

Public Hearing: Saskatchewan Telecommunications

Mr. Chairman: — We'll call the committee to order. Mr. Lloyd, good morning. I wonder if you would introduce the rest of your officials to the committee, please.

Mr. Lloyd: — I have Dave Schultz who is our vice-president of finance; Larry Shaw who is the manager of disbursements; and Dave Lozinski who is our manager of human resources; and Diana Milenkovic who is the VP (vice-president), corporate affairs.

Mr. Chairman: — Thank you very much. Mr. Lloyd, do you have any prepared statement you wish to give to the committee pertaining to the issues surrounding SaskTel and the special report of the auditor that you wish to make?

Mr. Lloyd: — Not really. The only comment which I would make is that I presume that we're here before the Public Accounts Committee to deal with the particular questions which are noted in the special report of the Provincial Auditor, namely that on page 23.

Mr. Chairman: — I neglected to do something here before we get going and I had best do that now before anyone says anything. I need to make you aware of certain things prior to any testimony being given in the committee.

Witnesses should be aware that when appearing before a legislative committee your testimony is entitled to have the protection of parliamentary privilege. The evidence you provide to this committee can't be used against you as the subject of a civil action.

In addition I wish to advise you that you are protected by section 13 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which provides that:

A witness who testifies in any proceedings has the right not to have any incriminating evidence so given used to incriminate that witness in any other proceedings, except in a prosecution for perjury or for the giving of contradictory evidence.

As a witness you must answer all questions put by the committee. Where a member of the committee requests written information of your department, I ask that 20 copies be submitted to the committee Clerk who will then distribute the document and record it as a tabled document. You are reminded to please address all comments through the chair.

Please proceed. Anything more?

Mr. Lloyd: — Nothing more that we would wish to say at this particular juncture in time. I believe we have submitted to yourself, Mr. Chairman, responses to the questions which the committee had asked. And I guess that is in effect our report to yourself.

Mr. Chairman: — I would entertain a speaking list at this time.

Mr. Sonntag: — Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As you said, Mr. Lloyd, I'm specifically interested in the auditor's reference in chapter 3, section 4 of the special audit report on page 23 where the goods and where services were provided without charge. And I note your department lists a vehicle lease for a Legislative Secretary to Department of Justice for 13,623. First of all, that is correct, is it?

Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Sonntag: — Can you give me some explanation of this?

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the VP of finance, Dave Schultz, to provide the explanation.

Mr. Schultz: — That money is . . . there is a vehicle lease for January to December of 1990, vehicle lease for \$6,975; there was a vehicle lease termination expense of \$4,438.36; estimated vehicle operating cost from November 1989 to December 1990 of \$1,170; and in 1989 from November to December, a vehicle lease of \$1,040. I believe that adds up to the \$13,623 in the report.

Mr. Sonntag: — So how many vehicles are we talking about here?

Mr. Schultz: — Two vehicles. For the period in which these numbers — the period of the *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor* referencing the \$13,623 — during that period there were two vehicles from November 1989 to September . . . excuse me, November 8, 1989 to September 19, 1990; another vehicle from September 19, 1990 to August 19, 1991. And that was for the period under review; two vehicles during the period under review.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. My question then would be: what were the terms, specifically the length of the lease . . . the length of the leases?

Mr. Schultz: — Both leases — I'll be corrected if I'm wrong — I believe were 36-month leases.

Mr. Sonntag: — Would it be normal that vehicles would be turned in prior to the expiration of the lease?

Mr. Schultz: — That is outside my area; I don't deal with vehicles specifically. I'll ask Mr. Lozinski just to reply to that question.

Mr. Lozinski: — No, it isn't normal. Basically, it's an open-ended lease so the lease can be terminated at any particular point in time once the minimum time requirement has been achieved. So it's an open-ended lease. So yes it can be terminated any time during the 36-month time period once the minimum requirement has passed by.

Mr. Sonntag: — Well I'm a relatively new member to the legislature and also certainly to the Public Accounts Committee and I might not understand all of the process and procedure perfectly so please feel free to correct me

here any time. My colleagues usually don't hesitate. But I want a little bit better handle on this.

So to be absolutely sure, what I've done is I got one of the researchers to inquire as to what the policy was and this is what was sent back to us. And I've got some extra copies here as well if anybody wants them, I don't know.

It is a memorandum dated November 9, '82 from the Hon. Joan Duncan, minister of Revenue, Supply and Services. And if I could I'd just read it into the record. It's addressed to Mr. R. Folk, R. Katzman, G. Muirhead, C. Maxwell, L. Birkbeck, G. Dirks, M. Morin, L. Hepworth, T. Embury, all legislative secretaries, and in reference specifically to all legislative secretaries' CVA (central vehicle agency) vehicles. It reads as follows:

As communicated to you and your Minister on October 18, 1982, by Mr. G. Smith-Windsor, Cabinet has decided your vehicle needs, while travelling on behalf of your Minister, will be handled on a pool basis rather than on an individual vehicle assignment basis.

Central Vehicle Agency will keep a limited number of executive vehicles at their Pool Depot (now located at 815 Dewdney Avenue) which, when available, will be made available for your use on a first come, first serve basis. The only other competition you will have for these executive vehicles will be the Cabinet Ministers who occasionally require the use of a spare executive unit when their assigned vehicle is out for service and/or repairs. When executive vehicles are not available your vehicle request will be serviced by one of the standard CVA pool vehicles.

The normal Pool depot procedures and policies will apply, the most significant of which are that Pool vehicles are to be used for government purposes only, for out-of-town use only and for short durations. When planning a trip, please call 565-2041 to reserve a vehicle by indicating the pickup and return dates and times. When going to pick up the vehicle (at 815 Dewdney) please take along a completed Pool Car Requisition (sample attached) form, which will serve as identification as well as initiate the billing process. When the car is returned at the completion of the trip you will be asked to complete a Pool car distance report which will result in the distance being charged to the department or agency designated on the requisition.

Gasoline purchases enroute can be made using the CVA vehicle expense vouchers which will be provided at the time the car is issued. The top copies of any such credit card purchases are to be turned in with the vehicle. This and other operating/purchasing policies are described in a CVA operators handbook found in the glove box of each car.

E. Crosthwaite, my Executive Assistant or L. Benson, Direction of CVA, are available to discuss any further questions you may have. Those

Legislative Secretaries who were assigned CVA vehicles in August should make arrangements to return the vehicles to CVA upon receipt of this memo.

Signed, Hon. Joan Duncan.

I guess I would ask Mr. Strelieff. Are you aware, this is the policy and was the policy?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sonntag, this is the first time that we've seen this document. So we're not sure whether this was the official policy or not.

Mr. Sonntag: — Do you know what the policy would be now?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sonntag, we haven't got that information with us right now.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. Could you have that provided for us?

The Chairperson: — That's SPMC (Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation). The Clerk can probably get it.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay, I won't follow that any further then.

Then I would ask to Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Chairman. To my knowledge SaskTel has never had a Legislative Secretary. So I guess the obvious question then is which Legislative Secretary received this car?

Mr. Lloyd: — I guess my response to that must be that SaskTel was instructed by the minister's office, the minister responsible for SaskTel, to provide Mr. Muirhead with a vehicle and that SaskTel was to absorb all the associated expenses with that particular vehicle. The reason provided was that telecommunications functional role that Mr. Muirhead was playing or was carrying out on behalf of Mr. Lane for SaskTel.

To facilitate the request, the internal instructions were to treat the vehicle as part of SaskTel's fleet complement and to outfit Mr. Muirhead with a corporate fleet credit card. Instructions were given to provide the vehicle from sources other than CVA.

Mr. Sonntag: — In light of what I've read here out of the . . . what I was led to believe was the policy at that time anyway, didn't anybody in SaskTel say anything about this? Or was this raised with the minister's office?

Mr. Lloyd: — This I would have to defer, not having been there, to Dave I guess.

Mr. Lozinski: — To my knowledge, yes. The concern was raised in the minister's office. This would be third-party information, that at the time it would have been from the vice-president of human resources which was Barry Roberts, and continuing on to Mr. Fred Yeo. The indication that I received — again third party — from them is yes, the concern was raised. But I don't have anything to substantiate; it was just third-party

information.

Mr. Sonntag: — Following question then would be, do you know what was the minister's response?

Mr. Lozinski: — I am not aware. I was not made privy to the minister's response.

Mr. Sonntag: — Is anybody aware of what the minister's response may have been?

Mr. Schultz: — I think it's important to understand that the president of the day, Mr. Coombs, is no longer with the corporation, neither is Mr. Roberts nor Mr. Yeo, and therefore that sequence of knowledge is no longer with us. And any discussions that may have occurred between officials of the day and the corporation during that period of time and the minister, we no longer have access to it.

Mr. Sonntag: — You alluded to earlier that a credit card was issued as well. Did the Legislative Secretary that we referred to or . . . There was a credit card issued with that car as well, is that correct?

Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Sonntag: — If so, then can you provide this committee with copies of the credit statements?

Mr. Schultz: — There were no receipts filed. The credit card was used but receipts were not transmitted to the corporation and therefore we do not have actual copies of the receipts that we could file with the committee.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. Again in light of the letter I have read here from what I thought was the policy, that would certainly be considered to be unusual. Is that not correct?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, that is not normal corporate practice.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. Well I don't know whether you can answer this question then. In light of that, were expenditures made other than fuel or travel related, to your knowledge?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, there was. There was . . . We're talking about expenditures related to the vehicles other than gas. Could you just repeat the question, please?

Mr. Sonntag: — Yes, that's correct. That's exactly what I asked.

Mr. Schultz: — Other than the payments I discussed earlier for lease and terminating charges and our estimate on operating expense, there was the purchase of four tires for the car, and we have a receipt for that. Just let me check with my officials if we have some other receipts on work on the car.

Yes, the receipt we have for four tires that were purchased on June 27, 1990 — four tires, \$696.24. I believe a copy of this was filed with the committee. Or it was not? Okay, we can certainly make that available to the committee.

Mr. Sonntag: — I may have misunderstood you here, I'm not sure, just clarification. You said the vehicles were for

the cars. You said those tires that were purchased were for that vehicle? I guess my question following then is, how do you know that?

Mr. Schultz: — We presume that, we presume that. We have no evidence that would suggest otherwise.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. You had said earlier in your earlier statement that this was a new vehicle. Doesn't that seem unusual as well, that there'd be four new tires purchased for a new vehicle?

Mr. Schultz: — I'll reply and . . . I believe that was June 27, 1990; that was for the vehicle that was leased from November 8, 1989, to September 19, 1990. When it was turned in on September 19, 1990, it had a total of 47,900 kilometres at September 19, 1990. So it likely would have had somewhat less than that at the end of June 1990 when the tires were changed.

Mr. Sonntag: — Probably as a driver yourself, and that would seem like low mileage to replace all of the tires on a new vehicle?

Mr. Schultz: — I think you're asking me to draw a conclusion here. One doesn't know the circumstances. Were the tires cutted or not. Certainly if you prorated the mileage and look at the time frame, a likely mileage that would have been on the tires, the tires do seem to have worn out rather quickly. But again whether there was damage, etc., on rural roads, one doesn't know.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. Thank you, that's good. I'd ask either whoever would like to respond, Mr. Kraus, or the auditor, Mr. Strelieff. I understand that ministers are given cars and credit cards on an individual basis. Is that correct?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sonntag, in '82 or right now?

Mr. Sonntag: — At that time, in the time period that we're referring to.

Mr. Strelieff: — My understanding would be that they are. I'd have to check to make sure, but that's my general understanding.

Mr. Sonntag: — Can ministers at the same time as having vehicles and credit cards, can they collect their travel allowance?

Mr. Kraus: — Can I answer that? I'm not sure I have the policy right at hand here, but they are entitled to per diems when they travel. If a minister travels, he's entitled to a set per diem as per regulation. I should know but I can't remember whether the per diem is for meals only and hotels are . . . (inaudible) . . . or whether it includes hotels, but there are regulations that establish what a minister can or cannot get when he or she travels. And that is adhered to; they must submit expense accounts and so on. But whether the use of a CVA vehicle is above and beyond that . . .

Mr. Sonntag: — Mr. Chairman, my question to Mr. Kraus then would be — maybe I could clarify a little better —

would be, if a minister has a CVA vehicle and a credit card, would they be entitled to collect the regular MLA (Member of the Legislative Assembly) travel allowance at the same time?

Mr. Kraus: — I know where you're going, or what you're asking. And first, I'm not sure I wouldn't have to break this down into several parts, but if you're saying would there be a duplication of claim, I don't believe so. You're saying if they're using their credit card for charging bills or whatever, is that right?

Mr. Sonntag: — Can they do that? And then at the same time is the minister entitled to collect his travel allowance, or to collect a regular MLA travel allowance at the same time as . . .

Mr. Kraus: — No. We reimburse them according to the per diem schedule that's provided. There's things that they get on a per diem basis and then there are some actual and reasonable and actual out-of-pocket expenses that are provided for as well. They must claim on an expense form, whatever. Whether they paid cash for that or charged it is immaterial.

We're going to reimburse them for what they are entitled to according to the policy. And again, how they paid for it doesn't matter. In other words, we're not going to be paying credit card accounts on their behalf. That might be duplicating what they would have claimed on their expense accounts. At least we better not be. There is no intention of that, or it shouldn't be occurring.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay. Just so we have this perfectly clear. Like myself as an MLA, depending on where the constituency is, etc., and the population in the constituency, there is a formula that we receive a travel allowance in each constituency. And I guess my question is that if I were ever to become minister, would I still be entitled to that travel allowance?

Mr. Kraus: — Maybe you could answer that.

Mr. Chairman: — No. At least not in my experience. If you were a Legislative Secretary you would.

Mr. Sonntag: — Okay, that's my next question. What about legislative secretaries then? That's my following question.

Mr. Kraus: — I'm sorry. I just don't have . . . without having the policies in front of me it's hard to recall how they work. Perhaps the Clerk would recall better than I do since they administer some of them directly.

Mr. Vaive: — Mr. Chair, the MLAs get the travel allowance and the MLA's appointed Legislative Secretary then also receives the travel allowance as an MLA, even if he's a Legislative Secretary. And that's my understanding of the policy as it is now applied.

Mr. Anguish: — I guess what Mr. Sonntag is getting at is that you shouldn't be able to draw both, and the reason that legislative secretaries are still allowed to get the normal MLA travel allowance is that they aren't assigned a vehicle, that they're supposed to draw a vehicle from

the pool. In this case SaskTel carried out the wishes of the minister in providing a Legislative Secretary with a vehicle.

Some of the questions that puzzle me if I understood the testimony correctly, is that there were two vehicles during the same time during that particular period?

Mr. Lloyd: — No, there was a sequence of vehicles, which you could perhaps run through once again so that it's clear. The first vehicle was a 1990 Olds Delta 88 leased from November 8, 1989 to September 19, 1990. The second was a 1991 Olds Delta 88 leased from September 19, 1990 to August 19, 1991.

Mr. Anguish: — There's no overlap of vehicles.

Mr. Lloyd: — There's no overlap, no. And I guess the last vehicle was a '92 Olds 88 LS leased from August 19, '91 to November 19, '91. So that's the sequence of events on the lease transactions.

Mr. Anguish: — You mentioned that SaskTel protested assigning this vehicle. Who did the employees at SaskTel protest to?

Mr. Lloyd: — I guess what has been suggested is that since we do not have any of the parties to the discussions here, it was somebody who was asked to carry out the activity, namely the getting of the vehicle.

Mr. Anguish: — But how does one of your employees . . . Someone from up there mentioned that there was a protest filed. And if there was, you must have known who it was filed with and who filed it, otherwise how would you know there was a protest from the Crown?

Mr. Lozinski: — I'd like to clarify that. I indicated earlier that was a third-party discussion item back to myself. I do not have proof as to whether it was carried out, as to who the contact was made with, as to who the issue was raised with. It was a relay message from the then vice-president of human resources, which was Fred Yeo, to myself, indicating that he had protested through Mr. Coombs, the president at the time. And indication was that . . . Beyond that I'm not too sure.

Mr. Anguish: — So really likely some complaining that went on amongst employees of SaskTel and it wasn't really a protest made to the powers that be.

Mr. Schultz: — I think I could . . . My understanding which like David's is third hand, was that it wasn't . . . wouldn't characterize it as the employees. It was more some members of the executive of that day.

Mr. Anguish: — What exactly? SaskTel executive, Executive Council . . .

Mr. Schultz: — It was the president and . . . it would be the president of the day, who was Jim Coombs, and the vice-presidents of human resources during this time period, which was first of all Barry Roberts and followed by Fred Yeo, that Mr. Coombs questioned the expenditure and was instructed to carry through with it.

Mr. Anguish: — Did this also go to the board, this issue?

Mr. Schultz: — To my knowledge it did not go to the board, but I cannot say . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Were any of you with SaskTel at the time?

Mr. Schultz: — All three of us were with SaskTel at the time.

Mr. Anguish: — The other thing I find puzzling from SaskTel is that you can't verify the credit card expenditures.

Mr. Schultz: — The credit cards are generic. At the time we had one credit card number for all our vehicles. And we had in that sense a generic credit card. We had the same number for all the vehicles there. Roughly, if you looked at I&R (install and repair) vans and pool cars, etc., this number isn't correct, but it's roughly correct.

There are around a thousand of those vehicles, if you look at the I&R vans and everything that would have potentially a card with them. And that's what made it difficult of course, because the expenses would flow in under this generic credit card number for that number of vehicles. And many of them of course are being driven constantly day in and day out, so of course the number of receipts we would receive that would come into the financial department are quite high. And the ability to ferret through and then try to select one vehicle out of that when they're all coming through on a generic number was very difficult.

Mr. Anguish: — Well you'd think someone at SaskTel would want to keep information like that to protect their own integrity. If an unusual situation comes about where a member of the Legislative Assembly or a Legislative Secretary receives a benefit from a Crown corporation, you would think that you would want to pay particular attention to transactions that did seem unusual, by your own admission, just to protect the integrity of yourself as an employee and the integrity of the corporation.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Chairman, I'd like to respond to that because there's some question here that may be somewhat . . . going in a different direction.

When an employee uses one of our fleet vehicles and uses our credit card, they submit on the expense form . . . an expense form which indicates what the expenditure was for. That's the process or the control mechanism that exists . . . (inaudible) . . . Do you want to go through that whole process?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes. I mean we get bills back from all the companies we purchase gasoline from, on one hand, and employees are to submit their forms, their expense forms and their chits, on the other. And then we try to go through sort of a matching process to make sure they're reconciled. Basically the onus is on the employee to do this, or the user of the vehicle to submit the expenses.

Mr. Anguish: — Well, Mr. Lloyd, if the Minister of Justice came to you tomorrow and said give Doug Anguish a

vehicle; I want him to drive that vehicle, wouldn't you pay sort of extra little due diligence to watching the accounts that would come in to protect the integrity of the corporation and yourself as the president and others who are the controllers and that? And that's what I'm asking. I'm asking why there wasn't a file kept on such transactions within SaskTel. Now wouldn't you, as the chief executive officer of SaskTel, pay an extra bit of attention to the Minister of Justice coming to you and saying, give Doug Anguish a vehicle?

Mr. Lloyd: — Yes we would.

Mr. Anguish: — Well that's what I'm talking about, the integrity of the corporation and why there wouldn't be files and particular attention watched to these receipts that came through from something that was an unusual situation.

Mr. Schultz: — I think, though, we should put this in perspective that on all the other expenses regarding the vehicle, everything else, we've been able to reconcile, and we have documentation to support all of that. On this one particular cost item, given the way the systems work and the pure volume that travels through, it becomes extremely onerous, labour intensive, and time consuming, and quite expensive for the corporation to have done that. And that's just one element of all the costs. But that's not to say that overall that we don't have the agreements on leasing or all the other facts kept in order. It's just on this one item where we require sort of as normal procedure for the user of the vehicle to send in their chits in order for us to maintain our reconciliation that in this one particular instance that did not occur.

Mr. Anguish: — Well I find this an abnormal situation. I would think that you would take corrective measures because it's not normal. I just . . . I find it surprising that there wouldn't be some extra attention paid to keeping track of these types of expenditure. You can say it's expensive to watch that? It's one vehicle; it cost you in the corporation \$13,623. As a member of a committee watching the taxpayers' purse, I find that awfully expensive too, sir.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Chairman, just one comment on that. I think in terms of the practices and processes, what you're suggesting and I think what we would agree with is that yes, there should have been some extra vigilance shown in terms of collecting the expense slips from the particular individual involved, to make sure that the reconciliation was available. So that's . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Yes, I appreciate that, Mr. Lloyd.

Were there other unusual practices at SaskTel whereby people who were not employees received a benefit and there was no benefit received by the corporation, yet a payment was made? I guess I would ask you in connection with that question, Mr. Lloyd, is do you perceive that there was a benefit accrued to SaskTel because of providing this vehicle at a cost of \$13,623?

Mr. Lloyd: — I do not know at that juncture in time what the relationship between the minister responsible for SaskTel and his Legislative Secretary were with respect to

activities of SaskTel. Do we have one now? No. And that's about all I can respond on that one. I don't know how one measures benefit in that sense.

Mr. Anguish: — Was there a situation in these years under review where other MLAs or other legislative secretaries or members of the Executive Council received a benefit from the corporation?

Mr. Lloyd: — Yes, there was, and that material we have submitted to the committee. And if you wish, it's there for the record. And if you wish us to read it in, we shall proceed to do so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Anguish: — Was this provided as one of the responses to the committee and circulated?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — No, I can review that.

Mr. Lloyd: — Do we wish to read it in?

Mr. Schultz: — Do you wish us to read it in?

Mr. Anguish: — No, it's not necessary. I hadn't seen it, and I've obviously got it and haven't read it. So rather than having you read it into the record, I can search my own files and read it.

Mr. Chairman: — I have one further question to Mr. Anguish. Mr. Lloyd, in reviewing your practices at SaskTel and also the . . . I asked the Clerk to provide me with the legislative details on how legislative secretaries operate. I think you're aware that under section 50 of The Legislative Assembly Act, subsection 3(c), legislative secretaries are allowed to claim all expenses. And in fact under section 11 of the government reorganization Act, sub 3, it even extends those privileges to members of the Legislative Assembly. You will find the exceptions to that in directive no. 3 of the Board of Internal Economy which was last updated on January 13, 1992. It basically prohibits ministers from claiming certain expenses because they aren't eligible for a travel allowance and certain other per diem type things.

Quite frankly, in anything that I've seen in the Act here doesn't indicate to me that SaskTel in any way was breaking the law of the province of Saskatchewan by allowing a Legislative Secretary to claim full expenses for duties tied to things such as the 40/40 program, other SaskTel initiatives. Do you disagree with my statement?

Mr. Lloyd: — I guess I would make the following comment . . . is that it certainly was an item which was picked up in the *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor*. And clearly if highlighted by the Provincial Auditor, I rather suspect that there was some feeling that this was a transaction or an arrangement which was not in the normal keeping with the way things are done and with the normal authorization processes that exist. That is all I can assume, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: — Well I'm referring to, and I'm sure you are too, section 4 of the special report of the auditor; it's goods and services provided without charge to other

government organizations.

In other words the auditor in these particular instances is talking about the paper trail not being clear enough, not that . . . at least according to the sections that I've quoted here from both The Legislative Assembly Act and The Government Organization Act, not the fact that legislative secretaries are allowed to claim expenses for duties performed while in the service of a department or Crown corporation.

In these areas the service provided to an organization by another wasn't clearly defined in this section, not that legislative secretaries can't claim expenses, and yet what I'm getting from the drift of the conversation here is that we're on to the expense side of it rather than how you do your accounting to provide clear paper trails.

Mr. Lloyd: — I can only assume that the concern was that of the Provincial Auditor — and maybe we shouldn't assume this — was that the goods were provided to the Legislative Secretary to the Department of Justice, and I don't know what relationship that has with SaskTel.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, what we asked the various government organizations, to provide us a list of the goods, services provided without charge to other government organizations, and what SaskTel provided us was the item on page 23 where they said that they paid for a vehicle lease. That was provided to the Department of Justice. So there was an example that SaskTel provided of goods or services provided without charge to another government organization. And that's the question that the Public Accounts Committee asked us to go out and find out about. And it's as straightforward as that.

Mr. Chairman: — My interpretation of what we were doing here was saying that the Department of Justice should have billed out the car instead of SaskTel, according to the auditor. If my memory is correct, what the Legislative Secretary to the minister of Justice, who was also the minister of SaskTel, was doing was working on his behalf doing various programs, mostly around rural Saskatchewan, such as 40/40. And according to everything that I've been able to find in the Act, Acts in the Board of Internal Economy, any Legislative Secretary performing those duties is entitled to claim expenses for those duties.

Now one other thing that I think is a little misleading in my time as a Legislative Secretary which went from December of 1985 until I was appointed to cabinet in the fall of 1989 and then as a cabinet minister. I lost the odd receipt. Sometimes my wife put it through the wash machine. Sometimes other things happened. I know whenever my secretary asked for receipts and I provided some, the department in question or Crown corporation never had any problem coming up with either the second or third copy of the triplicate or four-part credit card slip.

Are you telling me today that you and SaskTel don't have access to either the second or third copy of the credit card receipt?

Mr. Schultz: — We do get the slips that come in from various companies we deal with and we attempt to match

them with what is submitted by the individuals using the vehicles. To the extent they don't, they can't be matched, then they go into a pool where we have all the unmatched slips. It's basically a computerized, mechanized process.

Mr. Chairman: — I can appreciate with the number of little grey vans that you have running around the province, that you had a difficult time matching up grey van to grey van. How many 1990 and 1991 Oldsmobiles do you have?

Mr. Schultz: — Well I presume we would have had one. I don't...

Mr. Chairman: — And are the signatures of each and every person who signs a credit card for SaskTel attached to the receipt, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. Schultz: — The matching... we have sort of an automated computer process that looks at the matching. We do get copies of the receipts and we do keep them on file. That's the information I've been provided with.

Mr. Chairman: — So whoever was driving that car would sign their name and you would have that.

Mr. Schultz: — Yes. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman: — So if you had to, you could probably go find those for me.

Mr. Schultz: — That's correct.

Mr. Chairman: — Well I won't ask you to do that. So each and every expense that that car incurred was signed for by the person operating at that time, in the case of the car being referred to it would be Mr. Muirhead's signature that would appear on those receipts. And you would have all of those?

Mr. Schultz: — Could you repeat the question again please.

Mr. Chairman: — I said, the individual driving those two particular cars at that time, in the case being Mr. Muirhead, you would have his name on each and every receipt that was invoiced to SaskTel?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, that's right. Who ever assigned the card, we should have the gas company side of the receipt; the signature should be on there.

Mr. Chairman: — Or the battery company or anywhere else. Where ever.

Mr. Schultz: — Where ever.

Mr. Chairman: — Right.

Mr. Schultz: — The cards are to be restricted to use for fuel and that's what we're talking about here, strictly is the fuel expense. So on the fuel expense from the gasoline companies we should have a copy of the receipt with signatures on it.

Mr. Chairman: — Right. To your knowledge are any of

those receipts fraudulent?

Mr. Schultz: — I have no knowledge of any wrongdoing in that sense.

Mr. Chairman: — And most of those receipts, as far as you're concerned, were receipts that came in from various points around Saskatchewan — Regina, Saskatchewan — while Mr. Muirhead was in the service of SaskTel performing various duties?

Mr. Schultz: — What I've been advised is, without seeing... Excuse me for a moment. We have no indication that the gasoline was used either for or not for SaskTel business. We presume the vehicle was there and that it was used as it was to be used.

Mr. Chairman: — One final question. Do you have anything in writing, anywhere in the files at SaskTel, referring to this supposed conversation of someone in the executive council of SaskTel with the minister? Is there any indication from either the finance, where I understand you're the first vice-president, or the human resources people, is there anything in writing anywhere to substantiate this sort of third-party conversation that we've been told about here?

Mr. Schultz: — No, no. And that's why we have been very clear in giving our evidence that some of the information we've given is third-hand. We do not have anything in writing that we can find presently that would indicate, that would substantiate.

Mr. Chairman: — In my part of the world we call that coffee-shop talk. Some people call it hearsay. I don't have any further questions.

Mr. Sonntag: — May want to wait just a second, Mr. Chairman. My question is directed to Mr. Kraus who is on the phone right now.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kraus, I tried to give you a little bit of warning on this but I think I may have misled you a little as well. My question is: what was the total amount of MLA travel allowance paid in this particular case to Mr. Muirhead during the period while he had access to a car and credit card from SaskTel? And that would be from the period under review that we referred to earlier. So that would be more than one year. I see you looking at...

Mr. Kraus: — Is the period under review more than 1990-91?

Mr. Sonntag: — Yes.

Mr. Kraus: — Well then I would have to go back and do some research. I mean, as you know the *Public Accounts* for 1990-91 show that Mr. Muirhead received \$18,125 as a travel allowance; but what he might have received in other years, I would have to check back. How many years back are we going? All the way back to '82?

Mr. Sonntag: — My question is just simply: for the period where there was a vehicle and a credit card — travel allowance paid during that time.

Mr. Kraus: — Could you tell me . . . I mean, I'd have to . . . I'm sorry, but I'd have to look this up, search through our records.

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Chairman, I think there are two questions here. One question is that we have the year under review, I think that we ought to be capable of addressing right now. And that particular year under review to which has been referred to is — what the hell is it — 1990-91? Yes. So it's 1991. Therefore during 1991, yes the Legislative Secretary to the minister of Justice did have a vehicle from SaskTel.

The Vice-Chair: — I'm sorry to interrupt. I want to draw to your attention, the scope of the auditor's report covers two years. It covers the fiscal year '89-90 and '90-91.

Mr. Lloyd: — Then we can pick up the '89 as well. Yes, there was a vehicle. And '90.

Mr. Sonntag: — My question is simply what the travel allowance paid during that time period was.

So maybe while Mr. Kraus is looking that up, I'll conclude with just this last comment then, I think, and turn it over to Mr. Muirhead or Mr. Kujawa here.

The point was made earlier, the ministers are not allowed an MLA travel allowance because they have been given a car, and in this case the Legislative Secretary received a vehicle and a credit card, the same as a minister, yet this Legislative Secretary received a MLA travel allowance. I think there needs to be a rule against this kind of action, and rightly or wrongly in this particular case . . . I mean we're concerned about perception here and I think the perception here is one of double billing and I think that there needs to be some rule made on this. That's the only point I make, and I leave it with you.

Mr. Kraus: — This payment that was made to Mr. Muirhead as a travel allowance as reported in the '89-90 *Public Accounts* was \$18,105.

The Vice-Chair: — Are you concluded, Mr. Sonntag?

Mr. Sonntag: — Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Muirhead: — Thank you. I think if we could go back to where Mr. Sonntag started, he wanted to . . . He said he was inexperienced in government and from the questions that rose from the members opposite, I think very much inexperienced. Didn't understand what's going on, so I'm going to just explain a few things.

But I want to ask a few questions first to SaskTel. Do you have a contract with myself or the Legislative Secretary? Was there a contract of any kind between myself and SaskTel for that car, perhaps saying what my duties for that car would be or whatever? I mean was there some contract or understanding with SaskTel to me what I was to do with that car or otherwise? Was there a contract drawn up or rules or regulations or whatever? Was there such a thing?

Mr. Lozinski: — The vehicle lease contract, that was

acted out on behalf of SaskTel by the vice-president of the day, and at that particular time would have either been Barry Roberts or Mr. Fred Yeo.

Mr. Muirhead: — Are you aware of any contract? We've heard a lot of coffee-shop talk around the place. Are you aware of any contract between SaskTel and myself for what my duties were supposed to be pertaining to SaskTel with that car? Are you aware of such a thing?

Mr. Lloyd: — I would have to say that . . . Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that no, we're not, because there was nothing on file. Whether or not there was a verbal contract of some nature, we have no idea.

Mr. Muirhead: — At the time that I was given a car from SaskTel, who was I a Legislative Secretary for, in the years under review?

Mr. Lloyd: — Legislative Secretary to the Department of Justice.

Mr. Muirhead: — Oh yes, another question: whose name was the car given out in? Life if you rented a car from Wheaton Chev Olds — I understand where the car always came from, in fact I know it did; that's where I picked them up — whose names is the car given out in? Whose name in SaskTel signed for it or whatever? Because I wouldn't know that . . .

Mr. Lozinski: — As I indicated previously, the car was leased in SaskTel's name. The person on behalf of SaskTel that executed the two contracts in question here was the vice-president of human resources at that particular time, which was Mr. Fred Yeo.

Mr. Muirhead: — Now my question goes to the auditor. Why this has all come about is because . . . And I'm glad this all did come about here and I think it's very well this is being discussed because it's been something that I've heard rumbling for not just this last few months, rumbling around for years, that certain MLAs, certain legislative secretaries have cars, some don't; some put in for mileage, some get CVA cars, some get government cars. I'm not the only one, you know. You just . . . you cited this one here.

And I understand it's because SaskTel paid for the car. Am I right saying this, Mr. Strelieff? SaskTel paid for the car but I was doing my duties under Justice. Is that why you brought this to the attention?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Muirhead, we brought it to your attention because we asked SaskTel if they paid for any goods or services that they provided to others without charge, to other government organizations. SaskTel reported that, on page 23, that they paid for a vehicle lease for a Legislative Secretary to the Department of Justice. So SaskTel is saying they paid for goods and services that were provided to another government organization. That was the question we were asked to ask by this committee, and that was the response and that's what we put in our report.

Mr. Muirhead: — So now if I had have been . . . If the car had have been paid for out of Justice when I was the

Legislative Secretary to Justice, would it have come about at all, is the question.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Muirhead, if I was in the Department of Justice and asked that question, I don't think it would have come to our attention, because the Department of Justice would have . . .

Mr. Muirhead: — Okay, now we're getting to the bottom of it. It all comes down to that . . . to two things here. I was given a car by SaskTel when I was the Legislative Secretary to the Department of Justice; and the other thing, that I was also getting a travel allowance. Now let's get very, very serious about all this. Because I didn't bring this about; you people did. And I don't blame you because there are some things here that should be brought to the eyes of the public.

Now I want to go back to SaskTel. Why did you neglect to send this bill over to Justice? If you were charged for a car and I was Legislative Secretary to Justice, where were you? Maybe the president is not here and the vice-president fired and the other man has been helped to his grave, maybe by SaskTel. Now maybe you can tell me some of the rumours around there why you didn't bill it to Justice; it wouldn't be here. Instead of coming in here . . . I know you were asked these questions; I don't blame you. But why did you not at the time? Did you ask the minister: can we bill this to Justice? Can we not do that?

Mr. Lloyd: — Mr. Chairman, I'm not in a position to respond, not having been in that particular circumstance at that juncture in time, so . . .

Mr. Muirhead: — I'm very surprised at this, sir. I'm very surprised about several things that have come up here this morning. I can't believe the questions that Mr. Anguish asked were very legitimate questions — where are the expense vouchers for the car and all these kind of things. You had it for tires for a car. You had those. You didn't have the daily . . . I'm just surprised that they do their business that way.

And I was involved with SaskTel for five years, but so help me I thought it was run better than that. I thought somebody there . . . if they were concerned in coffee-row talk, I thought if you were concerned about paying for a car and I was doing my duties for several different departments under Mr. Lane that you should have billed it through to Justice. Maybe some gentlemen that were there through the years have an answer to that. Why didn't you bill Justice? We wouldn't be sitting here dragging me through this here commotion here.

Mr. Schultz: — We can only answer from the perspectives of positions and functions we had at the time. And our instructions were, as we understood it at the time, was not to bill it. We can only respond from what our personal instructions were at that point in time.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well is that instructions . . . like the chairman said, is it coffee-shop talk or just rumour among yourselves or did somebody ask?

I didn't even know until this came out; in fact I never seen it until yesterday, or a few days ago, I'm sorry. I didn't

know that Justice maybe wasn't paying. I wouldn't know who pays for what. I just know what I have, and I'm involved in several departments.

What the people don't know here, that's out here, that I was out driving a car running around spending my government tax money when I should have been using my travel allowance. Now let's get very fair . . . and to you, Mr. Sonntag, let's get very, very . . . after you're around in government for a while you'll find out.

I spent four years in opposition, nine years in government, and now I'm back in opposition. I do so much work for the taxpayers I was figuring on asking Roy Romanow for a car yet because I deserve one, and I think Roy will probably give me one. I'm quite sure he will. And he knows. He wouldn't allow you people to even do if he knew what you were doing in here today he would say, don't do this to Gerry Muirhead because you don't understand.

If you think I'm going to take my \$18,000 travel allowance . . . and I've already in this last year back in opposition have driven over 70,000 kilometres as travelling in my constituency. I'm noted for travelling and looking after my constituents; that's why I get elected again for goodness sakes. I could not travel the province.

Now here's where the whole mistake is. I talked to the press last night, and I didn't tell them all of it because I didn't want to. But today I will.

They were just talking about a little work with SaskTel. What would I do out there with SaskTel? Well I drove quite a few thousands of miles in the province with the 40/40 plan. I was flown by airplane to the . . . which is getting to the real bucks. Why didn't you come in with the dollars and cents about my plane travel on the 40/40 plan? It's more expensive than a car. I was given a plane to go to the far points of the province. I was in North Battleford with an airplane. Nobody thought of bringing up an airplane travel. And when I could drive, I could drive. But the big one that you've all missed, I was a Legislative Secretary to the minister of Justice, and that's where the car should've been charged to. Because that was my travelling in this province, was under Justice which Gary Lane would have nothing to do with mediation services and Farmland Security Board, and that was all mine as a minister.

If anybody thinks for one moment that I would take my travel allowance money and my car, who is sitting home in a shop right now, was sitting there with a motor out of it, which I wore so many cars out for taxpayers, then I have to have you people come in here and his last statement was that we got to stop this doubling out. I assure you, Mr. Sonntag, and I assure the members of the press, there is no doubling up, that the media or that the taxpayer of this province, I do not owe. The taxpayers will never be able to repay me for what I've done for the people in the province of Saskatchewan, and not political. I was running all over this province trying to help farmers and help people under mediation services under the minister of Justice. And I was doing it, and I was doing it within my heart. And I had to be dragged in here.

I even had an NDP (New Democratic Party) MLA — and you'll never know who it was — phone me to my home and told me what you rats are doing to me. Now that's my last statement. If Mr. Romanow and Mr. Lingenfelter knew what you were doing, he'd be ashamed of you. But I don't blame you because you didn't know,

Going back to . . . You want to talk about my tires. I'll tell you about my tires. I was coming out of a new construction in Davidson. My tires were pretty good yet — 35-40,000 clicks on them. They were going to last easily till the car got called back in . . . (inaudible) . . . explanation on that too.

I run into a new construction where a sign had blown down in the wind into the boulevard in Davidson — you've driven through it yourself — run right into a big embankment and ruined the two front tires. And I wasn't able to get the other pair of tires. I wasn't able to get the four matching tires so we just put on the four. Maybe I shouldn't have, but I did. I mean I just put on the four because the other two were soon going to have to be . . . it was going to be called back in.

And if you want to know why I had more than one car, because one car would've lasted me for ever, it was nothing to do with SaskTel. Maybe you didn't know this. And it wasn't all these losses occurred when the car went back, because I know from Chev Wheaton Olds that my car was a watched car. They would give me a phone call: how many miles? We want to sell your car as a demonstrator. So that was called in. Maybe on the book value from SaskTel it might've showed, oh there's a penalty for trading a car in. But it's them that would call up and say, how many miles you got on that car? We want that car back. It had nothing to do with me.

I would've been satisfied to have driven a . . . I could've driven the old 1980 I was given when I was minister in 1982. I could still drive it today. Go look at the cars that I own, cars. And they're not new.

I bought a car within a few weeks after I was put out of cabinet in 1985. And that car is wore completely to rack and ruin. And you'll never have seen a government car at this Legislative Assembly when the House was sitting. I was very, very careful to drive my own car. And I drove my own car to duties in my riding.

I'm not going to say I didn't drive a car, a government car in my own riding because I did. I was caught many times when I had to drive that car. But I also had the government car sitting in Regina many, many times at my apartment. And I'd be called at home to go to Prince Albert, go to Rosetown and Kindersley. And I remember rambling over, way over to Kindersley one time in a half-ton truck for goodness sakes to a meeting and never got any reimbursement from anybody.

Don't jump on Gerald Muirhead. As I said to the press last night, I expect them to treat me right and properly in this, because I am not deserving of what you done. That's my last words on it.

What we should be discussing is what's in this paper — how somebody can get all this money for coming to these

meetings. It's unreal. The press better read these words. We better have a good look at how somebody can get . . . Like you, Mr. Anguish, are five gallons of gas away from my place; and I get \$1,000 and you get 6,000. Let's talk about the taxpayers' money. Let's get into it. Let's get back and get really into it. You guys . . . I read all this . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Muirhead, we're getting of the topic.

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes. We're off the topic. But we're going to get onto that one.

A Member: — A heck of a defence though.

Mr. Kujawa: — Mr. Chairman, I think like others have had a little difficulty following all of this and a little difficulty believing some of the practices that have been disclosed, as I understand them. When one of these cars is leased, like the one we're talking about, the ones we're talking about, that was a three-year lease. Is that correct? For X number of dollars. And when the lease . . . Like someone said, it was an open-ended lease. What does that mean?

Mr. Schultz: — First of all, I'll let Mr. Lozinski answer. But I just want to clarify, the first two cars that we've discussed that are within the period under review were for 36-month leases. The third car that was leased, that was only under a 12-month lease, right at the end. Just so that the record's clear, I'll let Mr. Lozinski answer the question.

Mr. Kujawa: — Talking about the three-year lease, you said there was an open-ended lease. What does that mean?

Mr. Lozinski: — Basically that means that with the open-ended lease is that at any particular point in time after the minimum time requirement has expired on the particular lease, then you can exchange vehicles. And what happens is that you take your chances on the market-place, meaning that at a particular point in time the expectation of the vehicle is to be a certain kilometres or a certain condition. Okay. If it happens to be beyond that, chances are taken on the market-place for reselling of that vehicle, and basically if the vehicle is not in the required condition at that particular point in time, then what happens is that you bear the consequences on the market when the dealer puts it back on the market.

Mr. Kujawa: — But what actually happened in this case is every time the car was turned in, several years before the contract was up, there was a considerable penalty charged.

Mr. Lozinski: — Yes.

Mr. Kujawa: — How much of a penalty was it?

Mr. Lozinski: — The amount in question was \$4,438.36. That's on the first one. And on the second one, the penalty for premature lease termination was \$6,910.

Mr. Kujawa: — So it is way over \$11,000 in penalties, just for those two.

Now the other expense is whatever was put on the credit card. Now you told us that there were about a thousand vehicles on this credit card. And if I were the Legislative Secretary and I charged up \$10,000 on my credit card, it would be split among the thousand and I wouldn't have to produce any documents to substantiate my claim. It would be paid. Is that right?

Mr. Schultz: — The normal procedure within the corporation is that individuals are . . . Well we get both the receipt from the company and the receipt from the individual as they track their mileage and they file the receipt and put it on various expense forms and we match them to ensure that we have a good duplicate matching. So within normal practice we would require or ask the individual operating the vehicle to submit the receipt and that we would attempt to match to make sure that the payments we were making to the various gasoline companies were the correct payments.

Mr. Kujawa: — But in this case no receipts were filed and no matching was possible.

Mr. Schultz: — We do have on record the receipts from the gasoline company. We do not have on record — correct — the receipts from the user of the vehicle.

Mr. Kujawa: — Okay, so all in all, you have the lease, the penalties, whatever is put on the credit card, unsubstantiated. What do these cars cost for the time in question?

Mr. Schultz: — Under the period of review it's \$13,623, for the period of review.

Mr. Kujawa: — Wasn't the penalty almost that?

Mr. Schultz: — The second termination charge that we discussed, the 6,900, occurred outside. It occurred in late August of '91 and therefore was outside the period of review of this report and therefore is not included in the \$13,623 figure that I've given you.

Mr. Kujawa: — But going just a little beyond the particular period, how much was spent on this car? Wasn't it well over \$30,000?

Mr. Schultz: — About 22,000, just roughly on the page here. We can certainly provide a schedule that would have it nailed right down. But just on the side, it's the 13,000 plus a second termination charge of \$6,900. Plus there was \$2,078 of repairs. When the second car was brought in, the undercarriage was damaged. Adding those together gets you roughly \$22,000.

Mr. Kujawa: — How about the original lease payment?

Mr. Schultz: — We're at 22,000. The lease payment on that vehicle was \$615 a month. What we have filed is up to the end of 1990 was the \$13,000 figure which is to the end of 1990. This vehicle was turned in in August, so that's another eight months at 615 a month, is about \$6,000, so that gets you up around \$28,000. We'll provide the exact numbers.

Mr. Kujawa: — And there are no records in . . . I realize that you people were not in charge of this at the time that this was going on. Are there no records within the corporation showing this expenditure of roughly \$30,000, and why?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, there is. We have our records on the leases, records on the payments of the termination charges. We have records from . . . we have the invoice on things like the tires, etc. We have records on all the gasoline purchases. We just have not been able to reconcile them exactly, but the records are all there.

Mr. Kujawa: — But there's no record of the person who had this car providing services to SaskTel.

Mr. Schultz: — I want to be specific in my answer. We have no written record that we . . .

Mr. Lloyd: — Simply put there's no written contractual arrangement between the Legislative Secretary or Justice and SaskTel. But there is a recognition that the minister of Justice was also the minister of SaskTel.

Mr. Kujawa: — No, I'm not at this point saying that you could tell or anyone else can tell the minister what he should have done and how he should have done it. I'm just asking: is there a record of the service by this person to your company?

Mr. Schultz: — I can. In some instances some of the expense forms for lodging and meals that have been filed . . . Now we have other expenses that were filed by Mr. Muirhead for lodging and food when he was on SaskTel business for . . . We have a couple here: the 40/40 plan would be one that was on . . . one that I'm just reviewing. SaskTel Legislative Secretary duties is another. So we have other expenses that have been filed by Mr. Muirhead that when they were filed, the explanations were SaskTel business.

Mr. Kujawa: — Now just one item. We're talking about the two cars during the time in question. Before the time that's on this report there was another car. There was pretty well the same deal as these two.

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, I believe it was . . . There was not a car before; there was one after the time in review, which stated . . . the first car was November 8, 1989, and came forward and then a third car outside of the period of review was then leased August 19, 1991. So the car was after the period under review.

Mr. Kujawa: — I have no further questions. Thank you.

Mr. Muirhead: — I just have a question or two that come to my mind to ask the people from SaskTel. How many vehicles does SaskTel lease from Chev Wheaton Olds? Is there a large quantity or is it a fleet that they had or what was the deal?

Mr. Lozinski: — If I can have the question repeated, and I will respond to it.

Mr. Muirhead: — How many vehicles, other vehicles, were leased from Chev Wheaton Olds? Because my car

was always leased. That's where I always picked it up; I never had a thing to do with SaskTel. I was sent over to Chev Wheaton Olds always to pick the car up, servicing and what not. I never was serviced with your SaskTel garage or whatever. Always Chev Wheaton Olds. I want to know how many others? I understand there was a lot of cars.

Mr. Lozinski: — Okay. I would like to clarify that. As far as SaskTel as a company, a direct lease for these types of vehicles, SaskTel was not leasing. Aside from Mr. Muirhead's, all of the other leases are personal leases; they're not SaskTel company leases.

Mr. Muirhead: — And what about the present all executive council, executive of SaskTel? I understand there's 12, 15 people at least had cars in SaskTel. Did SaskTel own them or did they lease them?

Mr. Lozinski: — No, those were their own personal, personal leases.

Mr. Muirhead: — But they weren't paying for them?

Mr. Lozinski: — I'm not following you.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well let's take the president, Mr. Coombs. He was given . . . naturally he was given a car to drive and so were many other cars. You mean that they had personal leases to who?

Mr. Lozinski: — It was their own, personal leased units which they paid for.

Mr. Muirhead: — And who reimbursed them?

Mr. Lozinski: — SaskTel reimbursed them.

Mr. Muirhead: — SaskTel reimbursed them then for their leases. So it's the same thing. Where did they get them from? Where did those cars come from? I understand they were all from Chev Wheaton Olds.

Mr. Lozinski: — No, they were not all from Chev Wheaton Olds.

Mr. Muirhead: — But my question was how many. You don't know that, how many.

Mr. Lozinski: — We don't have any specific records here. I do believe four or five.

Mr. Muirhead: — I'm glad this came out because I always wondered, like what this gentleman over here asked, why this here heavy cost of when the car went back in before the three years. I understood that was under my control because when they wanted a car, it would be called in. And I don't know who would be calling that in, SaskTel or Chev Wheaton Olds. When they had a car that hit 40, 50,000 kilometres they wanted them in, whatever, to resell as a demonstrator or sell them as a car with not too many miles on it. Do you know anything about that?

Because I did not call the cars in. Somebody in SaskTel has to be responsible or some place, to call these cars in, because I'm agreeable with the members opposite. That's

the biggest cost here was not the lease on the car, it was the car going back in. They take perfectly good cars . . . driving a cheaper model, 88 Olds, most of the time. I think two of the models or three of those in the year in question is what they were. Perfectly good cars and away they go. Who's responsible for that?

That's where the biggest cost comes from here. Like the members opposite were saying and I agree with them, it comes from the loss on the lease claim back before the three years.

Mr. Wood: — Mr. Chairman, I understand that the normal practice is that the vehicle be called back in at the end of the three-year period. That apparently is normal practice.

Mr. Muirhead: — So you don't know why these cars were called back in less than . . .

Mr. Wood: — In this circumstance I do not.

Mr. Muirhead: — That's the question I've asked before and I was always told because Chev Wheaton Olds resale. Maybe I was hearing the coffee-shop talk too like you guys who answer all my questions.

Mr. Serby: — I just want to pick up the question from where Mr. Muirhead was just finished. Do you have an existing policy now in SaskTel or has it changed over the period of time in terms of this leasing policy that we just talked about a couple of minutes ago?

Mr. Wood: — Yes we do. There is a new leasing policy as it pertains to the executive of the corporation. We do not have vehicles other than those. I believe some of them are grandfathered, are they not, until the lease expires?

To avoid any misunderstanding, the bulk of our fleet vehicles are leased from CVA, as I understand it, so that the only vehicles that would be on a lease arrangement such as these would be vehicles that pertain to the executive and whatever arrangement the executive had with the board of directors.

Mr. Serby: — So the current policy that you're practising today isn't really much different than the one that was issued on November 9 by the minister then in charge, Duncan, who had a . . .

Mr. Wood: — Oh, I was referring to SaskTel.

Mr. Chairman: — This is before Lexus and after Lexus.

A Member: — Pre- and post-Lexus.

A Member: — Really don't have a lot of Lexuses around.

Mr. Kraus: — I've taken some time to make phone calls and I was asked to determine whether this November 9, '82 policy was still in effect. And I was able to determine that it's much the same today as it was then — it really hasn't changed much — that legislative secretaries are entitled to their travel allowance, as an MLA is, whereas cabinet ministers don't get a . . . are not entitled to a travel allowance. But then again the ministers do have assigned

vehicles, so that's the compensation.

For legislative secretaries, as this memo points out, they are entitled to access to CVA cars on a pool basis, just as this memo outlines. But legislative secretaries aren't entitled to a permanently assigned vehicle, only to cars on a pool basis, as is outlined in this letter.

Mr. Serby: — In respect to that comment then, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Strelloff, in your examination of this particular department and in your review of this policy that you've uncovered, is it the common practice then of CVA vehicles being assigned to other legislative secretaries in other departments?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Serby, which policy did we uncover?

Mr. Serby: — No, I'm just referring to, Mr. Chairman, to Mr. Strelloff, the letter of November 9 which Mr. Kraus just alluded to, indicating that the policy really hasn't changed much today from what it has been. And this memo addresses itself to a number of legislative secretaries, of which Mr. Muirhead was part of. And I'm wondering, in your review of this particular practice, were there other legislative secretaries who were assigned vehicles?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Serby, as I said earlier, I wasn't aware of the November 9, 1982 letter. And what we'll do is have a look at . . . we'll do some research and find out what the current practices are, and also be prepared to answer your question.

Mr. Kraus: — This is basically the current practice though. I mean it really hasn't changed much. Legislative secretaries are entitled to travel allowance and they have access to cars on a pool basis from CVA. That's still the way it works now. That means they can use their own car and claim under the travel allowance, or if they wanted to, they can go to the CVA pool and have a car for a few days or whatever, but they can't have a permanently assigned vehicle like a minister can. That's the main difference.

Mr. Serby: — I appreciate that comment. I guess my question still remains though, whether or not there were any other folks who were working as legislative secretaries who were assigned vehicles in their duties. And I understand you saying that you aren't aware of that, but that you were going to make . . . or that you would be checking to see whether or not that in fact was the case. And I'd be pleased to hear that.

In respect to the current policy, Mr. Chairman, to the department regarding the leasing of vehicles, I'm not clear on how it is that you decide that a vehicle should return back to the department again or back to resale. What sort of policy have you practised over the period including this time frame that we're talking about here?

Mr. Schultz: — The normal practice is that we run for the period of the lease, three years.

A Member: — Two years?

Mr. Schultz: — Three years, the period of the lease. With most of our vehicles, our vans, etc., we watch maintenance expenses. We track maintenance expenses to the vehicle level and watch them to know which ones are needing more and more maintenance, and then we take the ones out that are costing us more on a per mile or per kilometre basis and retire those and bring in new; and always move the higher cost units out and replace them with the newer ones.

Mr. Serby: — Thank you very much for that. My experience in working in government for several years, working in around CVA vehicles and privilege of having a car to operate on your own, there was a system within the department — not SaskTel — but considering yours, is there someone who is assigned this responsibility within your department itself to ensure that when vehicles reach this particular threshold that they're recalled?

Mr. Schultz: — Yes, it's not within the department I'm responsible for, but within the corporation there is a group that tracks and watches the expenses within what we call the vehicle group, and that is their responsibility.

Mr. Serby: — In your experience with the department, which appears fairly long, and in my knowledge of my operation of departments and CVA vehicles, it seems unusual, highly unusual for a vehicle to be recalled either by a dealership or by the department when it has the kind of mileage that these two that we're talking about in particular are identified. Would you support that? Or could you disclaim that by providing me with some information that we have vehicles that have been recalled, particularly in your department, that have that mileage or less, particularly by field staff or even executive director people?

Mr. Schultz: — I'll let Mr. Lozinski answer as he was in the vehicles area at the time.

Mr. Lozinski: — Okay, I guess I'd like clarification. Are we talking about our SaskTel fleet, or are we talking about the vehicle in question?

Mr. Serby: — Well let's talk about your SaskTel fleet because this vehicle was part of your fleet. So in the operation of your fleet, is it the common practice for your department to recall vehicles where you have lease arrangements as with most of them as you do in this case, at a mileage that doesn't exceed 60,000 kilometres?

Mr. Lozinski: — No, that was not our common practice.

Mr. Serby: — Is it your practice today?

Mr. Lozinski: — No, it's not.

Mr. Serby: — So the requirement for recall of a vehicle today and during this period would be initiated by whom?

Mr. Lozinski: — My understanding at the time was that it was initiated by the party in question. Again I'll qualify it because those people are not here present today to substantiate that. My understanding is that the directive came down through the corporation from the respective person that was sitting in the vice-presidential chair at the

time, which the two people that we referenced previous, Mr. Roberts and Mr. Yeo. As far as down through the ranks, our directive was to make sure that the contract with the particular dealership was in place for the new vehicle for the individual in question and for us to honour all the expenditures as we have indicated.

Mr. Serby: — Would you concur that it's unusual . . . an unusual practice to have a senior executive director of a corporation request a — for a better word I guess — adjustment into the changing of a vehicle when you have a branch within the department that looks after the lease agreements and the longevity of which your vehicle would be part of the department. Wouldn't that be an unusual request?

Mr. Lozinski: — Yes it would. Yes.

Mr. Serby: — Would it not also be, in my estimation anyway, a role that would usually not be assumed by that level of government?

Mr. Wood: — I'll try to answer that, Mr. Chairman. I think the answer to that question is yes. The vice-president would generally not be that concerned about the time at which vehicles were traded in. Normally it would be handled through the fleet manager.

Mr. Serby: — So just in review of this in my own mind, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that a decision to change a vehicle that doesn't conform with the CVA policy within the department, to some degree has been made either, I would suggest, by someone at the senior level, which you've affirmed, either on their own request — which behoves me to try to understand why somebody at executive level would ask for a change in vehicle when it doesn't conform to the policy — or by the individual who's responsible for the operation of the car, would leave me with the only other question, unless we had a strange arrangement with the dealership, which I'm not familiar with at all in terms of CVA operations, that recall vehicles on a regular basis. And I have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Wood: — This was not a CVA vehicle. It was a direct-lease vehicle.

Mr. Serby: — Sorry. I meant that.

Just one more short question, Mr. Chairman. It's to do with the travel allowance and the usage of a credit card. I'm interested, Mr. Kraus, in knowing: currently if you're a cabinet minister and if one were a Legislative Secretary, you indicated earlier that there are some provisions that would allow you to claim your expenditure that you're awarded under the stipend that's paid to a private member. What are those? And how would they be separated from what you could claim under a credit card?

Mr. Kraus: — I think the best way to deal with this is, up until recently . . . so certainly for the period under review and up until a number of months ago, and I'm not sure the process has changed even since this time period, but whether I receive, have a credit card — and I happen to have one but I don't use it very often — or a cabinet minister or a Legislative Secretary, whether or not they

have a credit card, for them to be reimbursed by the government at least, and I cannot speak for the Crown corporations but I can speak for government department side of things, if they want to be reimbursed they have to follow the same procedures they always have. And in my case when I've travelled I may use my credit card, but I still have to submit the same old S-4 identifying my room costs, my per diems for meals and so on; perhaps aircraft if I flew. That's how I'm reimbursed.

The credit card company sends the bill to me and I pay them. The government is under no obligation. In fact, the obligation to pay that bill is mine and mine alone, and it's been the same with the ministers and anyone else who's had a card. That's what differentiates our system from some other organizations and maybe even some other governments.

It was done on purpose because although the rule is you're not supposed to, for example, make personal purchases on that card, you can't be sure that an individual doesn't get into a situation that he doesn't buy a shirt or whatever, and say I'm going to put it on my American Express card. And so that we would not have any embarrassing moments, we thought it would be wise to stick with it. Perhaps a little more bureaucratic way of doing things, but have them still submit the claims in the same old way, and the responsibility of paying that card was up to the individual. The government is under no obligation.

I don't know if that helps at all, but we haven't been paying the credit card company directly, not for individuals. At least not up for this time period. Now there may be some change in that, but it hasn't happened yet and it would be very limited and very controlled if there was a change made.

Mr. Serby: — Done.

Mr. Muirhead: — Just another question. When the car would be turned back in, presumably the one that I'm talking about, and you paid out the shortfall on breaking the lease, if it's such a large amount of money, why did it leave the fleet? Why didn't you stay there? To me it kind of proves a point that there was something going on, like I said with the . . . like he said with the Chev Wheaton Olds. There had to be something here, or you wouldn't just go pay 4, 5, \$6,000 out for a shortfall. You'd put it back in for somebody else to drive.

I mean, there's something here that I can't get a handle on is what's always bothers me. I need to know, and I need that question answered maybe at a later date. Was there a deal with Chev Wheaton Olds on cars called in because they wanted to resell them as a low-mileage car? Maybe you can just give me that question at a later date, but I want that question answered.

Mr. Lozinski: — I would like to answer that. I would like to clarify the issue for the record. There was no specific special deals with any dealer, and also to answer your question about why wasn't . . . why weren't those particular units taken back into the fleet, understand is that number one, they were not corporate colours. Okay? There were not our standard offering, okay, with our fleet

because it's our policy within our fleet not to have air-conditioning and so forth, and so forth. So the only option that was left to SaskTel was to return that particular unit to the dealership.

Mr. Muirhead: — I would sit and watch for years . . . Well the same thing going on down there now. The executive of SaskTel have cars, and some of them never leave the city. And they're always new cars. Somebody has to be costing somebody a lot of money. I was the one that was driving the province and I have to watch other people, their cars sitting in the compounds down here in SaskTel, and I see a new one every year with no mileage. So I mean . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, can we take a break.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well I'm through with this. I don't need to say anymore. If you guys want to quit asking questions, I can . . .

Mr. Anguish: — We want to quit.

Mr. Chairman: — If there's anything that Mr. Muirhead wishes in writing from you people, I'm sure you can accommodate him in the future.

Mr. Muirhead: — I do have some questions that I asked.

Mr. Anguish: — Do you have more questions that you haven't . . .

A Member: — No. No, I'm through.

Mr. Chairman: — Thank you, Mr. Lloyd, for bringing your officials, for coming this morning. You're excused.

The vice-chairman has moved that we take a 10-minute break. Is that agreed?

The committee recessed for a period of time.

Mr. Chairman: — Now the task before us is to draft a report to the Legislative Assembly on this particular item on the auditor's special report. Yesterday everyone was provided with sort of a summary of the various recommendations that were in this particular report. I'll leave it to the committee to determine how we want to proceed here.

Perhaps the easiest way to approach this — I'm open to suggestion — would be to go through the attached sheet, and some of the recommendations we can easily dispense with and others that may wish to be embellished or have a different tenor to them, we can mark them. My suggestion would be that we go through this and then leave it till tomorrow morning to sort of finish it off, to give members time to, if there's one particular area that they want to think about or confer with others on, rather than sort of just going through this and saying that's the final disposition of it.

What's the views of others?

Mr. Anguish: — I have no problem with what you're suggesting, Mr. Chairman. I agree with your suggestion to

go through them in the order that they've been presented in this summary of recommendations. And I think that the committee can reflect on our discussions at any time prior to the report actually going to the Legislative Assembly.

Mr. Chairman: — I was hoping that we would have something in draft form for members by the end of the week or sooner.

Mr. Anguish: — Yes.

Mr. Chairman: — And the sooner that's done, I think the better.

And also if the auditor, as we go through this, wishes to make comments on any one of them, feel free.

Mr. Strelloff: — Sure.

Mr. Chairman: — Maybe we should have a comment if you wish, line by line as we go through it. Or is that too time-consuming?

Mr. Anguish: — I don't think it's necessary at this point.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Well everyone has this particular document. Perhaps we'll just start then at the top. Do you want to just have me say yes or no, or do you want me to read it out, or . . .

Okay, 1-1. Yes. Agreed.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — There was some discussion between yourself and the government on secondment. Was it a two-month policy?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Van Mulligen, we have received some announcement by — is it the Executive Council? — by the deputy minister to the Premier on what kind of movement's going to take place or proposals are taking place on secondments. Mr. Van Mulligen, do you want us to read in the proposals that we received?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — No, just a general idea that you have what the government's planning to do, or Mr. Kraus has them.

Mr. Kraus: — Well I think at this time what's being recommended and adhered to is that the formal agreements are in place for secondments over two months in duration. In other words, if it's a relatively short period of time, it's probably not practical to enter into an arrangement, and it just becomes too cumbersome for every arrangement where somebody might work for some . . . A Department of Health person might work for Social Services for a couple of weeks, so they thought they'd cut it off at some point, and they said anything over two months must be documented and formalized. That's what's being recommended internally. I'm sure that's one of the recommendations you must have received.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Van Mulligen, in general we were advised that the policy that was going to be put in place by the government says something like all secondments are to be supported with a detailed

secondment agreement with the employee's organization to pay the employee's salary for the first two months of the secondment. If the employee is seconded for more than two months, as Gerry said, the organization the employee was seconded to will reimburse the original organization. And our concern was that when there is a secondment agreement, that there be a written contract or a written understanding of who pays and what services are being provided and why the secondment is taking place.

Mr. Anguish: — Do you agree that if it's less than two months that there's no need to formalize it?

Mr. Kraus: — My understanding is this — at least what I had been led to believe — is that the recommendation internally is that, no, we don't document it unless it's over two months. However I can't say as someone may not have decided to go beyond that, but I think that was the general idea. If somebody's going over for four or five weeks, fine, let them do the special project and come back to the host department or department they work for. If it's something longer than a couple of months, then you should have a formal arrangement, and one department should pay the other.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, if it is less than two months, it seems like a reasonable policy to move to have no written agreement. But the catch would be is if they're just renewing two-month agreements or there's just so many two-month secondments happening that there's something wrong with the system. In those cases, I think that should be revisited. But if it's, as Gerry noted, just every once in a while you need someone for a few weeks, then perhaps a written agreement isn't that important.

Mr. Kraus: — I think a lot of it has to do with the understanding and the commitment of people to adhere to what's an appropriate procedure. And I would hate to think that people would be playing some game to get around the fact that we'll have this person seconded for seven weeks, bring them back for a week, and then another seven weeks. I just can't believe anybody would do that. I guess it's possible, but . . .

A Member: — Where have you been?

Mr. Kraus: — But this is a very high-profile issue, and I think . . . but my understanding deputies are more than concerned that they make sure these things are more than two months, they're going to document them. They don't want to be cited.

Mr. Anguish: — How will they know that? Is that a directive that goes out from . . .

Mr. Kraus: — Well there are certainly . . .

Mr. Anguish: — To notify deputies that they need to formalize any arrangements where the secondment goes over two months?

Mr. Kraus: — Some of these directives, I believe, have gone from the Premier's office down to the various ministries, and the idea was that would be passed on

down. Whether these things have been discussed formally in deputy minister forms or not, I can't say for sure. But I believe this has been communicated down.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I guess I'm kind of sorry. I asked a question; I guess we're starting to get into the details of what the government is or isn't doing. We've got a recommendation as to, you know, what we think, and I agree with it.

But having said that, there doesn't seem to have any doubt that if someone works somewhere for more than two months, then there's got to be a formal agreement which stipulates how the salary is to be paid, etc. And that is the agency which benefits and has to reimburse the agency which is providing the employee.

Is there any kind of notation or agreement in writing that goes into the personnel files, if a person is to go — well I guess more than a day or so — to some other shop, that it's noted there that this person is going over there for a week or two weeks or . . .

Mr. Kraus: — I don't think it would make it so far as the personnel files. I mean that might just be arrangement between you and I and our respective departments. I need someone, and you'd say okay, I'll give you this person for six weeks, and that's probably about as far as it goes.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But there would be nothing in writing.

Mr. Kraus: — Well there isn't a requirement for there to be something in writing. I'm not saying that there might not be but there's only a requirement at this stage that there be a formal agreement when it's a two-month or longer secondment.

Mr. Strelieff: — It does seem like it would be reasonable that if it was a six-week assignment that the person going across would want that in his or her personnel file to just document the kind of experience that they're getting. And that would be just an automatic memo to personnel records, and that would protect the . . . not protect, but just document what the individual organizations or the individuals are doing and what kind of experience they're gaining. It would be a positive thing.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Anyway, we're not here to write the government's policy, and if the government's policy isn't working, I'm sure we'll hear about it again in the future. But I agree with the recommendation as far as it goes.

Mr. Anguish: — I have a problem a little bit agreeing with the recommendation, if there's disagreement between the Provincial Auditor and the Provincial Comptroller as to when a secondment has to be formalized. And I don't want to agree to this unless there is that understanding between the Provincial Auditor and the comptroller because I don't think we want to have the Provincial Auditor's office at some point citing these examples of abuse because it's not written in at some point in the future. So I want the two of you to come to some kind of agreement on terms of what a secondment is and when it has to be formalized.

Mr. Kraus: — It was my understanding formally — and I'll let the auditor just respond to this — that if there was a policy established that would ensure that formal agreements were put into place for secondments over two months of consideration, he would think that was a reasonable policy. He may prefer to see even a month documented in a formal agreement. But I think when we talked informally, he felt that this proposal was reasonable. You know, I don't want to put you on the spot, but I think that's what we had agreed to.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, that's a reasonable interpretation of where we stand. So there is no disagreement.

Mr. Anguish: — Then why don't we put the recommendation, where secondments are in — and I'm talking about 1-2, Mr. Chairman — where secondments are in excess of 60 days . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well it would read something like this: we recommend where secondments are in excess of 60 days, ministers ensure organizations properly document all arrangements to provide employees to others.

In item 1-2 I'm wondering if it's agreeable that we insert after "we recommend" the words "where secondments are in excess of 60 days." So therefore it would read: we recommend where secondments are in excess of 60 days, ministers ensure organizations properly document all arrangements to provide employees to others. Mr. Kraus, is that all right?

Mr. Kraus: — Sounds good.

Mr. Anguish: — Does the Clerk have the wording?

Mr. Chairman: — I am curious. Because the auditor's relationship with the Crowns isn't the same as it is with line departments, you in theory could have people bouncing in and out of from Crowns to line departments in less than 60 days and not be documented, right?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, less than 60 days under this would not be documented.

Mr. Chairman: — It would be very easy to pick it up. I think if you were with line departments, you'd quickly see a pattern evolving that you would catch on to. But from Crowns back in and out, you'd have no . . .

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, we're now asking this question in our audit process of all government organizations about the practice of secondments. So we're looking at it right across the waterfront, not just in departments.

Mr. Kraus: — Mr. Chairman, does the auditor, the Provincial Auditor, ensure that the private sector auditors then are aware of those requirements? Like you said you were asking all Crowns. You're either doing it yourself or through the other auditors?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, yes we are ensuring that when there's an appointed auditor they know to keep track of these things.

Mr. Chairman: — Section 1-3, agreed? Agreed. 1-4?

Mr. Kraus: — Do you want my comments on what I think the policy might end up being, or you're going to make your own recommendations and . . .

Mr. Chairman: — By all means.

Mr. Kraus: — Is this on the 1-3?

Mr. Chairman: — Right.

Mr. Kraus: — I believe that the position may be, is that they would like to see the . . . is that hiring is to be done through agencies, Crowns, or departments that appear before the Committee of Finance. I believe what they're talking there is saying that Saskatchewan Power Corporation can't hire a ministerial assistant, but if it was a Treasury Board Crown that was receiving its funding from the legislature and had to appear before Committee of Finance, go through the estimates routine, they wouldn't see anything wrong with that.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Would that show up in the *Public Accounts*?

Mr. Kraus: — No, not necessarily. Not unless Treasury Board Crowns provide that detail. But the case of SPMC, they are providing the detail, so you'd see it. That's right.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, I disagree with that policy by the way, that policy proposal. I think all ministerial assistants and all minister costs should be run through Executive Council so you know where there is a cost of a minister, not just the ministerial assistants but the cost of travel and other associated costs.

And there's a general issue here that I think . . . and a general solution to the general issue. And then many of the problems that we have in the special report relates to the departments providing detailed information about their spending and other government agencies and corporations not providing detailed information about their spending. And to solve many of the issues that are in our special report, I certainly strongly recommend that the committee recommend to the legislature that all government organizations provide the same kind of details of expenditures as departments.

I notice in . . . the previous government had announced that they were going to increase the disclosure requirements for government organizations funded primarily by the tax dollars so they are truly accountable. And that was an important step to help clean up or help rectify some of these problems.

I see an equally important step would be to require the same kind of disclosure of government corporations and certainly the Gass Commission also recommends something similar, that all government organizations should be providing the same level of detail as departments unless they're specifically exempted by the mandate. But it's a general issue. And I think on the ministerial costs it should be moved to the Executive Council so you can keep track of everything that's moving through a minister's expenses and that if departments are

spending public money and so are Treasury Board corporations and Crown corporations are spending public money, they should also be providing the same kind of details of expenditures.

Mr. Kujawa: — Mr. Chairman, I'm referring to 1-3 and several of the others. I think generally a recommendation of a negative is not really a good legislative way to go. And saying, for instance, that we recommend ministers not hire this through corporations, is not telling them how to do it. If we tell them how it should be done, then we don't have to list all of the negatives. Just like we say that the ministerial assistants should work for the executive government, and that does not include working in a constituency office. We could go on and on and say doesn't include tugging boats down the Saskatchewan River for tourists, etc.

Another one on the next page where we shouldn't pay for goods or services not provided. Dammit we know we shouldn't. The Criminal Code says we shouldn't. I don't think we need that as a recommendation. Because once we start listing the negatives, we will be here for ever listing those which should not be done.

So that's my comment on 1-3, the second part of 1-5 and 2-1. Now maybe you want a whole lot of discussion on whether we should promote negative recommendations. I think we can't.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, one way of making a positive statement would be to say that we recommend all costs, all minister costs, including the cost of ministerial assistants to be borne by, accounted for, managed by Executive Council and reported by Executive Council.

Mr. Kujawa: — Right.

Mr. Strelieff: — That's one way.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That's one way. I wanted you to say that all ministerial staff are to be paid by agencies, departments, and Treasury Board Crowns that appear before the Committee of Finance. That way you also ensure accountability.

Mr. Kujawa: — And it's a positive recommendation.

Mr. Kraus: — My comment there is that you have to look at who answers the question too, and it could be . . . You get in Committee of Finance and the opposition generally asks well, Minister, could you give us a list of your ministerial assistants, and asks a bunch of questions about them. I think it puts the Premier in a tough spot when he'd have to answer the questions across the whole government. Because if you took the recommendation of the auditor, he'd bear all the costs, and I think have to answer all the questions.

And I also don't think that it properly shows the cost to the Department of Finance. I mean there is a significant cost to running the minister's office and his ministerial assistants and other things. I think it's . . . I could argue that it's fairly charged to the minister of Finance rather than Executive Council. If people want to know what the cost

of these departments are, it's fair to do as is being recommended by the . . . or suggested by the government.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, one of the problems with having costs, ministerial costs being borne by the department, is the department doesn't really have any way of managing those people. They report to the minister. And sometimes they'll be working on departmental duties and sometimes on agencies and corporations and a wide array of duties.

And I'm not sure in a legal context whether ministerial assistants can actually be hired by Crown agencies and corporations. I think they may have to be solely managed and hired and controlled by the departments. But I think a more preferable route would be to show the cost in Executive Council because that's where it could be managed.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I'd like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that 1-3, that we recommend that all ministerial staff are to be paid by agencies, departments, and Treasury Board Crowns that appear before the Committee of Finance. And let me just say that we've gone from a system of where ministerial assistants were being paid for by commercial Crowns to do work in ministerial offices, and there was no public accountability at all, to a suggestion by the auditor that ideally the most preferred method would be for all those ministerial staff to be accounted for through the Executive Council.

And I happen to agree with Mr. Krause, and being familiar with the process in the House before the Committee of Finance, that many of the questions that do arise, at least the beginning of consideration of estimates, are always about ministerial staff. And then to put the Premier on the spot to ask about assistant Joe Blow in the Energy department, who he doesn't know from a hole in the ground, to be asking questions about that, it seems to be to be inappropriate.

I think that a good first step for us would be to take this recommendation that if they're paid by an agency, department, or a Treasury Board Crown that's answerable to the . . . or that appears before the Committee of Finance, then at least that we're showing that there is some public scrutiny of all ministerial assistants. And let's see how that works.

And if in your opinion that that's somehow not working and that there's not accountability, then we can revisit that at some future time. But my feeling is that that's what will work. The question is not just only *Public Accounts*, but there's also a question in Committee of Finance of asking ministers, what is it that this person does; what is their relationship to this; what are their qualifications? And those are questions that arise all the time in estimates in Committee of Finance. I think it's an appropriate way to play it. As Serge says, it's a positive recommendation and I think it ensures accountability both in Committee of Finance and here too, because it will show up in *Public Accounts*.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, and members, when the permanent head comes to the table and we ask them, do you know whether you've been paying for all . . . or when

you make a payment to an individual, do you know if that person is providing services to your organization, how will that permanent head answer that question in the context of ministerial assistants who work for a number of organizations, not just one? And when we ask them that question, what are they going to say? It's a very difficult question.

And the second point is . . . which is why we're moving these recommendations forward is to solve those kind of problems. And the second point is I'm just not sure whether Treasury Board corporations and agencies have the legal authority to hire ministerial assistants.

Mr. Chairman: — I tend to agree with the direction of the auditor because I really believe that there should be some way that all political staff can be easily identified. Commercial Crowns right now, I mean you can have whatever tag you want to put on them and they still work for the minister and they're outside of the realm of the auditor.

I mean ultimately I think the taxpayer expects us to arrive at a system where you can clearly identify that these 100 people who work for the Government of Saskatchewan are political people, in some way that on election day they're all terminated, or something to that effect, that people feel comfortable with the public service being defined greater. I think what the auditor's trying to do here is define where your political people will be paid from. And ultimately in our system, unfortunately, the Premier holds ultimate responsibility for everyone in government.

Now Harry's right that you can get at that process in the legislature, but the broader you sweep the brush, the easier it is to miss something. And maybe it isn't Executive Council; maybe Mr. Kraus is right, the Department of Finance is where all of the political people in government are paid out of and identified by. Because otherwise I think, Harry, in all due respect to what you're suggesting, you will still have the public at large thinking there is the ability to hide political people doing political jobs in other organizations.

Mr. Anguish: — I think the issue is one of disclosure, so that the public does know who fulfils the political roles. And I wouldn't wish it on our Premier or anybody else's premier to have to stand up in estimates and get beaten up by the opposition because he doesn't know of some particular political hack that works in some department.

I mean that might be fine for your accountability process as an auditor, but politically it just causes a great mess. And I'm not talking about it in any kind of partisan terms, but I think that we just need to know who the political staff are. I think Mr. Chairman is right about that.

But there are other ways to do it, other than putting it all under Executive Council. I mean maybe we could recommend that the cabinet ministers or members of Executive Council report annually, to the comptroller and the Provincial Auditor, who works in their office and where they're paid from. I mean there's other ways of doing that, to getting concise and accurate information, other than putting it all under Executive Council. And I can't agree with you on putting it all before Executive

Council. There must be other alternatives to that that suits your needs.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, it's not my particular needs that I'm concerned about, it's the perception or the ability of permanent heads that come to the table and are asked, are you . . . all the people that you're paying, are they working for you? And they're not able to say yes, and they're not able to say where they're working in some cases because the ministers responsible have a diversity of responsibilities. And to make sure that the costs of what the department does are just the costs of what the department does and that the permanent heads can be held accountable, it's an important step.

And it's an important step to me in terms of just the openness, the making sure that those who are spending public money can be held accountable for spending public money.

Mr. Anguish: — I don't totally accept what you're saying. If your concern is the permanent heads that appears here before this committee and you have to do your audit in that particular department and your staff asked that permanent head of the department: do all these people work for you; do you know where they're working, that permanent should be able to say yes, except for these people who are ministerial assistants.

And with the staff that you have, I don't see the problem in you being able to audit whether it's 16 or 18 or 19 ministers' offices, to verify that in fact those people work in those offices.

I don't think it puts any undue stress or a lack of accountability on the permanent head's part to be able to not tell you where certain people are working because they would be tagged as ministerial assistants. I mean even in the most recent documents that came out that give the schedule of payments, people are listed in there as ministerial assistants.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, how will the senior financial officer or the deputy minister of a particular department sign when he signs the cheque that services were rendered to my department?

Mr. Kraus: — I may have an answer to that. Part of the directive that has gone out is that there be . . . it's recommended that ministers certify monthly time reports for their ministerial assistants. And the time report that was created is an attendance report that's not the same as but it's very similar to the kind of attendance report you'd find for management people.

It indicates if they have taken . . . their name; the branch — which branch would mean Department of Finance; date — the month of November; nature of the leave; and then it indicates: did you take any recreation leave, illness or pressing necessity leave without pay or earned days off, scheduled days off, and there's some reconciliation of how much sick leave, rec leave, and all of that you have left. The employee signs it; the supervisor, being the minister, would sign it. And these things are supposed to go over to the payroll people in the administrative . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Is that in practice now?

Mr. Kraus: — Well if I was to say it's in practice across the government, but I mean it's supposed to be in place. That is what's supposed to be happening.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd be very interested in those, Gerry, because . . . I'm going to use an example; I'm not going to use a name. But I went to a minister's office on a Thursday in this building, with a constituent concern, and was informed by the one secretary still there that there was no one available because they had all gone to the NDP convention already. Okay?

Now I don't think on that frigging form is that Friday was spent at the NDP convention, in all due respect.

Mr. Kraus: — No, and I mean . . . well I shouldn't say no. I don't know what is expected, but it does say that ministerial assistants hired under the ministerial assistant employment regulations — and this is on their attendance report — are not permitted to work in constituency or caucus offices on government time. And if they do so, they have to do that on their own time, their holidays or definite leave. Now whether they consider that to be in that category or not, I can't say.

Mr. Chairman: — And I'm not pointing a finger at any individual because I know it happened in certain circumstances when we were in government. And if my staff had done it I'd have fired them on the spot. But his guy evidently feels differently. So be it.

But I'll . . . You know, I can check the time sheets with you if you'd like and we'll see who's making the point here. The point being that you cannot in this system . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Into making a report to the legislature that we can agree on.

Mr. Chairman: — But we're trying to come up with a solution here to a problem that obviously is very open-ended. And I tend to agree with you, Doug, on second recollection. I don't think the Premier should have to stand in the legislature and account for some 21-year-old MA (ministerial assistant) that obviously has a mind of its own at certain times. That's not fair. And it would wreak havoc with our political system.

But I think as wide as Harry is suggesting is maybe still leaving in the public's mind that we haven't moved a great deal.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I think we have. I think we've moved a great deal. I mean we're shutting down some avenues here while making a positive statement about where it is that ministerial assistants shall be paid from, and by definition excluding a bunch of areas where they won't be paid from. And I think we're making a positive statement. And also saying that if there's ministerial assistants, their salaries are going to be reported somewhere, the public can see it, and the ministers are going to answer in the legislature because it's clear who's working for them and it's going to show up in the *Public Accounts*, unlike what we've had before. I think we're taking a big step forward here in terms of public

accountability.

Mr. Kujawa: — I'm probably missing a whole lot of administrative detail but why is it we have a limited number of ministers, they have a limited number of executive assistants and ministerial assistants? Is it too much to ask the Minister of Education to keep track of the number of ministerial assistants and what they're paid.

And if I am going to ask in the House about this, surely I don't expect the Premier, although he is technically in charge of everything, who in hell these ministerial assistants are. I'm going to ask the Minister of Education: how many assistants do you have? Three. What are they paid? What do they do? It seems to me extremely simple. What am I missing?

Mr. Chairman: — Well it's just the point the auditor made. If you ask the head of Department of Education who signs the cheques for the three of them, what they do; and he may not or she may not be able to answer because that ministerial assistant may also, in my case, have dealt with a Crown or with another agency on a part-time basis that that deputy minister of Education wouldn't be aware of.

Mr. Kujawa: — But if we apply the secondment rules to them the same as we do to other employees, we have that taken care of.

Mr. Chairman: — It's unworkable because that individual, for instance when you hit your short-staffing times, your two summer months were always very difficult to me because everyone wants to take their holiday at the same time in this province which is the few months of warm weather that we have, except politicians, then you would end up with my MA for SEDCO, okay — which is a Treasury Board Crown, I think it is, is it not? SEDCO? No, CIC (Crown Investments Corporation of Saskatchewan) Crown — ending up doing Energy and Mines stuff, end up doing SRC (Saskatchewan Research Council) stuff, at the end of the day ended up doing Native Affairs stuff. And I don't think that there's one of those guys could tell you . . . one of the permanent heads couldn't tell you on a given day what that individual was doing.

Mr. Kujawa: — So what?

Mr. Chairman: — Well . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — So what? The point is that you got a ministerial assistant who is being reported, and their salaries given somewhere, as opposed to a system which you had where there's no reporting of who these people were, what they're being paid for.

You've got them there . . .

Mr. Chairman: — But Harry, I distinctly remember.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And you've got someone that's answerable for them. What difference does it make . . .

Mr. Chairman: — People in opposition made a big point about what people were doing, other than working

exactly for the department.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — No, no. The point was that they were being paid by Crown corporations. No one was answerable. No, there was no reporting. And they were working for ministers through departments so that these salaries weren't showing up in departments. That's what the problem was. And you had these people working in other places, being paid for by Crowns, and no reporting of that. That's the point.

And you know, I think the suggestion that we made will deal with that. You know the auditor says you should deal with that by having all of them go through Executive Council; I don't agree. I think that's administratively, it's even more complicated.

Mr. Chairman: — That's ... (inaudible) ... that's not a solution to the problem.

Mr. Anguish: — Well it was a solution for the auditor's office at one point.

Mr. Strelloff: — The alternative to having it the Executive Council is to publish the details of payees and expenditures of all government organizations so then it just becomes open, completely, all government organizations.

Mr. Anguish: — There's one other problem here that I don't think we've really discussed yet either ... is that I don't think a permanent head of a department should be someone who has to answer politically.

And whether we accept it or not, ministerial assistants are political by the nature of their job, and it should be the cabinet ministers that answer for those people, not the permanent heads of the department, and it should be understood by your office in terms of whether they've got the authority to pay. Yes, they do have the authority to pay, but the nature of their work is different, and they shouldn't have to understand what that's doing. It should be the cabinet ministers who are held accountable for those people, as long as there is full disclosure as to where these people are working and where they are paid from.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anguish, to me your recommendation puts the permanent head in the position of having to be held accountable for the work that is done by a ministerial assistant that doesn't relate to the work of the department, because that's his responsibility. His responsibility or her responsibility is to carry out the work of the department and be held accountable for the costs of that department.

Mr. Kraus: — If the attendance reports are being provided to the administrative people and they're paying on the strength of the supervisor who is the minister, I think at some point you have to say, look, the deputy minister and his administrative staff are paying on the basis of that information. If that information is proved to be incorrect, I don't think you hold the deputy minister accountable. I believe at that point the minister has to be accountable.

I mean, this thing you could ... Quite frankly I don't think the deputy minister would know whether I sent some staff

member off to Timbuctu; he can't keep on top of hundreds and hundreds, in fact in some cases several thousand employees. So you have to rely on your system, and if someone is misrepresenting the situation, then that someone should be held accountable. And the case, as we've described it, I don't think it's the deputy. I think it would be, quite frankly, the minister.

Mr. Kujawa: — Again am I missing something? You have the Justice department, down there; you can see the building. The deputy minister of Justice is in charge of it, runs the damn thing, knows who's working for him, knows what he's doing, what they're doing. He doesn't know, except by reading in the paper, how many people are working for Bob Mitchell in this building in his political office, and he has no bloody say over the employees in this office. And they're not accountable to him, and if he asks them, what are you doing tomorrow, they'd be quite free to say, who are you? So why not leave the minister in charge of his assistants and be responsible for telling us who they are, what they do, how much they pay. Seems to me like you can't get it simpler than that.

Mr. Chairman: — Shall we adjourn for lunch and think about this for an hour and a half?

Mr. Anguish: — Hour and a half? One-thirty. Our agenda says 1 o'clock, One-thirty is better. I was actually going to make that suggestion, and I would support you. I would support you on the 1:30.

Mr. Chairman: — Is that agreed?

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, do you agree with that?

A Member: — Right.

Mr. Chairman: — By being chairman, Doug, you get to be wise in these things.

The committee recessed for lunch.

Mr. Chairman: — Call the committee back to order, and we'll proceed with the discussions surrounding the special report by the auditor and the series of recommendations that have been put before us. I believe we were at section 1-3, and the discussion was on the role of ministerial assistants and political people in the public service and how they should be reported to the taxpayers of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Van Mulligen, do you want to carry forward with your suggestion at this time, or do you want to ...

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Van Mulligen's suggestion, as I recall, read something like: we recommend ministers hire ministerial assistants only through Treasury Board Crowns, agencies, and departments that appear before Committee of Finance. Is that correct?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Yes. That ministerial staff are to be paid by agencies, departments, and Treasury Board Crowns that appear before the Committee of Finance. That is to say, estimates in the House, and then most definitely in the *Public Accounts* as well.

That's a more positive way of saying that we don't hire ministerial assistants through corporations.

Mr. Chairman: — Is there any further discussion on that particular point?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, and members, I'm still uncertain whether it's legal to hire ministerial assistants other than through departments. Corporations can only hire employees in a general sense, not ministerial assistants. And of course as I said this morning, I think it's more appropriate to put all ministers' costs . . . just like the present government has recently put the salaries of ministers into the Executive Council, they should also put the costs of the ministers in the Executive Council so that the organization that manages their activities can be held accountable for their costs.

Mr. Anguish: — Whose Acts would be violated?

Mr. Chairman: — The Government Organization Act.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Then I think we should go back to the recommendation that's there: we recommend ministers not hire ministerial assistants through corporations, period.

Mr. Chairman: — Treasury Board Crowns simply hire through . . . just to call it an employee. Different Act.

Mr. Anguish: — So there's two Acts that would be violated in the opinion of the auditor?

Mr. Chairman: — Well it'd be just one that would be violated. I'm just saying that if you hire in a Treasury Board Crown, it's just an employee designation rather than a ministerial assistants Act.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Then I withdraw. If we can't frame it positively — in all respect to Serge — then I just say that we recommend ministers not hire ministerial assistants through corporations as it's stated.

Mr. Kujawa: — Well if we're going to do that, why don't we say we recommend that ministerial assistants not be hired by astronauts or one-armed lesbians or any other thing that you don't want them hired by. You don't put in a recommendation that's negative because you never run out on negatives. So if you want to achieve something, you put it in the form that you want it achieved.

Mr. Chairman: — Harry, why can't you then say — because your point is valid — say, this committee recommends that the ministerial hiring Act of Saskatchewan be amended so that ministerial assistants can be hired by whatever you think.

Mr. Kujawa: — Right, right.

Mr. Chairman: — If you want to do it that way. If you're comfortable with it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can we just leave this one and let the . . . Like, the intent is to frame it positively and to maybe have Mr. Kraus and Mr. Cosman, if necessary, I guess, check the Acts and frame the thing positively

through departments and such other entities as may be in a position to hire ministerial assistants reporting to the . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Legislature.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — To the legislature without appearing before the Committee of Finance. You may want to re-frame that one in a positive way.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, we'll leave 1-3 and go on to 1-4.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Great.

Mr. Chairman: — Agreed. 1-5.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It certainly makes a good point that "The Executive Government does not include a constituency or caucus office . . ." And ". . . recommend ministerial assistants' contracts include this restriction". He says, well, what other exclusions might one think of? I don't know at this point how one would phrase that.

Mr. Chairman: — Does the auditor have any comment on this?

Mr. Anguish: — If the recommendation could be just ended after the first sentence, so that the recommendation would read: we recommend ministers require their ministerial assistants to work for the executive government only. Period. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, that is the objective. We were just elaborating on it.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Kujawa's point though is that you'd elaborate for ever, this person shall not work as an astronaut, shall not work for . . .

Mr. Strelloff: — Got a different copy there?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It says it does not include a constituency or caucus office and doesn't include, say, the political party office or whatever other variations might come up in the future, that's the problem. And if you have a positive statement, he works for executive government only, well that's executive government. Period.

Mr. Cline: — We should just erase the second sentence. That would suffice, I think.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Then we recommend ministerial assistants 'contracts include this restriction. You know, that's okay.

Mr. Kraus: — There was some intention, I believe, Mr. Chairman, to include that specific restriction in the ministerial assistant employment regulations. I don't know if that's happened, but they were giving that some thought. To at least identify those two things that should be excluded.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Whatever exclusions the government wants included on any given day but . . .

Mr. Anguish: — I still favour ending it after the first

sentence.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, the first sentence is the key point. Okay?

Mr. Anguish: — You okay on that, Gerry? Lynda? So delete everything after the first sentence in 1-5?

Mr. Chairman: — 1-6. Agreed. 2-1.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It's agreed but I guess the question is how do you phrase that positively?

Mr. Strelloff: — It could be that ensure that organizations pay only for goods/services not received. So it's a positive sense: we recommend ministers ensure that organizations pay only for advertising goods/services received.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That are received.

Mr. Chairman: — That are received.

Mr. Kujawa: — Isn't that exactly the same thing?

Mr. Strelloff: — But you wanted a positive statement instead of a negative statement.

Mr. Kujawa: — What else would you pay people for if not for goods or services?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well that's a good question.

Ms. Haverstock: — Sometimes you pay them and they don't do anything. That's what we've been discussing here.

Mr. Kujawa: — Well if you want to include it, sometimes we'll pay them for just staying the hell out of the way, that might be all right.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well that could be a good service.

Mr. Kujawa: — We recommend ministers ensure that organizations do not pay for that which they didn't receive. That's the same as saying, let's put a stop to stealing. That would be a positive statement but it's already in the Criminal Code and that's federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Cline: — That certainly covers it all, I think.

Mr. Kraus: — Just an aside, I heard on the radio on the way over that someone was wondering whether they should have legislation to prevent violence. And I wasn't sure where this was coming from or where it's going. But I mean what good would legislation be to that extent. You couldn't enforce it, to legislate there be no violence in the world or whatever.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, from my perspective you're sending signals to the government administration and your colleagues that in the past we paid for goods or services that we didn't receive. We shouldn't have been and we're concerned about that. And this sends a signal saying, make sure that you don't

pay for goods or services that you didn't receive. I mean, that's a signal. Obviously it should not be happening. It shouldn't have happened in the past and it shouldn't happen in the future.

Mr. Cline: — Mr. Chairman, actually Ms. Haverstock and Mr. Kujawa and myself had our hands up.

Mr. Chairman: — I'm busy thinking. Which one of you was first? Ladies first?

Ms. Haverstock: — Thank you. This summary of recommendations is based on one thing and that's the *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor*. I think it's more than appropriate in 2-1 that this remain in its negative form. It's the only way of expressing the contents of the *Special Report by the Provincial Auditor*, namely section 2 of part 3 of the review which are payments to advertising agencies for goods and services not received. So I would recommend that we just leave it as it is since it is addressing what we've been discussing in this special report.

Mr. Cline: — Well I don't really care if it's framed in a positive or a negative fashion. But I think it does need a little bit of refinement at the end. It should say after the word "received" in the second line "by the payor organization". Because there seems to be some argument that it's okay for one organization to pay for something that was received as long as it was received by somebody. And the only organization that should pay for advertising goods and services should be the organization that received the goods and services not some other organization. Okay. So in my opinion it should read, using the present language: we recommend ministers ensure that organizations do not pay for advertising goods/services not received by the payor organization. In other words, it's not sufficient for SPMC to pay for goods and services that were received really by the Executive Council because . . . and there seems to be people, you know, that think that's okay as long as somebody got something. And I don't think that's the intent of what we're trying to do.

Mr. Kujawa: — So you're saying, not received by them.

Mr. Cline: — Yes.

Mr. Kujawa: — Mr. Chairman, my point is that, yes, it's because of this report and these complaints that we're doing this study and making these recommendations. That could very well be a preamble to our recommendations and what we're saying. But if we put it this way, I'm going to get a job with the *Leader-Post* and get the biggest headline since the war was last declared, pointing out that the Government of Saskatchewan has now said we are not going to pay a whole lot of money for stuff that we didn't get. Brand-new law in Saskatchewan.

We'll be looked upon as if we're out of our cotton-picking minds. We're now saying ah ha! If you don't do anything for it, we're not going to pay you. We're not going to do any of this stealing; that new recommendation says so. I think we'd be laughed right out of the park. We know we're not supposed to steal.

Mr. Muirhead: — Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's a matter of whether somebody's stealing or not. I think it's what we've been mostly talking about this week and in the past, for services paid by that department but not received by that department. That's been a lot of the problem. Some other department may or may not have received the goods, or whatever. But is that not your intent, is to whatever department is going to pay must receive those goods? Isn't that what our intent is here?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, Mr. Muirhead, yes, and perhaps if we just move to 2-2 and just focus on 2-2 instead of 2-1, it provides more context and is a more useful recommendation.

Mr. Muirhead: — What I was going to recommend, and I don't care how we word it because I think it has to happen we recommend working in good this way if we . . . because we have to follow to 2-2. We recommend ministers ensure that organizations do only pay for advertising/goods received.

Then if you move into 2-2, that should work out. Because we don't want to . . . Mr. Kujawa was right. We don't want somebody come along saying, here, we want to stop what maybe never happened. We're not too sure it's all happened. It's only been, Mr. Chairman said this morning, coffee-shop talk that these things have happened. We just know for sure that it's happened, don't we, that departments have paid for services that they never received. But we haven't proved whether some other department, in some cases, did receive them or not. That's what we want to stop, isn't it. I think that's what our goal is.

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, I like the auditor's suggestion of deleting 2-1 and just moving on to 2-2. There's only one addition that I'd make to that.

Mr. Muirhead: — No problem with me.

Mr. Anguish: — It's in the second-last line of 2-2, to add after the word "received," which is the second word, "by that organization." Those are the words to be added, "by that organization."

And so that the whole recommendation to cover section 2, I think could read as follows: We recommend each payment voucher for advertising goods/services include sufficient documentation to support the payment, i.e., the payment is for the lawful purpose of the organization, the goods/services have been received by that organization, and the amount paid agrees to the contract or is reasonable as required by statute.

And I think that that covers off the entire section 2, and we'll just delete section 1.

Mr. Kraus: — Of course this should apply to all goods and services and naturally it does, I believe. But I would like to just point out one concern that I have, and it may not be a concern if the auditor agrees it is not a concern. And that is that there are times when you may be dealing with a company who is providing service. It might be someone providing computer services or software development services. And you are in a position where you are the lead

agency and it happens to me. And I may very well be doing work and receiving goods and services, some of which are really being provided to the Public Service Commission, and I pay the bill because the agency doesn't want to receive a bill from PS . . . I'm sorry, doesn't want to bill PSC and ourselves. And maybe there might even be a third party sometimes. But I will pay for that and in turn expect that PSC would reimburse us for their fair share.

But all I'm saying is, is that if you take this to the fine point, you could say, well you can't pay for it. Except for your portion, make the company bill everybody. And I would hope that isn't the intent.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, no that is not the intent.

Mr. Chairman: — We agree then, we'll delete 2-1 and go with the wording as proposed by Mr. Anguish in 2-2? Is that agreed? Agreed.

Section 3, goods and services provided without charge to the ministers.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — This 3-1, salaries are now reported through the Executive Council, but travel and other expenses are still reported through the ministerial . . . or through the departments. Is that correct? Is that the practice today?

Mr. Kraus: — What was the question again?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Salaries for ministers are reported through the Executive Council in the *Public Accounts*, are they? And in the *Estimates*?

Mr. Kraus: — It's been recommended that be done that way, but it's under review, and I'm not sure that a decision has been made just yet how that's going to work.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well no, I'm just trying to get it clarified what the practice is today as to how to report that. Because I have some concerns whether travel and other expenses of ministers come generally under the Executive Council. Because then that assumes that the Premier is going to be in a position of explaining and defending those proposed expenditures in the Legislative Assembly as opposed to ministers explaining and defending their own appropriations on a department-by-department basis.

Also when it comes to explanation in the *Public Accounts*, who should be providing that? The department or the Executive Council? My guess is probably the department.

So it's not a question of there not being accountability in terms of reporting; it's a question of who does the explaining here. And my feeling is that the departments, the ministers should do their own as opposed to the Premier on their behalf.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, I think my understanding is that for the '92-93 estimates, the minister's salary is in the Executive Council. The travel

and costs are still distributed elsewhere.

For '91-92, which is in the *Public Accounts*, that wouldn't have been the case. The minister's salary would be elsewhere, in a department . . . or department. So you've moved to the general principle that the cost of the minister is in the Executive Council, which you haven't moved . . . at least in the *Estimates* is other costs: administrative assistants and travel and whatever else.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — On this one there's travel and other expenses. And again I . . .

Mr. Kraus: — Well at this point for sure, travel and other expenses are still . . . travel for sure would be by department. I believe if the minister travels, I'm pretty sure it's included in our administrative subvote where the ministers' offices costs are located.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Just from two points of view, I don't know about salaries, the ministers' salaries, but certainly travel and any other expenses, it seems to me that from the viewpoint of accountability cycle at the front end in the Legislative Assembly and Committee of Finance, the minister explains, here's the money that's being suggested; part of that's for travel; yes, here's the travel I took last year; I'm prepared to explain what the travel is all about, my trip to New York or my trip to whatever, and I plan to travel again this year; and here's the rationale for my travel, and here's some other expenses that are being budgeted for; and yes, I had these other expenses last year and here's my rationale for that.

And also then for the department at the tail-end of the accountability cycle would come in here and say: yes, this is the minister's trip to New York; here's the details of that trip such as what was provided to us; and yes, here is where it fits within generally we think the mandate of the department, that is Trade and Investment, or something else, whether it was to attend a municipal ministers' conference in Halifax.

I think that you're going to get a better explanation of what those expenditures were all about if those expenditures are still in the department as opposed to the Premier standing up — if we adopt this recommendation — in the legislature saying, the minister's trip to New York? Well I'm not quite clear on the details of his trip to New York last year, and why don't you ask him? Well we can't ask him because the expenditure is here under the Executive Council. And when we get to his department, he'll say, well that expenditure's under Executive Council, so I don't have to answer it here.

And as opposed to bureaucrats from the Executive Council trying to explain to us various trips and other expenses that may have been incurred by ministers in relationship to their departments and trying to explain that to us here, without them really having a knowledge and an appreciation of what it is that the minister might have been doing on that trip or how it related to their departmental activity.

So I think in terms of getting an explanation upfront, the tail-end of salaries . . . I mean I don't know what's to explain, although I have some sympathy for salaries also

remaining with departments because then at least the opposition can move that a salary be reduced to a buck, but which you can't do under . . . I mean it wouldn't make much sense under Executive Council to wait till you got to that to reduce the minister's salary if you weren't happy with the answers you were getting in estimates.

But certainly for travel and other expenses, I think we're better off, that the accountability is given through the department as opposed to Executive Council.

Mr. Anguish: — What's your point?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well I'm not sure whether I agree with the recommendation. I have no problem with ministers' salary, but travel and other expenses, I don't necessarily agree with that.

Mr. Chairman: — But if it isn't a problem, Harry, why is it here in the department?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — In my experience like . . . I remember one time where we had Jack Klein's officials here when Jack Klein was the minister of one of the Economic Development portfolios. When we had Jack Klein here, we were asking his officials all kinds of questions about the trips that he took to Africa and other places. And they were able to explain in great detail what the trips were about and how this fit in with the departmental mandate, etc., etc., etc. I'm not sure anybody in Executive Council is going to do that very adequately for us.

Mr. Chairman: — What's the problem we're trying to solve then with this one?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, maybe another way of handling this is to recommend that the minister's department or that minister's travel, other expenses including ministerial assistants be clearly identified as a cost of the department. Or not a cost of the department, that's true — as an expenditure of the department.

And having it in the department's cost instead of other kinds of corporations and agencies and commissions, you at least have one spot to question what the minister is doing with his travel and other costs, including ministerial assistants, in the context of the department that he or she is responsible for, but that it's only . . . including ministerial assistants, the costs are only in the departments rather than buried in various Treasury Board corporations, agencies, and commissions. At least there's this one spot,

Now that answers your concern about the Premier being able to answer questions that pertain to Executive Council and pertain to all ministerial activity, and puts it right where the department is, where the minister is doing his business or her business, but keeps it in the department. So that would be ministerial assistants as well.

Mr. Kujawa: — Sounds good to say that that's going to be in one spot. But I've pointed this out before, that in my opinion it is not in one spot and can't be made into one spot because the deputy minister of the department is not

in charge of the ministerial assistant or his secretaries or his crews.

In the old days when I first joined the department in this building, we had a very unusual attorney general, minister of Justice. He decided he wanted a full-time secretary so he carried on for four years with a staff of one. The last I heard it's gone up to 17. They're doing less, but they're now 17. And the deputy minister of that department doesn't have any say over any of that, and is not going to get it.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, and that's why our original recommendation is that all costs of ministers including travel, other expenses, ministerial assistants, should be placed in the Executive Council where it's clear what's going on and the questions can be answered. Because for your reason, the permanent head of whatever the organization isn't responsible for those people. And he can't hold or she can't hold those people accountable.

Mr. Chairman: — Well we seem that we get over this hump of accounting and keeping the other. Why can't we have it so that they are disclosed in both places? So they're disclosed in both places. I mean, you're saying that the minister is doing his own thing in Justice, therefore he should be responsible. And Harry says that the Premier shouldn't be. But maybe for the sake of this problem, because it's going to occur more place than one, you just say that it'll be reported in both places.

As I said before, the Premier is ultimately . . . I mean I can remember my premier getting asked all sorts of questions about people that I don't suppose he ever even knew existed, but he still had to answer them in some fashion. He'd take notice or he'd do something with them in the premier's estimates. Okay. They went on for days and days and days about all sorts of strange things.

A Member: — Oh don't exaggerate.

Mr. Chairman: — Doug! How quickly the worm turns here.

What would be wrong with it? The auditor would feel comfortable that they're reported in both places. And away you go. The minister still has to stand in the House and defend himself.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I don't quite understand. The question is one of reporting things that are paid for, the taxpayers paid for, and . . .

Mr. Chairman: — I mean the hang-up here is, Harry, and you're right, you can't expect one individual to know everything that's going on in government. Right?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Right.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well I don't know what we're getting hung up here for. Because I've watched it in this here legislature for well on 15 years now and the only time this is going to be questioned by anyone really is in the legislature under estimates. And the Premier comes in with the Executive Council sitting behind him and people from the departments and the staff and they're

responsible to answer all questions.

And I agree with Serge. You just can't have one person being responsible for this or that. They've all got to be responsible. The Premier is asked a question. He can't answer those questions. He turns around to his deputy to the Premier; not the Deputy Premier but the deputy responsible for Executive Council. He has got to get that answer. It doesn't make any difference where it comes from, if it comes from the department or wherever. What difference does it make? I don't see anything wrong with the way it's worded here right now, the way it's worded.

Let it go where the chips fall over there. Because we are not in this room going to be telling the Premier and telling the ministers how they're going to answer these questions. You're all kidding yourselves if we think we're going to be able to tell Mr. Romanow or Mr. Devine, in the last nine years, exactly how this is going to happen. When you're asked those questions in that legislature, they've got to answer to the opposition. They've got to answer, and that's it. And somebody's got to come up with an answer.

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, you give us your undertaking that the first question you don't ask is look at the growth in Executive Council, look at all the people they've got in there. You wouldn't ask that, would you?

Mr. Muirhead: — Sure I would.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. Yes, well I guess we're opposed then to 3-1.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well I mean it's just . . . I don't see any reason to get hung up on this. Because the Premier is the head of the Executive Council and he has to see that that answer comes from some place, somewhere, and you shouldn't hang him up on where he has to get it from. He should be at open ground. Now if I was the premier of this province, boy I'd sure want to have open ground about who is responsible for what. I wouldn't want to be tied in.

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, can we revisit that one along with 1-3 because they sort of tie in together, if that's acceptable to you, Mr. Chairman, that we'll revisit 3-1 at the same time we revisit 1-3?

Mr. Chairman: — Is the committee agreed? Agreed.

Mr. Kraus: — Question on 3-2. I know that the government has developed a policy for gifts, acceptance of gifts. And you may recommend that but they do have a policy in place that includes up to what dollar value they can accept and/or whether or not they . . . when and if they have to disclose the value of the gift. I don't know whether that's been made public yet, but it's certainly been developed and accepted.

Mr. Chairman: — I don't think this was ever aimed at that policy. That policy has been around for a long, long time.

Mr. Anguish: — I suppose that since we are having a little bit of a discussion, is I'm a little bit concerned about the minister who goes out and speaks to the School Trustees Association and at the end of the meeting they are given a

small gift by the School Trustees Association. Or quite often with aboriginal peoples, if a minister will go out to a reserve and address the band members, there'll be a pair of moccasins or something like that given. I'm wondering if this recommendation, by us recommending that, says that you cannot accept your pair of moccasins or your little gift from the SSTA (Saskatchewan School Trustees Association).

Mr. Cline: — Is this not intended to say ministers not accept goods, services provided by government organizations without charge? No? You're dealing with beyond government organizations in this recommendation? We're talking about 3-2.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, Mr. Cline, you're right. The recommendation is in the context of one government organization providing a minister goods and services without charge. I got sidetracked because of the gifts angle.

Mr. Chairman: — Do you want to rewrite that, Mr. Cline?

Mr. Cline: — Well I think so. I mean, given what's in the report, I think what we intend to say is we recommend ministers not accept goods, services provided by government organizations without charge. Now and I take it that means government organizations other than the organization for which the minister is responsible?

Mr. Chairman: — No, that would have to be inclusive.

Mr. Cline: — Okay so it would be inclusive.

Mr. Chairman: — I mean, if the bitch is the Liquor Board then you'd have to . . . you can be the minister of it, you still can't receive goods and services from it. Okay?

Mr. Cline: — Okay, because you're talking about a minister in his or her personal capacity — is that correct? — as opposed to as minister responsible for a department?

Mr. Chairman: — That's very difficult to differentiate. When you're a minister you occupy the office. What we're doing is saying there's a guideline there that you can't even receive a set of book-ends from the geologist in the Department of Energy and Mines if you're Energy minister. I mean that's basically what you're . . .

Mr. Kujawa: — Mr. Chairman, I think we have to figure out exactly what it is that we're trying to deal with here before we can come up with a draft of it. And is it confined just to government departments? Probably not. And even if it is, then how about this prior to a formal secondment? Can't we receive some goods and services?

Like for instance, I'm working for Justice, and the Department of Health wants my services for two days. The minister says, go and provide it without charge. You don't say a word about that. I've worked for two days in the Department of Health. Surely that's okay, if you do it for . . .

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, the recommendation is set in a context of the ministers

should not be receiving goods or services without charge as a personal benefit.

I'm not talking about carrying out the duties that you would have to carry out, but as more of a personal benefit. And in the context of other government organizations is what we were focusing on as a result of this report.

Mr. Kujawa: — But again, shouldn't there be a limit because, if there isn't, I have a bag of wild rice about this big that I'll have to return to Cluff Lake. I got it as a gift.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Mr. Chairman, I agree with the principle of this recommendation, and I guess it's like framing laws. You agree with, or you set certain . . . you articulate certain laws, but you leave it to the organization to define the regulations thereafter.

And I agree with this principle. Now how the details of that are going to get worked out, well we'll leave that to the government to determine because maybe they'll figure 100 bucks is appropriate or maybe 200 bucks. And I can't . . . you know that's not what we're recommending. Let them sort that out. But in term of the general principle, I agree with it. I think it's a good one.

Mr. Hunt: — You added principle?

Mr. Chairman: — On what's wrong? Mr. Cline's wording?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Yes . . . (inaudible) . . . on my part. It is a principle.

Mr. Serby: — The only concern that I would have about Mr. Cline's amendment to it is that that excludes any kind of goods or services that you might receive from someone who's outside the government.

Mr. Cline: — I would make the point that that is regulated, I think, by The Members of the Legislative Assembly Conflict of Interests Act. That is, there are rules that pertain to receipt of gifts from outside of the government, I think, by members of the legislature, which would include members of cabinet. So I assume that it would be covered off that way in what we're talking about here. And I think we're mixing apples and oranges.

What we're talking about here is the way the government works — the organizations in government. And the other I think should be — because we're dealing with public accounts here — the other is an ethical question to be dealt with in the conflicts of interest context in that legislation and whatever regulations may be arrived at thereunder or by whoever administers that legislation.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes, I know that ministers have a . . . there's a formula in place, as Gerry said, for when you go deal with the Japanese. They always give a gift, and they expect one in return. And the department people already have that kind of stuff all figured out, of what sort of meets the threshold of being acceptable in the eyes of both parties and doesn't break the taxpayer, sort of thing.

And I don't know what that formula is, but they give things and it's the way business is done. But they seem to

operate . . . and there's never been a question, to my knowledge, raised in my time in the legislature over that type of gift exchange thing going on.

Mr. Anguish: — But Mr. Cline's wording would take care of that by adding "and provided by government organizations."

Mr. Chairman: — Well, you could qualify that by "Saskatchewan government organizations" then, if that's the problem.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But there you go. Now you're getting away from a principle to prescribing the particular circumstances, as opposed to saying to the Legislative Assembly, here's a principle that we feel that should be paramount in the government's considerations. How you want to define that, whether it's government organizations, federal government organizations, provincial government organizations, Crown corporations, agencies, departments, other outside organizations, non-governmental organizations — what about hospitals that are mostly funded by the government? Where do they come in? Or universities as distinct from other business organizations that may not have any relationship to the government?

I don't know. I don't want to get into it.

Mr. Cline: — I'm saying Saskatchewan government organizations. I mean it doesn't make sense to have the recommendation worded the way it is worded because even we don't know what it means if we leave it like that. Therefore we have to confine it. And it seems to me that you confine it to Saskatchewan government organizations because we are dealing with public accounts — the public accounts of the province of Saskatchewan, and in particular how the organizations within the provincial government spend their money. We're not dealing with Japan or the federal government or the university or the hospitals, in my opinion.

And the rest of it, I mean you have to regulate in another way, it seems to me. It's got nothing to do with the mandate of this committee.

Mr. Chairman: — Is the auditor comfortable with that?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, our recommendation is in the context of Saskatchewan government organizations providing goods or services to ministers without charge. We weren't contemplating a broader scene.

Mr. Cline: — No, I assume that. I just think that it should be clarified.

Mr. Muirhead: — I'd almost recommend that maybe we just take it out entirely. Ministers not accepting goods and services without a charge, I mean that's getting into a pretty dicey bunch of little things that could come up on that.

Mr. Chairman: — Well it's in the report though, so we

have to deal with it.

Mr. Muirhead: — Yes but we can vote yes or no on here, accept recommendation yes or no. Maybe I'm just recommending . . .

Mr. Chairman: — You're wanting us to vote no and turn it down. Well yes, that's an option.

Mr. Muirhead: — I'm recommending we just throw it out.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd rather we put something in place though.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Did you say that the government was working on a policy or had one?

Mr. Kraus: — We actually developed it for the Treasury Board, and it went through cabinet. And I'm expecting that it will be made public shortly. And I suppose I shouldn't say too much about it, but I believe, if it's adopted as recommended, that it would include some public disclosure. And I mean now we're not talking about gifts for ministers from their own Crowns or their own departments. We're talking about when you speak somewhere and the agency or someone maybe gives you a gift of . . .

Mr. Anguish: — We're getting into a pretty broad area . . .

Mr. Kraus: — I know. But that's the thing, is that they do receive gifts regularly, and they've tried to come to terms and set a policy that will be reasonable and publicly accountable. And that's beyond maybe what this thing is addressing.

Mr. Anguish: — Could I propose one more wording, and it's in line with what Eric says, but it changes it to a positive from a negative or maybe it's a positive-negative. I'm not sure.

To use wording similar to this: we recommend that goods and services provided to a minister by a Saskatchewan Crown corporation, department, or agency be paid for by either the department or Executive Council.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But that's not what the government's getting at, I guess.

Mr. Anguish: — Well that's what the auditor's getting at, and we're dealing with what the auditor's getting at, not what the government's getting at. I mean, how did we get into the policy on receiving gifts from an Indian band? I didn't know that was what we were on to at the start.

Mr. Chairman: — What minister is going to refuse to pay for . . . what department head is going to refuse to pay for his minister's whatever, Doug?

Mr. Anguish: — Well that's all right because then it's accountable.

Mr. Chairman: — True, but if he shouldn't have incurred the cost? He's still putting onus on his deputy to sort of pick up the tab with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Kujawa: — If we are agreed that this applies to gifts from governments, from other branches, etc., then why don't we switch it by saying nobody in the Government of Saskatchewan should give stuff away. If they don't give it away, that the other guy can't accept it. And there you have it on a workable basis.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, from what I can see, if you add: we recommend ministers not accept goods or services without charge from Saskatchewan government organizations, that covers the intent of what we were getting at.

If you want to broaden it to what Gerry's getting at or other kind of factors, fine. We were just trying to focus on reminding ministers that they should not receive goods or services without charge from various government organizations, various Saskatchewan government organizations. We have not done a study on what you receive from Japan and what should be received from Japan, so I have no advice or comments to offer.

Mr. Kujawa: — Wouldn't it be easier to say then that the government organizations not give stuff away for free?

Mr. Chairman: — To move on on this, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to take the prerogative of the wording that the auditor obviously feels comfortable with, that was part of his report on this thing, and we can say yes or no to it. And if we don't want that, then fine we'll move to the next one.

I mean, that's basically Mr. Cline's amendment. The auditor's reconfirmed it. If we don't like that . . .

Mr. Anguish: — Read to . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Strelloff: — We recommend that ministers not accept goods or services without charge from Saskatchewan government organizations.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — But it's okay for them to have accepted them from other, outside organizations.

Mr. Strelloff: — These recommendations are developed in the context of this report, and you're not dealing with something that that happened in Japan or Germany.

Mr. Chairman: — Somebody else can deal with that . . . Public Accounts.

Mr. Serby: — Just a question, Mr. Chairman. I'm hearing Mr. Kraus say that there is a policy that has been established.

Mr. Chairman: — But that's other stuff.

Mr. Strelloff: — That's from Japan or Germany.

Mr. Serby: — Oh, is it?

Mr. Kraus: — It wasn't to address whether or not you would get something from . . . let's stick with the Liquor Board; that's a case of liquor from the Liquor Board. That would not be accepted.

Mr. Chairman: — The question is, do we accept that recommendation or not

A Member: — Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: — Agreed? Carried.

3-3.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — 3-3?

Mr. Chairman: — Back to the same thing that you were with 2-1 and 1-3 and 3-1.

Mr. Anguish: — . . . with the 3-1 and the 1-3.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Three does it.

3-4. Agreed.

3-5.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I don't know what to make of that. I'm not quite clear what it means.

Mr. Chairman: — Who's got it now?

Mr. Anguish: — SPMC, don't they?

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, this means to inventory the furniture and equipment in ministers' offices; and my understanding is that that is happening. And Mr. Kraus confirms that as well.

Mr. Anguish: — Executive Council is doing that or SPMC?

Mr. Kraus: — SPMC may provide the furniture but Executive Council keeps an inventory here. They're doing that now in their administrative offices in Executive Council.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Well it's not accounting for; it's just keeping track of.

Mr. Kraus: — Yes, the word is "physically". Yes, they keep track of it physically, account for it and so on.

Mr. Muirhead: — Maybe somebody can answer me this question. When I was minister of Crop Insurance somebody brought me three or four beautiful, great big pictures, supposed to be owned by Crop Insurance or SPMC, I don't know who, and they're still in my . . . I haven't been a minister for seven years and they're still in my office. Who's responsible for that?

Mr. Kraus: — Whoever provided you with the pictures. I couldn't tell you that.

Mr. Muirhead: — Well I'm asking you, would that be Crop Insurance or would that be . . .

Mr. Chairman: — No, it would be SPMC.

Mr. Muirhead: — I've had somebody come into my office in the last two or three years and took some secretary back there and they said: oh yes, we wanted to see if the

pictures were still here, and walked out. And I don't know who really owns that, when that was put there by SPMC and given to me when I was minister about '84. I just thought of that now. I mean who . . . it doesn't belong to me.

Mr. Kraus: — I think it's SPMC.

Mr. Muirhead: — You think it's SPMC . . . (inaudible interjection) . . . Well I want them there as long as I can keep them there.

Mr. Chairman: — Does anybody have any problem with this? Can you recommend this? If it's been done already, well . . . Agreed? Agreed.

Section 4 — says Goods/services provided without charge to other government organizations.

Well it's very similar to 3-2. Are we going to get in the same . . . Does that need to be clarified with "Saskatchewan government organizations", same as the other one?

Mr. Cline: — Yes, it doesn't hurt to say Saskatchewan government organizations. But when it says, "have clear legislated mandates," that doesn't necessarily mean by legislation. It could be by regulation, for example, could it not? Yes.

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Cline: — So really what we need is clear mandates however they may arise, but I'm not sure legislated is the right word. It may be taken to imply that we're recommending that every organization has to have rules passed by the legislature itself dealing with this, which I don't think would be an appropriate recommendation for us to make or very practical.

Mr. Chairman: — Any comment on that? Auditor have any problem with that?

Mr. Strelieff: — Taking out the word "legislated"?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, we have no problem with taking out the word "legislated" as long as the mandates are clear. I understand the government has announced that they will be introducing significant, descriptive, detailed mandates on what each government organization is supposed to be doing, and we look forward to those mandates.

Mr. Chairman: — Just take out the word "legislated."

4-2. Agreed.

4-3. Agreed.

Section 5. Evidently that's been done.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The only question is will it be consistent . . . (inaudible) . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Leave that up to the ministers, Harry.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Okay. Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Now we have three areas to revisit. Do you want to take a short break, and then revisit?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Yes. 1-3, 3-1, and 3-3?

Mr. Chairman: — Yes. 1-3, 3-1, and 3-3?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Yes.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay. Ten-minute break.

The committee recessed for a period of time.

Mr. Chairman: — . . . back to order.

Perhaps before we launch into these three sections again, I'll give the auditor an opportunity to perhaps come up with a solution here before we have a lot of debate again.

Mr. Strelieff: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One possible solution would be that all costs of ministers' travel and other costs and ministerial assistants be placed in the minister's department and clearly identified as costs related to the minister so that the deputy or the permanent head isn't held accountable for those costs. Now that doesn't move it to the Executive Council and it doesn't spread it around to the Treasury Board, corporations and agencies and commissions where there is some question whether there is legal authority to even hire ministerial assistants, but at least the costs are clearly associated with the ministers and he or she can defend and discuss those costs. And by separately identifying them, the permanent head, the deputy minister, is not responsible or in some way not directly accountable for those costs.

Mr. Anguish: — We had a little discussion and it might be possible that we have some wording that would be acceptable. And if the word is accepted, I believe that 1-3 could be deleted and covered more extensively in item 3-3.

So if we could go to 3-3 first, Mr. Chairman. And we propose the wording as follows: We recommend the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance, provide all furniture and equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, and any other goods or services required for the operation of the minister's office.

And we propose that to you and if that's acceptable, I think we could delete 1-3 because it would be covered in 3-3.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — As to the question just on that . . . As to the question of reporting, I think, which you were getting at, if the *Public Accounts* are — it's been a while since we discussed it, the format of the *Public Accounts* — but if the *Public Accounts* clearly indicate that this is the ministerial office expenses and related thereto, I don't think that's any big problem. I mean, they are by and large

now anyway, and the questions are asked, which of those costs pertain to the ministers' offices. I don't see any problem with that.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, the *Public Accounts* so far only provide details of departments. I think there is, or there was, a move towards providing the details of the same type or organizations that you've just mentioned: the Treasury Board, corporations, commissions, and agencies that appear before the Committee of Finance. But I'm not sure what the status of that move is. Perhaps the comptroller can advise.

Mr. Kraus: — Could I make an observation? And I say this with due respect to the auditor. He did use the term "so far", and I just want to point out that we probably have more detail, and I would argue perhaps in some ways too much detail, but we have a phenomenal amount of information in our *Public Accounts*. I doubt anyone other than ... Some of the jurisdictions that get into measuring outputs would provide the quantity. You won't find ... That supplementary that I provided, goodness, I don't think you'll see anything like that in any jurisdiction. So we have so much information now, I wonder how we could provide any more short of giving you six feet of information. But I have some difficulty with the idea that I should include ... or you would want all of these agencies' details in the one *Public Accounts*.

I thought that what you saw for SPMC in their annual report where they provided some details, I thought that was appropriate. Because if you want to ask SPMC about their payments you can ask them and refer to their annual report.

And so I would hope that you wouldn't recommend, for example, that the details of SPMC's payments and some of the other Crown agencies be provided in these *Public Accounts*. I think they should continue to support the payments that are made from the Consolidated Fund to the government.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I think we're getting on to a somewhat different discussion than what the amendment that Mr. Anguish is putting forth. One is the question of who is responsible for the expenditures. The other question is the format of reporting that.

I agree with Mr. Anguish's suggestion as to how we ... section 3, goods and services provided without charge to ministers, I agree with the suggested response that he has, and that is the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crowns which may be legally permitted to make such expenditures and which report to the Committee of Finance, that in fact provide the furniture, equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, etc.

Mr. Chairman: — You still have that problem, Harry, without a recommendation to change the legislation under which hiring is done, you're going to run counter to the ministerial hiring Act — ministerial assistants hiring Act.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — No, we're saying ...

Mr. Anguish: — It must be legally permitted. And I repeat.

We recommend the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance provide for all furniture and equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, and any other goods or services required for the operation of the ministers' offices.

Mr. Hunt: — You were saying you were comfortable with that suggestion as well.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — This one, yes.

Mr. Strelloff: — You suggested once that the amounts of the ministerial costs, whatever organization may be allocated, to be identified as ministerial costs, clearly, so that the permanent head within the organization isn't so obviously accountable for something that he or she cannot manage, which is a problem.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — I think that's assumed. That's the case now, isn't it?

Mr. Anguish: — That's the case now within the supplementary document that Mr. Kraus mentioned.

Mr. Strelloff: — Mr. Chairman, members, the supplementary document that Mr. Kraus refers to only covers departments — departments only. And that's the only document that's referred to this committee. You've broadened it out to Sask Property Management Corporation, agencies, corporations — other than CIC corporations — so that information isn't disclosed in the supplemental and isn't therefore referred to this committee for scrutiny. And as a result, in the past at least, it's difficult to get to those details.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — And so what do you suggest we add to what Mr. Anguish was saying?

Mr. Anguish: — You see I can't think that the key is that they have to be legally able to provide that function, goods and service, or the staffing positions, and that they appear before the Committee of Finance to be held accountable for those expenditures. And even though it might not show up in a line of the *Public Accounts*, certainly there's nothing to preclude a member standing in the Committee of Finance to ask whatever questions that member wishes to ask.

So I think those things are key — that they have the legal ability to do it, and that they have to appear in the Committee of Finance.

Mr. Chairman: — There was some writing that was tacked on the end there — what was that? — for which they are accountable or ...

Mr. Hunt: — It's a separate identification of costs for the provision of such services. I think Mr. Anguish's motion dealt with the provision of services, but not a separate identification of the cost provision. In the *Estimates*, for instance, if the point is reviewable before Committee of Finance, then separately identifiable as that time. I thought Mr. Van Mulligen indicated some support for that earlier. I think Mr. Anguish's motion just dealt with the provision of services.

Mr. Chairman: — And what you're saying is the costs of those services have to be identifiable at the same time.

Mr. Streliaff: — Mr. Chairman, members, as long as you've moved the ministerial costs to organizations outside the departments, the separate identification of it is in fact relevant because it's not provided anywhere other than in the Committee of Finance if you ask the specific question. And if that's what the committee believes is rigorous enough, I mean that's what the committee believes.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Can I just suggest that maybe we add: and that the costs of such goods and services be allocated appropriately and the government attempt, wherever possible, to report these through the *Public Accounts*.

A Member: — Through the *Public Accounts* or through the annual reports?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Through the Public Accounts. If they're not in the Public Accounts they're going to be in an annual report.

Today Treasury Board Crowns aren't obliged to give a listing of all the payees and, you know, provide that level of detail. Tomorrow that may change. Tomorrow, who knows? Maybe the ministerial Act then will be changed so that Treasury Board Crowns can also assume part of the costs for the operation of ministers' offices. Who knows, maybe tomorrow the Treasury Board Crowns will also come through the *Public Accounts*. I don't know. But the point isn't just that who's responsible, but also that the costs be allocated appropriately. And there's a further question of report.

I don't want to go out on a limb and say today that, well, you've got to come through the *Public Accounts*, you know. Just that the government attempt wherever possible to report through the *Public Accounts* and see what happens.

Mr. Anguish: — I want to go back to the reporting of it. Do we need to work that into the wording, the question you asked about whether it's identified?

Mr. Hunt: — Mr. Van Mulligen was trying to pick up the gist of it that would provide for a little more flexibility perhaps in the end result, depending on . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — What happens now if a minister has a department and got agency responsibilities and some may have even had two departments? How do the ministers' office costs get allocated now? Is it just one department and that's it?

Mr. Kraus: — There'd be a primary department, and I'm speculating a bit if they have a couple of departments, but certainly when they have a Crown, it's the department that's picking up all of their office expenses.

However, it can happen. With some of the Crowns it's possible that a minister and even a ministerial assistant might be travelling for the Crown specifically and they

will bill that across. They try to make sure they do it fairly, but it can be done if it's demonstrated the work was done for the Crown.

I think the government would . . . I shouldn't say the government, but I think they probably would like to keep pushing as much as they can towards the departments. But still they . . . and I think the idea is to try and make sure accountability is well-served but be reasonable and fair here. I'm not so sure that an SPC (Saskatchewan Power Corporation) or a CIC shouldn't pick up some travel costs if it's for them. Why should Finance have to bear that burden?

Mr. Anguish: — Right.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — So the suggestion then that the costs of such goods and services be allocated appropriately doesn't concern you then?

Mr. Kraus: — No.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Or it's something you would support?

Mr. Kraus: — Yes.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — So I've run that one up the flag-pole and maybe you folks can decide what you want to do with it.

Mr. Anguish: — Well are we comfortable with the proposal that I made for 3-3?

Mr. Streliaff: — Could you read it again and see where we are?

Mr. Anguish: — Sure, I'd be more than happy to read it. With this?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Oh sure.

Mr. Sonntag: — I think that would make me happy.

Mr. Anguish: — What would make you happy?

Mr. Sonntag: — If you read that with it.

Mr. Anguish: — This with it.

Mr. Sonntag: — Yes.

Mr. Anguish: — I'm not sure I can read it but I'll do my best:

We recommend the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance provide all furniture and equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, and any other goods or services required for the operation of the ministers' offices; and that the costs of such goods or services be allocated appropriately and the government attempt wherever possible to report through the *Public Accounts*.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The other thing we can do is maybe get this thing typed up and deal with it tomorrow morning, if you want to table it further.

Mr. Chairman: — Oh, I'd rather deal with it so that I can give . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — They're still trying to figure it out from Mr. Anguish's verbal presentation here what the intent is and what it is that he's exactly reading off.

Mr. Chairman: — I'd rather get it in a draft, Harry, and if we don't like the draft we at least have time to change it.

Mr. Anguish: — Is there some way of finding a wording which we can tell goods or services that are provided to a minister that wouldn't normally appear in the *Public Accounts*, if there is an expenditure made outside of what would normally appear in Public Accounts, that they would be compelled to appear before the Public Accounts Committee to account for it?

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Minister, members, this committee has access to anybody in government through the *Public Accounts*. Everything a government does, now that we have a summary financial statement, is run through the *Public Accounts*. So if you want to bring in somebody from Sask Crop Insurance Corporation and ask them if they provided any services to the minister responsible, you can.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay, let's go back to this suggestion then. Is that all right with you? Do you want me to read this again?

Mr. Chairman: — Well let's do a comparison here. Doug, is your proposal going to assign some sort of value to the 17 times that three ministers used tickets at the Centre of Arts even though the tickets they used aren't normally sold to the general public? It's in this section. This section was put in place, it said:

Accordingly, we are unable to determine if the Centre failed to collect revenues due to the Crown.

On tickets at the Centre of the Arts, but these tickets evidently aren't sold to the general public anyway.

Mr. Anguish: — One of the recommendations, Mr. Chairman, that we're making, I would think that a minister should not accept those tickets. I think that item number 3-2 provides for that; item 3-2 reading: we recommend ministers not accept goods or services provided by Saskatchewan government organizations without charge.

That's my view on that.

Mr. Kujawa: — The Centre of the Arts is not a government organization.

Mr. Chairman: — Quasi.

Mr. Kujawa: — It isn't.

Mr. Chairman: — Well it receives an annual stipend, doesn't it?

Mr. Anguish: — I think for the purposes of this it is, because it reasonably received money from the government.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It is a government agency.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, the board of directors of the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts are appointed by a separate government council. Therefore it is part of what government is and does.

Mr. Kujawa: — All right. We'll switch this to the Globe Theatre. Would that apply?

Mr. Chairman: — No.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, we haven't dealt — at least in the context of this report — we haven't dealt with goods or services provided by outside organizations to ministers. We just haven't done that.

Mr. Chairman: — Nor do we want to. We just want to get to the public accounts.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. So are you comfortable then . . .

Mr. Chairman: — Well I'm getting there, yes. The gist of what you're trying to do is that the agency, department agency or Crown that reports through the legislature will have to bear the reporting of this in this committee. Right? Is that what you're getting at?

Mr. Anguish: — Try me on that once more.

Mr. Chairman: — Well you're saying that anything that goes through the Committee of Finance will have to show ministerial whatevers, providing that it's legal, which means ministerial assistant hirings, and therefore it should show up in this committee through the annual *Public Accounts*.

Mr. Anguish: — Well it may not show up if you're not with the *Public Accounts* documents. It might not show up in the *Public Accounts* documents.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — It might show up in their annual report.

Mr. Anguish: — It might show up in their annual report.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, if you want to add a different wrinkle to it, trying to keep, I think, the spirit of where you're coming from, you could say that the ministerial costs, just a thought, the ministerial costs should be identified in the annual reports of Treasury Board corporations and commissions and agencies, so that if it's not specifically identified in the *Public Accounts* because it's not within a department, it is specifically identified in the annual report of a Treasury Board corporation or commission, and then you could also suggest that those reports be referred to this committee. But in general they are through the *Public*

Accounts.

So the one wrinkle then is to show the ministerial costs and expenses that have been allocated to a Treasury Board corporation or agency or commission, that those annual reports would show ministerial costs. Just that idea; I'm not sure of the words.

Mr. Chairman: — But I think in the past they weren't identified by particular minister, were they? They were just shown as ministerial costs, which could have been a whole whack of ministers performing a service there.

Mr. Strelieff: — My understanding in the annual reports of specific corporations and agencies, those kind of costs weren't shown at all in a specifically identified way. They were just buried somewhere.

Mr. Chairman: — Right. But I think under the members' expense regulations or whatever, that a Treasury Board Crown would show ministerial travel X, but that might have had three or four ministers involved in travel for that particular corporation. Wouldn't that be the case, Gerry?

Mr. Kraus: — I'm not sure . . . I just heard the last part of that question. I was thinking about the reporting of the Treasury Board Crowns, and I . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — Gerry, when there's an annual report of a Treasury Board corporation, does that corporation in its annual report specifically identify ministerial costs?

Mr. Kraus: — Oh no, no, You have to wonder whether . . . I understand what you're trying to achieve there, but you wonder, does that add any value? Is that the way you want to keep track of the . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — Well I think they should be assigned to the Executive Council.

A Member: — We're moving a bit on this, Gerry.

Mr. Chairman: — We're trying to saw this off here.

Mr. Strelieff: — There's no sort of pull-up?

Mr. Kraus: — This isn't really off topic. One of the members on the committee the year before, the year before that, mentioned that you know it's odd how much we focus on a minister or something and say, look at all the expense associated with him. But you could take some other individuals like myself or the auditor and say, well now let's allocate all the office expenses and the rent and the travel and see what our costs add up to. At times here it just seems to me we're almost going overboard to identify some expense that's been allocated to a Crown that . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — So you're arguing like I am — they should be in one place so you don't have to fool around with all those allocations. I agree with you.

A Member: — I'm glad that there's some movement over there.

Mr. Strelieff: — You're a good teacher.

Mr. Anguish: — I understand what the auditor is saying in terms of . . . Any government, whether it's this one or the past one or a future one, should not be able to hide something away from the public. We used to get very frustrated, especially within the Saskatchewan Property Management Corporation, because there was so much going on. You didn't know which questions to ask to get at the answers that you were really looking for.

Mr. Kraus: — Do you want the policy that requires Crowns of any nature to report expenses that they're incurred on behalf of ministers and ministerial assistants if they're not reported somewhere else? Is that what you're really after?

Mr. Wendel: — Do they report that in the *Public Accounts*, Gerry?

Mr. Kraus: — Not if . . . Like the instance I gave where they may go on a trip that pertains to CIC or Sask Power Corporation, that cost would be picked up by one of those two corporations. They report it. It wouldn't be out of our Consolidated Fund, no. We would not report it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — On the other hand, you could say that in addition the cost of such goods and services be allocated appropriately. How about saying the cost of such goods and services be allocated and reported appropriately and the government attempt, where possible, to report through the *Public Accounts* of course. That's what you're getting at, right? It's not a question of just allocating it, but it's also a question of reporting appropriately.

Mr. Strelieff: — Mr. Chairman, members, yes the disclosure of it is an important element. And the other element is holding the permanent head accountable to what the permanent head is responsible for. And that's the one we're missing here. That puts the permanent head and his staff in awkward positions.

Mr. Anguish: — How about, Mr. Chairman, another attempt at 3-3 here. We recommend the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance, provide all furniture and equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, and any other goods or services required for the operation of the ministers' office. Where good or services to a minister's office do not appear in the *Public Accounts* documents the appropriation should be noted in the annual report of the appropriate entity.

I don't see that we have a problem with that because there should be disclosure of where people are hired and to what purpose they're hired. Is appropriation the wrong word in there?

Mr. Strelieff: — In the last phrase it seemed to be in the wrong because it's not appropriated.

Mr. Kraus: — The expenses incurred by . . .

Mr. Strelieff: — Just that last phrase.

Mr. Anguish: — Expenses incurred ... (inaudible interjection) ... Sure I'd be more than happy to read that again, Mr. Muirhead.

Mr. Muirhead: — The reason why I'm asking is I think we're getting closer.

Mr. Anguish: — We recommend the appropriate departments, agencies, and Crown corporations which are legally permitted and which appear before the Committee of Finance, provide all furniture and equipment, support services, ministerial assistants, and any other goods or services which ... any other goods and services required for the operation of the ministers' offices. Where goods or services to a minister's office do not appear in the *Public Accounts* documents, the expenses incurred should be noted in the annual report of the appropriate entity.

Mr. Kraus: — And that would include SaskPower or it would include SPMC.

Mr. Strelloff: — No. You said that only organizations that appear before the Committee of Finance, unless SaskPower does appear before the Committee of Finance.

Mr. Kraus: — I think the last sentence though was broader than that. At least I interpreted it that way.

Mr. Strelloff: — Well okay. When it happens, it should be recorded.

Mr. Kujawa: — If we're going to try to get down to at least a basic wording right now, phrases like "which are legally permitted" I think should be deleted because if they're not legally permitted, they can't be here.

Our job is ... Like one of the things that I was brought up on is if you're drawing a contract, unless the janitor of the building can understand it, it's no damn good. And we tend to use too many words that we don't understand.

Mr. Chairman: — Mr. Kujawa, can we, for the purpose of a draft to get on the table tomorrow, can we take this as it is because they want to consult with the Legislative Law Clerk and some others on this hiring practices. So if we've got a legal problem, we can maybe clean it up. If we just get it into a draft stage and then at least people can look at it and proceed with it or change it.

Is the committee comfortable with this last wording change to the draft stage? Agreed.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — The principle of ministerial responsibility is that ...

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. And I recommend then with the acceptance of 3-3, we delete 1-3.

Mr. Chairman: — Agreed? Okay we still have 3-1 to deal with.

Mr. Anguish: — Three-one. We recommend that new wording be placed in 3-1. And the new wording would be as follows: we recommend the office of Executive

Council be responsible for ministers' salaries; the travel and other expenses be the responsibility of the appropriate department, agency, or Crown corporation that is legally able to provide such goods or services.

Mr. Chairman: — I wonder instead of having that legal thing there we should have "legislatively able" ... (inaudible interjection) ... Yes, that's true.

That's a good point here. The auditor just said to me that really we've covered off all of that stuff after salaries in 3-3. And you could just stop at salaries.

Mr. Anguish: — Can we delete 3-1?

Mr. Chairman: — No, just stop at salaries.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay.

Mr. Chairman: — Point being because your wording is basically the same on the rest of it in 3-3.

Mr. Anguish: — Okay. Agreed? So then the new wording would be for 3-1: we recommend the office of Executive Council be responsible for ministers' salaries. Period.

Mr. Chairman: — Well it's a good or a service. Travel is obviously a ...

Mr. Strelloff: — Does the minister's office include the minister ...

Mr. Chairman: — We've covered off everything else down here though.

Mr. Anguish: — What was your question?

Mr. Strelloff: — For 3-3 we have the goods and services provided to the minister's office. Does the minister's office include travel for the minister? I assume it would. If that's the case, then you've covered it.

Mr. Van Mulligen: — That's the idea here.

Mr. Strelloff: — The minister's office in 3-3, does that include ... Goods and services to the minister's office, does that include goods and services to the minister as well, or just his office?

Mr. Anguish: — No, the minister would be included as well. Our intention is that ministerial travel be covered, of course.

Mr. Chairman: — If we can get that wording for 3. Do you think you've got it, Bob, on 3-3?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Got that down, Bob? Which version have you got?

Mr. Vaive: — On the fourth try, I got it down.

Mr. Strelloff: — All costs of the minister assigned to the ...

Mr. Van Mulligen: — To your auditor's office.

Mr. Chairman: — Okay, well we can prepare the draft then to be presented to the committee tomorrow afternoon. At that time, if there's problems with certain wording, we can tackle it again.

There's nothing else on the agenda today. There's a couple of things that the committee should do, though. The chairman and vice-chairman have accepted an invitation to that luncheon tomorrow, and that will necessitate the committee changing its hours. I don't know if any other committee members have decided to take that in or not, but that'll necessitate adjourning a little bit earlier than 12 noon.

Mr. Anguish: — Mr. Chairman, as much as I'd like to dine with you tomorrow, I have another appointment that I had made some time ago when I knew I was coming down here, at the lunch break, and I won't be able to attend with you. So Mr. Van Mulligen says he'll be going and will be your companion from our group, along with any others who want to attend — the more the merrier. But I just didn't want you to think that I was being negligent in my responsibilities by not attending that particular luncheon with you.

Mr. Chairman: — Sounds good to me. But we still need to formally sort of change our time . . .

Mr. Van Mulligen: — 11:30.

Mr. Chairman: — 11:30 till . . . I don't know if we need to say 2:30?

Mr. Van Mulligen: — Let's make it 2 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman: — 2 o'clock? Agreed.

So we'll begin in the morning with deliberations of the report ending March 31, 1991, and everyone should also bring their comparisons made between the Gass Commission and the auditor's report.

Mr. Anguish: — Ms. Haverstock, do you have that reference sheet that compares the two?

Ms. Haverstock: — I sure hope so. Amongst the paper on my desk, it'll be there somewhere.

Mr. Anguish: — Gerry, you have a copy of that?

Mr. Chairman: — So if someone could move adjournment, Mr. Cline. Is adjournment agreed? Carried.

The committee adjourned at 3:47 p.m.