

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
October 29, 1987

Mr. Chairman: — If I may get your attention, we are not going to, I think, need a great deal of time this morning. I thought we should call this short meeting to give some approval to, or change to, a proposed report, because before the House recesses we should give a preliminary report on the work of the committee.

So our Clerk has been good enough to put this report together, and I think it was distributed to everyone yesterday, so you had a chance to take a look at it, and I recommend it to you. It basically covers things that the committee, from the minutes, has dealt with and deliberated on. I place it before you for discussion. If there is no . . .

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, sir.

Mr. Neudorf: — Just for a point of clarification, is this a regular practice for interim reports to be handed in, and particularly . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Sometimes it happens two or three times a session.

Mr. Neudorf: — All right. Well I certainly have no trouble with that, and I think most of the . . . or all of the members from this side would certainly agree with doing something like that in a typical response, I suppose, of our openness and our willingness to co-operate in letting the public in on the discussions rather than protracting it until such time as we're totally finished, so we have certainly no problem that way.

I would have one question. This report as we see it before us, who drafted it?

Mr. Chairman: — The Clerk, as always. It's always drafted by the Clerk or whoever our Clerk is at the time, and then they present it to us for our consideration. That doesn't mean it's the final word. They just help us with the draft.

Mr. Neudorf: — All right. Well I've spent some time going over the report, and as far as the first page of the report is concerned it seems to be very factual and straightforward, so in my opinion there would be nothing wrong with that one at all.

Number two . . . on page 2 rather, there are four issues that are brought forth, and again that is probably just a more factual accounting of some of the decisions that were made in the report. And from what I can ascertain it is a legitimate report and the four points are acceptable in my opinion. Again the other members can speak for themselves. However, it's not what's in the report that I would question. It is perhaps what is not in the report that could be addressed.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you would be open to some comments at this time I'd just like to perhaps indicate that if we're going to be giving a report to the legislature as to what this committee has been doing over . . . I think at the beginning there it says somewhat in the neighbourhood

of 16th, this I believe is our 17th meeting already.

We have covered an awful lot of material. We've made a lot of decisions, a lot more than are in here, and it just seems to me that we should be flagging, perhaps, for lack of a better word, some other issues. And I did not have time, Mr. Chairman, since I've received this report to get back to you ahead of time so that we could distribute some of the concerns that I think that should be included.

So with your permission, I would just like to go over a few points.

Mr. Chairman: — Sure.

Mr. Neudorf: — I have a copy here of these and I could give them to the Clerk afterwards so that she has the exact wording of what I'm trying to put across. One of the points that I have here that I would like to bring forth for discussion is that we include this:

That the committee considered the need for obtaining the Hopkins report which deals with summary financial statements, and on consideration it was decided that the report exceeded the committee's mandate, but agreed to discuss the Provincial Auditor's recommendations regarding summary financial statements.

And I include that, Mr. Chairman, because we did spend a lot of time on it, and it was an issue of concern.

Mr. Chairman: — Would you repeat the latter part?

Mr. Neudorf: — The latter part — "but agreed to discuss the Provincial Auditor's recommendations regarding summary financial statements."

Again, from my perception, this is just a factual account of what we did decide. So it would be my opinion that this could also be included in our reports.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, I don't have the minutes here, but from my recollection on the Hopkins report, I don't think it was agreed that we . . . I still want the Hopkins report, but the official simply said no. I don't agree with that, and I think I made that point at the time that I still think we should have access to the Hopkins report. They simply say it's a policy decision report. Now we have to take their word for it, And I think I said at the time, Bill, that, you know, they can simply say everything is policy — it's a policy report and we have no access to it.

I'd still like to see it. Yes, we certainly agreed that we would like to have a look at the summary financial statement, but to me the best thing would be if we could get hold of the Hopkins report and have a look at it. Obviously they think it's a policy report, and we therefore are excluded from having access to it. But I personally feel that we should have access to it.

Mr. Chairman: — I think, as a lead, and I just paraphrase what you were saying, Mr. Neudorf, it's true we did not consider the Hopkins report — and I'm only trying to help here. I don't think it was agreed that it wasn't within the

mandate; it was a decision of the officials that it was a policy paper, and I think that's the more accurate statement. There is a distinct difference.

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, that's exactly what I'm referring to is the fact that that is why it goes beyond this committee's mandate is because it was a policy paper and that it was a treasury board document, and that is why it exceeded our mandate. That is exactly my point.

Mr. Chairman: — What I'm saying is that there was not an agreement on that. There's nothing recorded to that effect. All that's recorded is that the officials said that it was a policy statement and therefore it could not be presented, and the committee left it at that.

Mr. Neudorf: — That is exactly . . . also my point, Mr. Chairman. By agreement, I do not mean to indicate that it was 100 per cent agreement on this committee, but by consensus we did not pursue that issue because there was that agreement, by consensus, that it exceeded our mandate.

Mr. Chairman: — Well I think we have to be accurate here. I'd like to find some better words than that, because you're putting words in the mouth of the committee, which . . . we never decided that.

Mr. Rolfes: — That's the problem.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, I'm sorry, I'm interrupting.

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's exactly my problem. Once they say it's a policy paper, I mean, I may disagree with them, but I have no choice. I mean, what am I going to do? There's nothing I can do. I mean, if they say it's a policy decision . . . they may have been instructed by someone else to say, look, this is a policy decision, and that's what you say at the committee. And there's nothing I can do about it. But I don't agree with it. If you want to put it that the officials said it was a policy report and therefore the committee will not have access to it, fine; I'll agree with that. That's exactly what happened.

Mr. Neudorf: — Perhaps, Mr. Rolfes, to expedite matters, maybe I should reread what I did say, and then you can catch the wording, perhaps. Maybe this will mollify you:

The committee considered the need for obtaining the Hopkins report which deals with summary financial statements, and on consideration it was decided (I did not say "agreed" at this point, I said, "it was decided") that the report exceeded . . .

Now whether you agree with that decision or not is beside the point, but where I used the word "agreement" was only to say that, and the last phrase was:

. . . but agreed to discuss the Provincial Auditor's recommendations.

Mr. Rolfes: — All right, Mr. Chairman. If you want to put in it was decided by the government members that it exceeded, fine. I don't think it exceeds.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well perhaps we could say, it was decided on division. Is that . . . ?

Mr. Rolfes: — Well, make it very clear that there was a difference. I mean, I just do not want to have it read later on that we all agreed that it was a policy paper, because I don't think it is.

Mr. Chairman: — I really want to be accurate here, and I think Mr. Rolfes may have the final, ultimate answer to this. I'm still not happy with his solution either, because I think it's our obligation to be accurate.

There was not a decision of the committee at no point on this. It was a decision of the department, and the committee did not pursue it any further. So the committee did not decide. There is no official decision, either in the minutes or in the *Hansard*, and I don't know how the committee can rightfully say something that is not in there.

And I'm not arguing. If this is the wish to put something respecting the Hopkins report in our report, that's fine. I'm just trying to struggle here to make sure we're not out of line.

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, I think if you put in, because the officials decided it was a policy paper, okay, fine. I mean, then it's clearly established.

Mr. Chairman: — And we didn't pursue it any further; we left it at that.

Mr. Muirhead: — There was no vote or nothing.

Mr. Chairman: — No.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, there was no vote on it, because I remember pursuing it, and he said it was a policy paper, and I left it because there's nothing I can do.

Mr. Chairman: — So let's see if we can help the Clerk and find some right words here. Oh, we have a proposal.

Ms. Ronyk: — The committee considered the need for obtaining the Hopkins report on summary financial statements. The committee was informed that the document was a policy paper. The committee agreed to discuss the Provincial Auditor's recommendations regarding summary financial statements.

Mr. Chairman: — That's accurate. Does that meet your need?

Mr. Neudorf: — I think, Mr. Chairman, that I will accept that at this point. And I think what we've also done here is raise the fundamental issue of how this committee operates, and I will concede that perhaps this is not the appropriate time to pursue that further. And it may well come up again in future.

Mr. Chairman: — I appreciate the point you've been trying to make, Mr. Neudorf. I think besides that, with respect to that I still think the committee has to not deviate from what it did earlier. If it was intending to do something earlier, it should have done it then. We have to

... we're part of the legislature. But I'm happy with that if you are. And we can add that to the report as it is. Do you want to repeat it so that we don't have to have another meeting?

Mr. Neudorf: — Pardon me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Do you want that repeated so that we don't have to have another meeting to decide on this? We'll just include it.

Mr. Neudorf: — No, that's fine. I concur with that.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Anything else?

Mr. Neudorf: — I have another suggestion, Mr. Chairman.

After discussion of the opinions of the Provincial Auditor, the committee acknowledged the opinions rendered and proceeded to other business.

Mr. Chairman: — Can you tell me where you are? Or are you just adding something or what?

Mr. Neudorf: — No, Mr. Chairman. I still have a few more points that I would like included in our report, and this is the second issue that I'm raising now, so it's not one of the original.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay.

Mr. Neudorf: — I maybe perhaps should repeat that:

After discussion of the opinions of the Provincial Auditor, the committee acknowledged the opinions rendered and proceeded to other business.

You'll recall that this had to do with Mr. Martens' motion which we did pursue.

Mr. Chairman: — Can you elaborate on that? I don't ... I'm not sure I ... What subject was that?

Mr. Neudorf: — We were dealing with the subject of the auditor, including all kinds of things up to present time, and giving his opinions and stating his opinions on years of the present instead of just the year under review. And then we were getting off on a tangent where we were dealing with such things as '87 issues instead of staying under the year under review.

So I believe it was Mr. Martens who made ... Was it a motion that you made to the extent that ... (inaudible interjection) ... Right, a recommendation that we acknowledge the fact that the auditor was expressing these concerns and then leave it at that. And then we continued on to other issues.

Mr. Rolfes: — Can I just ask a question? I think I would change one word in there, "opinions" to "concerns", but I don't know what that does. It doesn't ... What does that add to the report?

Mr. Neudorf: — It adds the flavour of the basic concern that I have that we're going to have to address in this committee, and I just want to make sure that the legislature is aware of the fact that ... of the trend that this committee was starting to establish where everything and anything was being discussed. And I think that is a concern that I have that we have to address.

Mr. Rolfes: — Well I can't agree with that because I think many times you called me to order, which the Chairman agreed. You know, that's fair enough. I'll always attempt to go beyond the bounds if no one calls me to order, knowing full well what the rules are. I think the rules are clear enough that we discuss all the items that are mentioned in the auditor's report.

And I think we would be doing a disservice to the auditor if, in the year under review, he saw some trends and could not alert this committee to those trends or those, you know, those things that were happening within government. I think we would be foolish to tie the auditor's hands and say, no, you may not mention that because that anticipates the future, or you are ... You know, the committee has always, in my understanding, has always discussed whatever the auditor put in his report, and that's always been under discussion.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Mr. Rolfes, I have no objection to what you're saying. All I'm saying is that this was a decision that we made in this committee, and I'm just suggesting that we include this in our report.

Mr. Chairman: — Let me try to qualify. I think that's only taking out a part of the decision, and I really wonder what's going on here, because as I read this, on October 1, moved by Mr. Martens:

That the Public Accounts Committee recognizes the necessity for the auditor to be accountable to the Legislative Assembly;

The Public Accounts Committee recognizes the necessity for the independence of the auditor in relation to the executive branch of government; and

The Public Accounts Committee recognizes the importance of the auditor to freely express his opinion on the financial records of the executive branch of government.

All of which, I think ...

Mr. Neudorf: — This is what he was saying, and we agree.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes. And then that:

We therefore move that we acknowledge the opinions rendered ...

Mr. Martin: — I'm wondering if you're talking ... excuse me, but I'm wondering if you're talking about the ... remember we had that discussion related to his preamble to the '85 or '86, we were dealing with — I forget which year — but we may have been dealing ... let's say we're

dealing with the year '85 or . . . I don't want to get confused . . . at any rate, his preamble to the report dealing with the previous year. In other words, he was talking 1987 words on a subject dealing with 1986.

And my point at that was, if I remember correctly, was that I thought his . . . and the problem I have with what you're saying, Herman, is that if in a preamble to a report about previous year's activities he makes some reference to trends, then that opens the door for any one at any time to say, well, in the auditor's report, from cover to cover he's talking about issues. You know what I mean, you're saying any time the guy says anything in his report, from cover to cover that is, that opens the door to talk about almost anything.

And I always felt that it was important, at least . . . now I've only been around not a very long time, but it is my understanding that it was important in this public accounts that you only talked about the year specifically under review, which is what I understand is what we were supposed to be doing. So you know what I'm saying?

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes. I can't disagree generally what you're saying. But what I'm . . . I hope that we don't tie the hands of the committee so that we can't . . . If the auditor, in his opinion, is alerting us to certain things that are happening and it's not within the best interest of making a government accountable for its expenditures, then I think it's incumbent upon the auditor to mention that in his report and alert us to it. I mean, we are . . . this committee is the watch-dog.

Mr. Martin: — I agree with what you're saying except that I think that if he talks about something in 1987 words, you have a . . . you know, anybody has an opportunity to then flag that as something to be brought up in the legislature and/or the next year is something to watch for . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I think we're not in order here. Let's deal with what Mr. Neudorf has. Mr. Neudorf, would you be . . . I've missed the comments Mr. Rolfes made. Would you entertain including this whole section, because I think that . . .

Mr. Neudorf: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would. The reason it's not included is because I thought from my perspective that it would be redundancy. If it's leaving out the intent of the committee and you feel that that should also be included, I would have not problem with that. It will lengthen it considerably, but I guess that's not a problem.

Mr. Chairman: — It will look like we've done more.

Mr. Neudorf: — Perception again, yes.

Mr. Chairman: — Right. So we're going to say what is in minute no. 9, October 1, and conclude with your comment on after the discussion of the opinion . . . something about the committee acknowledged. I don't know the wording but it says . . .

Mr. Neudorf: —

The committee acknowledged the opinions

rendered and proceeded to other business.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, after having you read that, we acknowledged it.

Mr. Rolfes: — Did we say acknowledged the opinions or concerns?

Mr. Neudorf: — Opinions. I will stick with opinions.

Mr. Rolfes: — Okay, good enough.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Thank you. I don't know how we're going to approve this because we're going to want to see the final draft, don't we? How is it done?

Ms. Ronyk: — What I could do is prepare the final draft, distribute it into the House this morning . . .

Mr. Chairman: — We don't have to report today.

Ms. Ronyk: — No, we could, you know, meet for five minutes at the end of one of our adjournment periods today.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. We'll leave it to Mr. Muller.

A Member: — He's got some more.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, I know he has some more. Okay, carry on.

Mr. Neudorf: — I have three more, Mr. Chairman, but I'm going to reduce it down to one because I feel that there's a steady pull back on every suggestion that I'm making. So whether I'm touching a few nerves here or what I'm not quite sure but . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Not really, we're just trying to be accurate here. Don't start talking about nerves.

Mr. Neudorf: — All right, Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that. The last one that I'll bring up then is that the committee rejected proposals for establishing a target date for the release of the public documents and for the tabling of *Public Accounts* when the House is not sitting.

Mr. Chairman: — Where do you find that?

Mr. Rolfes: — Was there a motion made?

Mr. Neudorf: — I thought there was.

Mr. Rolfes: — I don't think so. If there is, we would be opposed.

Mr. Neudorf: — This was one of our first . . . or second meeting. At a first or second meeting that we had, we had a long, long discussion on this issue.

Mr. Rolfes: — But I don't think there was a motion made.

Mr. Neudorf: — And it was my feeling that the decision was made exactly the way I have stated it here.

Mr. Chairman: — Our Clerk tells us that what we agreed

to is in item 1 on page 2 as presented to you in a draft report.

Mr. Neudorf: — Is that on the top of the page there?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, if I may. Both Mr. Kraus . . . Mr. Kraus expressed concern, and if I draw your attention, I think, to the September 29, I believe, issue, I think it's stated in there if I remember correctly. Mr. Kraus is concerned that the reports were not in time, and felt that they should be completed within six months of the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Kraus stated that, which was concurred in, by the way, by Mr. Lutz.

If you read the report — I believe it's September 29; could be 22; I was going through some of these yesterday for some other information — that's what the committee agreed to. We didn't make it specifically six months, but did express our concern and agreed with Mr. Kraus and Mr. Lutz on that.

Mr. Martens: — Yes, Mr. Chairman, the focus of the discussion went beyond the reporting of the method. When we were talking about . . . We were also talking about, I believe, the aspects of the potash corporation in relation to the financial statements and the problems that were related to the ITC (International Trade Commission) in the United States having information as regards the potash corporation, and that flexibility was to the benefit of the people of Saskatchewan at that time.

And both the Crown Management Board and Mr. Lutz worked that out so that that became a positive in relation to the delaying of the reporting of the . . . or giving the reports. And I think that some of that flexibility has to be maintained in order to deal with government on an ongoing basis, because it has ramifications in other places.

However, I will also say that the concern you raise has to be dealt with. I think that it's an important issue. However, there has to be some flexibility on the part of both the auditor and the area of concern in relating to this. I would see . . . I wouldn't know how to draw a rule that you could establish that you could establish firm flexibility.

Mr. Chairman: — I hope we would not be attempting in the committee here to tell the auditor how to perform his duty. The legislature already has told him that, and any motion we make here should not in any way do that. And I don't think you're suggesting that, but you made a comment which I think may be misinterpreted.

We cannot in this committee, nor should we in this committee, instruct the auditor on how to carry out his functions. And I don't . . . That's not what you're saying.

Mr. Martens: — No, no, I'm referring to the Legislative Assembly making the decision to deal with a firm date that disregards any other time frame for the establishment of reports and audits.

And I think that, as I've looked through various things, the

timetable of the Assembly is also a part that has to be included in all of this. And a lot of times the government knows what's going on and therefore has to have a certain degree of flexibility in determining, and that potash issue is exactly a case in point.

Mr. Chairman: — But that's something that government then has to answer for. Don't implicate the auditor in that.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, I don't want to get into that issue because I . . . but I think at the time when we discussed it, yes, some of us would like to have a set time, but we couldn't agree to that. We agreed to the motion that's on page 2 which says only on a timely basis. I mean . . . and that gives the government the flexibility. You know, I think the auditor expressed his grave concern of materials being outdated and no longer of any relevance.

And I remember, you know, asking the question, isn't there, isn't the date wrong? I felt we were . . . When I said it was 1983 — and someone said no, that's correct, that's what we're looking at is 1983; I said, four years? I couldn't believe it. I thought the date was wrong. And I read it yesterday in the report again. And then we finally came to the agreement that the committee expressed its concern and that reports should be on a timely basis. Now that doesn't tie the government's hand. If we had put in six months, yes, it would have tied the government's hand. And maybe you need that little bit of flexibility.

I mean if it was for me, yes, maybe sitting on this side is a little different than having to sit on that side, but I think that expresses what the committee decided on:

The committee emphasized the importance of financial statements being completed in a timely way in order that the value of information provided is not diminished.

I don't think that ties the government's hand. We're simply saving, hey, lookit, when the reports are done, and if you can get them done on time, okay, table them. And some of us would like to have them tabled when the House is not sitting so that we can study them. And I made the point at the time that, I think, one day we got 15 reports. Now no one can tell me that all those reports were done that particular day.

Mr. Muller: — There's not actually any tabled when the House isn't sitting.

Mr. Rolfes: — Make them available to the members.

Mr. Muller: — You can't table reports . . .

Mr. Rolfes: — Yes, you can. Oh yes, you can.

Mr. Muller: — I didn't know you can.

Mr. Rolfes: — No, you can simply submit them to the Speaker and the Speaker makes them available to the members. They don't have to be tabled, you know, on the desk. You can submit them to the Speaker, and then they are made available to . . . That's done in some other Houses.

Mr. Chairman: — Let's try to get to the issue here.

Mr. Rolfes: — I think we express it on page 2.

Mr. Chairman: — I can't totally remember the wording of what you're recommending, Mr. Neudorf, but we have a decision that's pretty clear and that's recommended in number one here by our Clerk, and I don't think, you know, if your motion — if it's not a motion yet, but a recommendation — is in a great deviance from that, then I can't really consider it to be in order.

Mr. Neudorf: — I don't think it's in great deviance from that. It recognizes the fact that members of this committee raised the issue of establishing a target date by which time the release of the *Public Accounts* should have occurred. This committee did not do that.

And secondly, certain members of this committee also raised the issue of tabling *Public Accounts* when the House was not sitting. This committee also did not come to a decision to do that, and that is what my point was. That's simply all I'm doing.

Mr. Chairman: — But since there was no decision, there is no report, nothing to report on.

Mr. Neudorf: — It was an issue that this committee dealt with. Now I don't know if we're only going to be doing with specific motions. Is this what this report is? Is this what this draft is all about — specific motions made and either accepted or defeated? Or are we going to report fully, or are we trying to hide something from the legislature?

Mr. Chairman: — Let's not get into that kind of terminology. We're reporting all that we considered, and you can see that on page 1. And then we're reporting where the committee came to some agreement on issues. That's here. But we never, as far as I remember as a chairman, came to any such agreement as you're proposing.

Mr. Neudorf: — I think, Mr. Chairman, that you're correct in saying that there was not a motion to that effect that was voted on, but it was still a decision by the consensus of this committee that we would not ask for tabling of *Public Accounts* when the House is not sitting. This was discussed. It was part of the discussion around this table.

Mr. Rolfes: — Mr. Chairman, yes. If Mr. Neudorf wants to put that in, I'll gladly agree to that and have a full debate in the House and accuse the government members of delaying and overruling this committee,

I thought it would be to your advantage not to have that in and not have that debate. But if you want to have that debate that you objected to having timely reports, and have us debate that in the House and accuse you people of overriding the committee because of your majority, and that you fully agreed that reports that we are now considering, which are almost four years old, that that's the way it should be done, and we wanted them to be submitted on a timely basis, and agree with the auditor and the provincial comptroller — if you want that debate,

fine. I'm not going to agree to this, but I can assure you it's going to be a full-fledged debate then.

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Mr. Rolfes, I find difficulty in understanding why you would not agree to an issue that was discussed around this table, and reporting . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — just a minute. Order, order. Let me clarify here. We're not here to report on things we discussed. I mean, if we were going to do that, all we should be doing is tabling the *Hansard*. We're here to report on the dispositions of the items before the committee . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Neudorf: — Well, Mr. Chairman, that was my question a few moments ago, is: are we reporting only on motions that were made and either accepted or defeated?

Mr. Chairman: — Basically that's what we're reporting on. We're not reporting on certain debates that took place, because all of us may have our favourite debate, and I think that's highly inappropriate.

Mr. Neudorf: — But even our debates led to decisions, either for or against, by default.

Mr. Chairman: — Those decisions are recorded here as best, I think, as we know.

Ms. Ronyk: — Mr. Chairman, the draft report contained all of the resolutions regarding the subject matter, not the procedural stuff, that the committee agreed to. That's normally what will appear in a committee's report, is what they have agreed to.

Mr. Neudorf: — By motion?

Ms. Ronyk: — Yes, formally agreed to by motion.

Mr. Chairman: — She's saying it better than I did, but that's what I was trying to say.

Mr. Neudorf: — All right. Well that was my question all along here, is what are we reporting on?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, that's . . . So can we live with what's in number one, which is general enough and meets, I think, what Mr. Martin was saying, that you shouldn't tie anybody, although some of us might want it to be tied; but that's fine.

Mr. Muller: — I think it satisfied me in number one on the second page, that gives the government enough leeway, you know, to have timely reports, and I think the should have timely reports. But we've agreed to that and that's . . . It's fully reported in here, as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. Chairman: — What's the wish of the committee? Is this agreed then, here? Okay.

Now we have added, how many items, one item?

Ms. Ronyk: — Two items.

Mr. Chairman: — Two items. I forget the second one. Can

you repeat the second one?

Ms. Ronyk: — That was putting in the other resolution . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, the total resolution.

Ms. Ronyk: — . . . the committee agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, okay.

Mr. Neudorf: — I had not included the preamble as it was.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, fine.

Is there any other thing before we let our Clerk go and do the final draft? Even if we met . . . Well, let's leave it to Mr. Muller and me. We should not take long. Anything else?

Mr. Muirhead: — You mean just for you two to make the decision that it's all right . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Oh no, no, no. Him and I will decide . . . No, I don't want us to be put into that jackpot.

Mr. Muller: — We'll decide when we're going to have a short meeting . . .

Mr. Chairman: — We will decide when we have a short meeting.

Mr. Muirhead: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman: — Then we might even let you know.

Mr. Muirhead — Not that I was against the two of you making decisions. I just wanted to clarify it.

Mr. Chairman: — No, Mr. Muller and I might make good deals.

Mr. Muirhead: — You might let us in on it.

Mr. Chairman: — Can we adjourn?

Mr. Neudorf: — Mr. Chairman, I promise at the next meeting I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman — We'll hold you to your word, now that we have you on record. Good day. Let's go to work.

The committee adjourned at 9:10 a.m.