely.

Mr. Little: — It would have been generic research from the standpoint of accumulating knowledge on housing conditions in Saskatchewan. The state of the age of the houses, how much repairs they need, whether they're major, minor types of repairs — that type of research.

Mr. Chairman: — Which is ongoing, it's got nothing to do with any specific program?

Mr. Little: — That's correct.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, so there was no work done,

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, just a follow-up question on this. Could you make available to the committee the particulars of that specific program? Obviously when a huge program of hundreds of millions of dollars are anticipated and launched by a government, usually there is a submission made to treasury board, and so on.

Could you make available the particulars on that program, you know, that you have submitted to government and eventually may not have been the same program that you were submitting, but it ended up as the home program. Certainly there were changes made, I assume, but you must have had some major submission that you made and then the government went finally with the home program. It may not have been what you had submitted but somewhere in that line . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

You're interrupting, sir; I've got the floor

Mr. Chairman: — Let the member answer the questions please.

A Member: — I like to interrupt once in awhile.

Mr. Rolfes: — So you do interrupt.

Mr. Chairman: — Carry on. Mr. Little, will you answer that question please?

Mr. Rolfes: — I've got the floor, just to remind the member.

Mr. Little: — In the year under review . . . (inaudible interjection) . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — At least I wouldn't be sitting on my brains.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Let's get this process under way.

Mr. Little: — In the year under review there was no submission made for the home program.

Mr. Rolfes: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's what I thought.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, any other questions?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I have one more. In a newspaper article in March of 1985 the minister responsible for SHC, one Sid Dutchak . . .

Mr. Martens: — Excuse me, Mr. Van Mulligen, we can't hear what you're . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Speak up, please,

Mr. Van Mulligen: — In 1985, in a newspaper article, the minister responsible for the housing corporation, Sid Dutchak, indicated that the housing corporation would be divesting, or that plans by the SHC in a report entitled: "Working for you, Saskatchewan", tentative plans called for the sale of \$5 million worth of SHC owned or controlled land. I wonder if you can tell us how much in fact was sold that year?

Mr. Boys: — I have some detail, but I have broken down by acquisition and infill. I'm not sure what Mr. Dutchak was referring to, but I can indicate that there was approximately 3.6 million in land held for development and another 2.8 million or so on urban infill properties.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That were sold or that were under the control of the corporation?

Mr. Boys: — Those were disposals during 1985.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I wonder if we could be provided, Mr. Chairman, with a list of those properties, indicating in each case the acres of land, the appraised value of those properties, the sale price of those properties, and who those properties were in fact sold to.

Mr. Boys: — Yes.

Mr. Little: — We'll provide that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Thank you. That's all the questions I have.

Mr. Chairman: — Is there anyone else, before we move on and dispose of this?

Mr. Martin: — In listening to Mr. Van Mulligen's request, we keep asking these people for more and more and more and more information. And I wish I knew why you wanted to ask that question so maybe it would satisfy me. It just seems to me that we're asking them to do an awful lot of work that really isn't going to help a great deal. Would you mind explaining to me why and how that might be an advantage to you, or is that question . . .

Mr. Chairman: — The member may wish to explain why, but I'm saying to the committee that we're here, you're here, as members of the committee to ask any questions that you think, as a member of this committee, will be relevant and will be needing an answer. I will not restrict any member from asking a question within the terms of reference of the committee.

Mr. Martin: — I absolutely agree with that. I mean there's no question about that whatsoever. It's just that I have the feeling that we're asking our officials . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Van Mulligen, what is your wish?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to explain. I asked some questions earlier about the extent, or to what extent land that was controlled by the corporation was also being offered for sale to municipalities. I want to satisfy myself as to whether or not that did happen. Secondly, even though the auditor may not get into questions of value for services, activities that the government undertakes, I think that's certainly a legitimate question for us to be asking.

And so, in asking that particular question I want to satisfy myself that the taxpayers of Saskatchewan got a good deal in terms of the divestiture of that land. Did the government and did the people of Saskatchewan get the kind of sale price that they should have been getting from that land?

There's also incidental questions such as, if that land were sold to one or two major landholders or developers in certain municipalities, does that then tend to reflect that perhaps too much land is being concentrated in the hands of one developer? That was the situation that occurred in the early 1970s in the situation that you know and I know resulted in an escalation of land prices, simply because one developer was able to withhold the supply of lots and therefore drive the prices up.

And I think that it's important for us as public officials to have access to that information so that if decisions have been made which are not in the public's interest, that information gets out.

Mr. Martin: — Was there any . . . (inaudible) . . . that that has occurred in this situation and that that . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I'm not entirely clear, but when you're talking about divesting yourself of — it looks like over \$6 million worth of property, I think that it becomes reasonable to ask those questions.

Mr. Neudorf: — Just in following up some of these comments, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make a general observation. I'm a new boy on the block, politically speaking, as many of us are here.

A Member: — A breath of fresh air.

Mr. Neudorf: — Yes. And I would just like to make a general observation here that in the fact that with the political procedure, I certainly endorse what you've been saying, Mr. Van Mulligen, and I think the last thing that we want to do here, in the political process, is inhibit the questioning process and I have no problems with that. If there's a question that you feel that needs to be asked, by all means ask it.

But having said that, it just seems to me that during the course of the last three or four months that we have been sitting here, these questions that I am hearing occasionally in this chamber right here have been asked at least on two separate occasions before. The opportunity occurs during question period, the

opportunity occurs during estimates, the opportunity occurs during motions for returns, and some of these have been asked same time. And I guarantee you, gentlemen, that when all of these returns and all of these questions have been answered, you will have triplicate copies of answers to the same questions that we have been asking throughout the course. Now if that's how you want it, I have no objection to that, I'll follow that.

But having said that, your concern at the beginning of this committee, the very initial meeting that we had, was that we need more time, that we want to sit intersessionally as well. And I made the comment, it seems to me at the time, that quality time, I think, is more important sometimes than just sheer magnitude and sheer repetition of questions. Now if that's how you want to operate, that's fine.

But I still think that we can get a hold of a lot of these things, get our questions a little bit more precise, do away with some of the repetition; I think we'll just have a more effective, efficient operation not only in this committee but, I'm speaking generally, in the legislature.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Chairman, I can make a number of comments, but I'm going to be very brief. First of all, if we ask questions in triplicate there shouldn't be any additional work because if the answers have been provided once it won't take any time to provide them a second time,

The problem and the frustration that we face is that in question period when we ask questions we're told, well, you can ask those questions in estimates. And when we ask those questions in estimates we're told, well, that's really not for the year under review and you should go to Public Accounts. And now when we go to Public Accounts you say, well, you should ask those questions in question period. And so we're getting the ring around the rosy here. We'd rather ask the questions in triplicate because then we might get some assurance that at least we'll get the answer once.

Mr. Chairman: — Good point. Okay. I think the point's well made. And I want to say that I have watched and listened carefully to this committee, and I saw no repetition of questions today. I want to make that point on behalf of all committee members on both sides of the House, of this committee's table. I thought the questions were all being asked as they should be asked. And as the Chairman I therefore I did not intercede.

I want to just, in conclusion, look at . . . I'm sorry, Mr. Martens.

Mr. Martens: — I think you deliberately misunderstood . . . or I'm not looking to put that much words in your mouth; however, Mr. Neudorf was not saying that the repetition occurred here. The repetition occurred between various committees of the government and agencies or opportunity that you have available to you, and I think that's where the repetition comes.

Mr. Chairman: — And I'm simply commenting on the committee because I wanted to say that I thought the committee had disposed of itself very well today,

Now let me conclude by going to one ... maybe I'd better conclude here.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Martens is suggesting that the opposition be given additional research assistants so as to avoid duplication, and I want to second his motion.

Mr. Chairman: — I won't accept that as a motion in this committee.

My final comment is that the reason ... Order. The reason why we brought the housing corporation is because members requested it, but it was prompted by partly with the reference to regulations, and lack of regulations, on page 161 of the auditor's report. We had a discussion about that, and the auditor has pointed out in his report that, and I read, because I think officials of this department and others need to take note:

... the legislature intended the Executive Council to exercise control over the eligibility criteria governing the grant and subsidy programs administered by the corporation, appropriations for which totalled \$25 million ...

The auditor has expressed some concern about that, and he recommends that regulations be issued under the legislation.

And the point I want to make is this ... and I know the argument has been made why regulations aren't in place because somehow they say legally they're doing what is right — legally. But my point is that if you don't have regulations, you can never be wrong. If you don't have regulations you can modify and decide whatever you wish at whatever time within the broad parameters of the legislation. If you don't have regulations, then those who check on appropriateness of expenditures have no terms of reference to which they can make reference to.

And so when I hear the comptroller say that they will be looking at regulations and have something to recommend to their superiors within a month or thereabouts, I'm pleased to hear that, and I hope that it is then done. And I hope that the legislators will continue to press the various departments, and in this case the housing corporations, the need to have those kinds of regulations so that accountability can be assured. That's what the auditor recommends. I would hope that the committee, later today, would undertake to agree with the auditor and pass on that recommendation further.

That is my only comment that I want to make, and I want to thank the officials for coming here for two days and answering the questions. And maybe we won't have to see you next year at all. Thank you.

It's time for a five-minute break.

Mr. Chairman: — ... get back to order again, welcome the official of the Department of Education. And as the case, I want to indicate to the officials that in the Public Accounts Committee you are here as witnesses much in the same way as you are in a court of law. You are required to answer all questions. You have the benefit of

having immunity from any kind of legal action, libel suit, or whatever, from anyone, in the same way as members of the Legislative Assembly have in the Assembly.

I want you to know that because I think it then makes it easier to deal with the questions to which you are required to provide the answers. We have a number of officials, some of whom I know, some of whom I do not know, and I'm going to ask the Deputy Minister, Mr. McFarlane, to introduce them and point out which they are.

Mr. McFarlane: — Okay. I sent you a list that Ms. Ronyk is going to distribute. It's deficient in one regard. I'm Lawrie McFarlane. I'm the Deputy Minister. This is Steven Pillar; he's the Associate Deputy Minister in charge of finance and administration. This is Mike Benson; he is the executive director in charge of finance and administration. Sitting behind on my right is Don Trew, who is the director of administration. In the middle is Pat Willison, who is the director of financial planning. And on my left is Lois Herback, who is the executive secretary of the superannuation commission. And her name is not on the list that I distributed, and you could perhaps add it. Lois Herback, and she is executive secretary of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission.

Mr. Chairman: — Thank you.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, if I may ... mind if I call you Mr. McFarlane, or Deputy Minister. or ...

Mr. McFarlane: — Anything you like.

Mr. Rolfes: — No. no.

Mr. Chairman: — Order. I don't think we can allow those wide parameters.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay. I have a number of observations in the year under review, and they relate pretty well to the same concern that I have throughout each one of the particular branches, so I think we can deal with them rather quickly.

I understand where, you know, the expenditures in some of the areas, but I notice in some of the areas, Mr. McFarlane, that there are a lot of money spent on advertising and on travelling expenses. In some of the areas they are fairly used. I assume that the travelling expenses in some of the branches is to deliver the programs out to the various areas and the consultation that takes place between the various agencies and school divisions and stuff that are out there. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Rolfes: — Could you tell me in the travelling ... In any of the subvotes, has any of the travelling expenses in the year under review ...

Mr. Chairman: — '84-85?

Mr. Rolfes: — Pardon me? No. Yes, I'm on page ... I just don't know what page.

Mr. Chairman: — Well we're dealing with '84-85.

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, '84-85. Oh, I'm sorry . . . '84-85. Well let's finish '84-85 and then I want to go to '85-86.

Under the year in review, '84-85, were any of the travelling expenses that are listed in any of the branches incurred by the minister or the minister's staff or Legislative Secretary? And if so, where did they occur — in what branch?

Mr. McFarlane: — So far as I can, Mr. Chairman. We believe that all of the travelling expenses that you have asked for are recorded in the executive administration subvote, and I can provide the majority, and possibly all of those — if you want them itemized, in other words.

Mr. Rolfes: — In the executive . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — They are in the . . . Right.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay. Yes, I would appreciate that if you can provide that for me.

Mr. McFarlane: — Do you want me to read them to you, or do you just want me to hand them to you later?

Mr. Chairman: — You've got them here?

Mr. Rolfes: — You've got them? Oh, fine, sure. Yes.

Mr. McFarlane: — We're dealing with '84-'5?

Mr. Rolfes: — '84-'5. Right?

A Member: — Yes.

Mr. McFarlane: — And this is Advanced Education. This is the Advanced Education.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, no. No, no. I mean Education

Mr. McFarlane: — Whoops!

Mr. Rolfes: — Well, we'll take them both. We're going to do them both anyway. We'll do them both, so it doesn't make any difference.

Mr. McFarlane: — Okay. We have Gordon Currie, \$160.

Mr. Rolfes: — What was it?

Mr. McFarlane: — Gordon Currie, the Hon. Gordon Currie, \$160; John Gerich, 1,205; Hon. Colin Maxwell, 3,588; Paul Meagher, 200; Eleanor Koch . . . Is that Eleanor?

A Member: — Alanna Koch.

Mr. McFarlane: — Alanna Koch, I beg pardon, who was a ministerial assistant, \$48; Kathryn Wiegers, \$42; again Alanna Koch, another \$22; and again Kathryn Wiegers, another \$22.

A Member: — Okay, what about . . .

Mr. McFarlane: — Well I haven't . . . Sorry. Alanna Koch again, \$269; Kathryn Wiegers, \$118; Alanna Koch, 1,383; Kathryn Wiegers, 470. That's it.

Mr. Chairman: — Four dollars and 70 or 470?

Mr. McFarlane: — Sorry. \$470.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. McFarlane could you tell me . . . I don't want them in detail, but can you tell what, generally speaking, these were spent on? And in particular I want to know what Colin Maxwell's expenditure was for

Mr. McFarlane: — If I recall in the case of Mr. Maxwell, he was part of a delegation that went to China, and I believe that that would be the majority of that expenditure.

Mr. Rolfes: — Was he the minister at the time?

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes.

Mr. Rolfes: — I can't even recall he was the minister. He must have been a pretty good minister . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well, better than the ones we've had since, but . . .

Mr. McFarlane, Gordon Currie's expenditure — I know it's a small amount, but what was that on?

Mr. McFarlane: — I don't have that with me, I'm afraid. I could find it out if you would like.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, no. Don't bother with it.

Also the legislative secretaries accompanied somebody on a number of trips, I assume. What was that expenditure for?

Mr. McFarlane: — I'm uncomfortable, given the rules of the committee where you want me to be exact, in guessing at these. Can I undertake to . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — I don't want you to guess.

Mr. McFarlane: — I know you don't. Can I undertake to provide you a precise itemization of what each of these were for?

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes. There is one I do want, too, and I think you would know this one — Mr. Meagher. In what capacity — was he the Legislative Secretary? He was.

Mr. McFarlane: — Yes.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay. And what was that expenditure for? Would you have that?

Mr. McFarlane: — I don't have it with me, but I will undertake to itemize all of these travel expenses.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman, I want to . . . from the executive administrative branch. Now I didn't do a calculation of

this, but there's 51,437. Can you tell me in just general terms — I don't want it in any particular — what was the majority of the money spent on in the travelling? I mean, these certainly don't add up to 51,000; it leans, I think, to about 45 to 46, \$47,000. What generally was this money spent on in the executive branch?

Mr. McFarlane: — Are we talking about Education or Advanced Education?

Mr. Rolfes: — Sorry. Under Education. I just take them as one, but I . . . okay, under Education. I will deal with Education first in '84-85, and then go on to Advanced Education. I think it's better to deal with them in that way when they're separated under that year . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it's all the confusion of the stuff that the government wants to hide that is so frustrating.

Mr. McFarlane: — By way of clarification there, the executive administration subvote in Education, and I guess also in Advanced Education, includes both the travel budget for the minister's office and also for the deputy minister's and the two associate deputy ministers' offices and associated staff. So we're dealing here with, not just with . . . that sum of 51,000 in other words covers all of the travel expenses including vehicles within the province for all of those individuals, not just for the minister's staff.

Mr. Rolfes: — What portion of that 51,000 was spent by the minister's staff?

Mr. McFarlane: — I'll undertake to find out for you. I don't have that with me.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay, fine. I'd like to have that. What portion of the 51,000 was either spent by the minister or the minister's staff?

Mr. McFarlane, under subvote 12 in Education, superintendents, travel expenses of \$231,000 was spent. Is that figure of 231,000 in line with what it has been, let's say, the year before and the year after? Would that be fairly well in line with what was spent in that particular area?

Could you tell me how many people that would include? Would that include about six or eight people?

Mr. McFarlane: — In terms of its comparability, which was the first question you asked, it looks like it is comparable. In the year that you mentioned, which was '84-85, the travel expenses were 231,000. In the succeeding year, '85-86, they were 235,000, which is within 4,000. The branch in question is the regional office of the department. In other words, we're talking about the regional directors of education.

Mr. Rolfes: — So you're talking about all the staff in those branches, not just the superintendents?

Mr. McFarlane: — Correct.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay, fair enough. Contractual services, can you tell me very — I don't want it in any real detail, but \$401,000 in the year under review was spent on

contractual services in Education under the superintendents subvote. What did that entail? It seems like an awful lot of money for contractual services. I wouldn't mind, if it takes a fair length of time, if you would detail that for us; you know, provide it to the committee, that's fine. I don't want to take up the committee's time in going through that now.

Mr. McFarlane: — We will provide it to you. The reason it's taking a little bit of time is it's a long list. The reason it's a long list is that we second staff from school divisions to work on curriculum, and we second teachers for six months or a year. And I mean there's a very long list of them.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay, if you'd provide that for me, I would appreciate that.

Let's turn to subvote 34, the official minority language office. And I notice, Mr. McFarlane, that your estimate expenditures for that year were \$501,270, and you expended 618. Now that's a \$117,000 over-expenditure. No, actually it was . . . yes, \$117,000 over-expenditure. That's a huge expenditure — over-expenditure. What happened in your estimates and what happened in actual expenditures that you're that far out?

Mr. McFarlane: — The situation, Mr. Chairman, is that the official minority language office enjoys the unusual situation of being able to negotiate on the way through the year with the federal government for cost-shared, and in some cases, 100 per cent cost-recoverable programming. And the policy within the department and within the government for some years has been that if there is extra federal money left over on the way through the year and we can get that on a 100 per cent cost-recoverable basis, then we go for it. So the extra expenditures that are shown here are 100 per cent recoverable, and they are recovered in the general revenue portion of the estimates.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. McFarlane, maybe you're not aware of it, but if you wish to have any of the other officials answer because they are better . . . I mean, we don't expect you to be the guru of it all. Feel free, because we're not restricted to just the deputy answering.

Mr. McFarlane: — Thank you very much.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to now turn to Education payments on page 183 of the report. I want to just mention a couple of observations. I was unable to spend all the time on going through detail in every one of these, but it is my understanding that in . . . I'm not sure in the year under review, but certainly there were constraints put on by the government in salary increases, wage increases, for people for example like teachers — because I was out there, I know what happened. And also the government made it known that they would not allow more than 2 or 3 per cent. I can't help but note when I went through the '84-85 that — and I will be asking a question — that there were a number of reductions in salary for some people, but huge — and I mean huge — increases for others. I did not, as I say, I did not go through

each one. I will some time when I get more time to do it. But I'd like you people to note certain names because they will come up again in '85-86 review when we go to them.

One happens to be Rene Archambault, I think is the correct pronunciation, at 35,600. I don't know some of these people. Donald Drozda at 65,000; John Gilbert at 67,000; Peter Dyck at 74,000; Bill Kalmakoff at 64,000. I've just picked out a few.

I hate to mention this one, but I'll have to since I've got it underlined, Steve Pillar at 68,000; Alvin Schell at . . . pardon me, Philip Schalm at 73,000, Alvin Schell at 62,000. And I want you to note this one — Rodney Wickstrom at 66,666.60. I want you to note that figure — 66,666.60. But I want you to note that figure because I'm going to draw your attention to that in '85-86 when we get to it because there was a huge increase of \$18,000 for Mr. Wickstrom to \$84,000, and I'd like to have an explanation on it.

And Archambault, I think if I'm correct, went up . . . I don't want to say it, but I think something like \$12,000; I would have to check. And I would like an explanation for why some of these people who got huge increases and yet some of the ones that I've mentioned, and there are many others, got decreases — and some explanation as to why that occurred.

Mr. McFarlane: — If the point that you're making is that, some people in the education profession enjoy unusually large salaries, I agree with you. I think they do, and I think that I have some difficulty, as perhaps you do, in justifying some of these salaries at times.

In case of the increases that you're talking about, rather than the gross amounts, in a couple of cases at least the reason is that these people came on part way through the year in '84-85. And so when one looks at the salary in '85-86 you're seeing a whole year's salary, and that would be the case for Rod Wickstrom. He came on two-thirds of the way through the year and got two-thirds of his salary paid to him, and then the following year he was there for a whole year and got his . . . and got the whole salary.

Mr. Rolfes: — All right. While you're on that, Mr. McFarlane, let me ask you then the question: the year under review I only quoted you 66,000, but there was a little bit later Wickstrom got another 14,438, on page 186, I believe — Rodney Wickstrom, 14,438. That means in that year, '84-85, he got 80-some thousand — \$81,000

Mr. McFarlane: — I understand that the reason there was that Mr. Wickstrom came from B.C. to accept the job, and the government policy paid for his moving expenses.

Mr. Rolfes: — Very generous.

Mr. Muller: — Do you have the addresses?

Mr. Chairman: — There's no address on there.

Mr. Rolfes: — I don't know these people except for a few

that I . . . I just noticed when I went through this last night . . .

Mr. Muller: — I was just wondering where Mr. Kalmakoff was from.

Mr. Rolfes: — Oh, I have no idea. I don't know. I don't know these people. I know Steve Pillar, but I knew him because he was there before. I don't know some of these . . . I think I know Peter Dyck. I'm saying nothing against these people. Don't get me wrong, I'm not slamming anybody's character. I'm not doing that. I want an explanation as to why some people got huge increases — and I think they are huge increases. Mr. Archambault, I know, came on in '84-85. Could you explain as to why that increase?

Mr. McFarlane: — It's my understanding there that he had a new job in '85-86, and it reflected the significant increase in his responsibilities.

Mr. Rolfes: — All right. Would you mind telling the committee . . . Okay. What was his job before, and what other duties were assigned to him after the significant increase?

Mr. McFarlane: — Do you want me to take time to get the answer, or do . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — Well no. I think if you would give it to us in writing, but I would like to have it very shortly if I could.

Mr. Chairman: — Normally we like the answers here, and we expect them here, but I don't think we're going to complete this committee today so you will be . . . next time you're before the committee you will have the answers.

Mr. Rolfes: — It had been my intention to finish this today because most of the questions are in a similar line and I don't think we have to spend that much time on it. But we've spent too much time on the other one which I don't . . . I mean, that's the committee's prerogative.

Mr. McFarlane, I have one further question on an individual, Sharon Tkachuk. When did she come on staff? Was it the year under review? This is on page 185. Sharon Tkachuk — and what was her position, and is she still with the department?

Mr. McFarlane: — Our recollection is that she did come on in that year, that she was a teacher in the correspondence school, and that she is no longer with the department.

Mr. Rolfes: — When did she leave, in the year under review?

Mr. McFarlane: — We believe last year.

Mr. Rolfes: — In 1985-86. I assume that was after the provincial election that she left. In case the members opposite don't know who Sharon Tkachuk is, she happens to be the wife of Dave Tkachuk, who had a very prominent job in the Premier's office. You guys would like to say, who's Dave now?

Mr. Martin: — Is that somehow a reflection on her work as a teacher?

Mr. Rolfes: — I didn't say anything . . .

Mr. Martin: — You implied.

Mr. Rolfes: — If the member from Wascana . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Order. Let the member from Saskatoon . . . Mr. Martin, let the member from Saskatoon ask his questions, okay.

Mr. Rolfes: — If the member from Wascana isn't satisfied with the quality of the people they hire, I assume he'll use his position to see to it that qualified people are hired.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Rolfes has the floor, please. Carry on. Order. Carry on, Mr. Rolfes.

Mr. Rolfes: — It seems to me the member gets a little touchy from time to time.

A Member: — Well a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — — What's your point of order?

Mr. Martin: — Sharon Tkachuk, who has an excellent reputation in many areas . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — You probably don't even know her.

Mr. Martin: — I know her very well through track and field.

Mr. Chairman: — We don't need the debate back and forth.

Mr. Martin: — The point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that of all the people they've talked about, she was the only one in which he made any reference whatsoever to a political connection. And I find that offensive, and I think it's out of order.

Mr. Chairman: — Let me rule on your point of order, Mr. Martin. The members can refer to the *Public Accounts*, as the member is doing, and I see that not to be a point of order. And I ask Mr. Rolfes to carry on in his questioning.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, I want to ask about another individual I know very well, Mr. John Egnatoff, who happens to be a very well known person in Saskatoon. He was also hired — this is on page 185. And Mr. Egnatoff also, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the member from Wascana, is also a very good friend of mine. He received \$2,205. I assume that that was on . . . that's page 185.

A Member: — Spell it, please.

Mr. Rolfes: — Egnatoff, E-g-n-a-t-o-f-f. Was that done . . . did he do some consultative work for the department? Can you just tell me what it was, in what capacity, what area?

A Member: — Urban. He was in Education back in '58.

Mr. Rolfes: — Oh, I know John very . . . no, John was chairman of the board for many, many years — lives in my constituency.

Mr. McFarlane: — I understand he was appointed as the chairman of the committee that looked into the labour dispute in Moose Jaw.

Mr. Rolfes: — Oh, that's right.

Mr. McFarlane: — These are his travel expenses.

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes. Thanks very much. I have one other person that I would like to ask about, and I'm sorry to the member from Wascana, but I have to ask a political question. Duane Weiman received \$2,434.69. Can you provide to me in some detail what that was paid for? That was 185, page 185 at the bottom.

Mr. McFarlane: — His expenses as ministerial assistant.

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, but for what reasons was he paid \$2,434? I think there is Legislative Secretary allowance, isn't there, that they receive, of 6 or \$7,000? Why the extra \$2,434?

Mr. McFarlane: — This is his travel expense.

Mr. Rolfes: — Could you itemize for me what the travel was about? — the purposes, the destinations, and the people . . . the purpose and the destination?

Mr. McFarlane: — I'll do that.

Mr. Rolfes: — On page 186 I have one other. Dome Media Buying Services Ltd., what is that? On page 186.

Mr. McFarlane: — I'm sorry. I didn't hear your question.

Mr. Rolfes: — Dome Media Buying Services Ltd., what services do they provide?

Mr. McFarlane: — This is the agency of record for the department which places our ads, and the ads in question would be anything from jobs that are being advertised to public meetings that we're trying to call, notices to the public of events that we're looking for them to come out to.

Mr. Rolfes: — Can you tell me what percentage of your advertising ads and stuff was done through Dome, and just what was this total amount under the year under review?

Mr. McFarlane: — Sorry, what was the last part of your question?

Mr. Rolfes: — I want a total amount.

Mr. McFarlane: — As far as we can construct sitting at a table, I would guess that the figure is about \$150,000, of which Dome consumed the 24 that's indicated there; and Smail Communications, which is also listed on page 186, had 129,000. And evidently what happened is that we began the year with Smail Communications as the . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — Smilk?

Mr. McFarlane: — Smail, S-m-a-i-l, as the agent of record, and switched two-thirds of the way through the year to Dome.

Mr. Rolfes: — Can you tell me the reason why you switched? Were you not satisfied with Smail?

Mr. McFarlane: — I really cannot tell you, but if you want, I will find out.

Mr. Rolfes: — I would appreciate. All right. That is just for Education, or for both Education and Advanced Education?

Mr. McFarlane: — It's just for ... The figures that I mentioned are just for Education.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay I will ask the same question next day on Advanced Education for both '84-85 and '85-86, so if you could have them for both I would appreciate that. And just so we can expedite the matter a little bit further, this is the type of questions that I will also ask next time, the series of questions on Advanced Education and Education for '85-86. So if you want to make some preparation in getting some of those, I think we can expedite the matter rather quickly.

A Member: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman: — I thank you, Mr. Rolfes. I'm going to try to get this part of the committee adjourned by a quarter after so we can decide about next week because we have some date changes I think we have to look at.

Can I ask the officials before you go to also tell us next week whether the Departments of Education or Advanced Education, in the years '84-85 and '85-86, did any, or paid for any, polling. I will also want to ask — and maybe you can answer it now; well give it to me next week — I will want to know for the year 1984-85, Teachers' Superannuation Commission, if any of the earnings of the Teachers' Superannuation Commission were taken out of the fund and put into the Consolidated Fund for both the years '84-85 and '85-86, and the amounts of money that were transferred out of the teacher's superannuation fund to the Consolidated Fund. I don't expect you to answer that today but the next day. Okay?

Mr. Muller: — We don't know if we're going to be sitting next week or not, so ...

Mr. Chairman: — Well, at the next sitting day when we ask you and invite you back.

Mr. McFarlane: — Just on the sitting, we also have our lives to co-ordinate around your requirements. Can you indicate if you want us next week, or is that impossible?

Mr. Chairman: — Oh yes. We're going to decide right away, and we'll let you know this afternoon. We

normally would be Tuesday and Thursday, and we'd be telling you next Tuesday, but because Monday is not a sitting day we have to make other provisions.

Mr. McFarlane: — If I can, and I know that this is not a major consideration, but Thursday would be a real problem for us, but if it's Thursday, so be it.

A Member: — If it's Thursday, it's no problem?

Mr. McFarlane: — No, it's a real problem for us.

A Member: — It'd be a real problem for us too, because we have Friday sitting hours in the House.

Mr. Chairman: — Thank you, have a good day.

Let's see if we can get this more directed here. Gentlemen, we have a problem next week in that on Monday it's Thanksgiving Day, so therefore Tuesday normally would be travelling time.

Now if you want to travel, have a later meeting on Tuesday, I'm open to that. Then we have the other ... the only other time is the Wednesday morning which some members say they have difficulty with. Thursday we sit Friday hours, so our option would be to sit after 1, say 2 Thursday for some time, two to five. If we can't agree to do something along that line — or Friday morning before we go and visit with Her Majesty, the Queen. But we don't have to have the whole committee here.

But if we can't find some days here, we'll miss a whole week, and then we will definitely be looking at sitting intersessionally. So I wondered if we could get some ... I'm looking for some advice here.

Mr. Rolfes: — Well, Mr. Chairman, as the lead critic on this side for Education, Advanced Education, I think I might have an hour to an hour and a half on both '84 and '85, and we could finish it, unless, you know, unless other members have a lot of other questions that they want to ask, I don't know. But I think that I could, you know, finish everything I have in about an hour to an hour and a half at the most. And particularly since I've indicated a lot of the questions I'm going to be asking, I'll have the answers and they'll go very quickly.

I think we've got to try and find some time. I know we can't accommodate everybody. I couldn't make it last Tuesday, and the committee went ahead. You know, Lloyd can't make it on Tuesday. I'm sure, maybe if the other members can be here ...

Mr. Martens: — I think on Tuesday three or four of us are probably going to have the same meeting, which is agricultural caucus meeting on Tuesdays.

Mr. Chairman: — No, but that is normal time set aside for committee meetings.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, I meant Tuesday.

Mr. Martens: — I'm talking about Tuesday.

Mr. Neudorf: — We're doing another meeting ...

(inaudible) . . .

Mr. Martens: — I am going to find it very difficult to be here on Thursday outside of the time that's allotted for the Assembly. On Friday I won't be here at all. It's a tradition at my house that when the third weekend in September or October rolls around, we have a round-up that I wouldn't miss for . . . (inaudible) . . .

A Member: — What kind of loyalty do you have?

Mr. Martens: — I won't be here at all Thursday afternoon or Friday or . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I respect the different commitments we all have. I'm really concerned that we are going to miss a week. We got started in this committee very late. We have this agenda which is a long agenda, and I really am looking for the committee to find at least some time next week in which we can meet. And right now I'm not finding a great deal of help coming that way.

Am I hearing that Tuesday, late Tuesday, is not open to enough members to have a meeting?

Mr. Martens: — Not late Tuesday.

Mr. Chairman: — Because, quite frankly, I could call a meeting on my own volition. As the Chairman, I could call a meeting. And if we don't have . . . If we have three members, we can go right ahead. But I don't want to do that, so I'm looking for some co-operation here.

Mr. Muller: — We could adjourn the House Tuesday evening and have Public Accounts.

Mr. Chairman: — Well that's not for us to decide. I don't think . . . that won't help the operation of the House either. We're looking here at time and getting work done,

Mr. Neudorf: — Well what about Wednesday from 8 to 10?

Mr. Muller: — I'm totally tied up from 8 to 10 Wednesday morning.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay. Well I'm just saying how many of your people can make it on Wednesday . . .

Mr. Muller: — If I'm at resource caucus, that's fine.

Mr. Chairman: — You don't have to be here, Lloyd. 8 to 10 or 8 to 10:30, what are you saying?

Mr. Neudorf: — Well at 10 we have a major caucus.

Mr. Chairman: — They won't decide anything against you guys.

Mr. Rolfes: — I'm sure I can finish in an hour and a half.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, let's take a shot at Wednesday, 8 to 10, and we will call Advanced Education back, and we will put Westank on standby. If Herman is right, he can be done in an hour and a half; maybe in half an hour we can get done with Westank.

Mr. Rolfes: — Well I was hoping we could finish it this morning, but we got side-tracked a little bit on Sask Housing. But that's all right.

Mr. Chairman: — We're adjourned.

The committee. adjourned at 10:25 a.m.